SENATE—*Wednesday, April 25, 1984*

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 24, 1984)

The Senate met at 12 noon, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of grace and mercy, we thank Thee for life. We thank Thee for Passover and Easter celebrations which remind us of Your liberating passion and power—Your gracious care and provision for every exigency of life. May we never turn our backs on such love. We thank Thee for Resurrection and its hope for emancipation from the weakness and limitation of the body which so often frustrate our fondest aspirations and highest goals. We thank Thee for the supreme hope which Passover and Easter promise. We thank Thee for the reminder of irrepressible life as beauty and fragrance explode and abound all around us in profusion.

We thank Thee, Father in Heaven, for the recess—for opportunity to strengthen family bonds. We thank Thee for the safe return of those who traveled. Especially are we grateful for the safety of Senator CHILES and Senator JOHNSTON. Thank Thee for all the work the Senators were able to accomplish in home States. Lead us Lord, as we enter into the heavy responsibility of legislation which impinges on the life of every American and often on the world of nations. In the name of Him whom the grave could not conquer. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there are five special orders this morning. If I may inquire of the minority leader, I have been told by my staff two things. First, that there will be a caucus of Democratic Senators at 12 noon today, and that it would be the preference of at least two of the Democratic Senators holding special orders that they be permitted to claim that time after that caucus instead of before.

Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, that is correct.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I see the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin present who appears to be coiled and ready to spring.

May I inquire if the Senator intends to claim his order then before the Democratic Caucus?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, may I inquire of the majority leader? I would be happy to go ahead right now. I will take about 7 or 8 minutes.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 2 P.M.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the Proxmire-Kassebaum-Grassley special orders the Senate then stand in recess until the hour of 2 p.m.

I further ask unanimous consent that at 2 p.m. Senators BAUCUS and BIDEN may claim their special orders to be followed by a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not more than 5 minutes in length in which Senators may speak for not more than 1 minute each, and that at the end of that time the Senate resume consideration of the unfinished business, H.R. 2163.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOSCHWITZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. The majority leader is very accommodating. On behalf of my colleagues and myself, I express our appreciation.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. President, I hope that we can have a good, full day today in the consideration of H.R. 2163, and that perhaps we will be able to work out the arrangements for a time certain to consider amendments in the furtherance of the measure before the Senate.

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS, ADMINISTRATOR, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, no American has done more to improve the American environment than the present Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, William Ruckelshaus. As EPA's first Administrator, Bill Ruckelshaus proved himself diligent in getting the facts, creative in finding solutions, and practical in developing environmental law and regulation.

Last week, Administrator Ruckelshaus spoke to the Economic Club of Detroit about where we are in meeting the newest challenges we face in protecting our environment. As always, his is a voice of candor, reason, and fairness. Mr. President, I ask unanimous that his remarks of April 16, "'Not in My Backyard:' Institutional Problems in Environmental Protection," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"NOT IN MY BACKYARD:" INSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS IN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

The last time I had the pleasure of speaking with you was in April of 1971. Although it doesn't ordinarily take me thirteen years to think up something new to say, I would like to use the perspective afforded by that interregnum to reflect on some of the remarkable changes that have taken place in the environmental protection field and to focus on what I consider quite serious problems that still remain to be solved.

From my viewpoint, the most striking differences between then and now are the issues that account for the dominant share of the Administrator's attention. In 1971 those issues were pollution from cars and sewer systems. Mobile source control problems took up most of my personal time then and, shortly before I gave my first speech here, EPA had filed a 180-day notice against Detroit's pollution of Lake Erie. I seem to remember being introduced here as the greatest friend of American industry since Karl Marx.

In 1984, I find that the 1971 issues, while still important, are no longer consuming, for the simple reason that we have achieved much of what we set out to do. Auto exhaust controls have reduced carbon monoxide 96 percent, hydrocarbons 95 percent, and nitrogen oxides 76 percent from the uncontrolled state. Despite a substantial increase in the number of cars, urban air quality has shown a steady improvement and an almost continuous decline in the number of exceedances of air quality standards for pollutants associated with mobile sources.

With respect to controlling sewage, to cite once again the local example, the city of Detroit has made steady progress in meeting its responsibilities; it achieved full secondary treatment and phosphorus removal late in 1981, which represents a significant contribution to improving water quality in the Great Lakes.

Along with these changes we have seen an accompanying change in attitude among industrial leaders. Almost no one now seriously contends that concern for the environment is a fad. Environmental controls have been accepted, like taxes and employee benefits, as part of the price of doing business in this industrialized society. And here it is fair to say that both industrial and political

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

31-059 O-87-37 (Pt. 7)

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

leaders have simply followed the clear preferences of the American people. For the past decade, Americans of all classes and conditions have time and again indicated their willingness to pay higher prices for goods and even to face the prospect of fewer jobs in order to keep the environment clean and public health protected. That's a fact as cold and undebatable as a profit-and-loss statement.

But despite these achievements and that kind of public support, I am beginning to be worried about what I see happening in 1984. We observe, for example, an increased level of contention over environmental issues, as if, having swept our stables, we cannot agree about dusting the piano. We observe the incipient stages of a breakdown in the invaluable tradition that the environment is a national concern, as we see regional or local interests predominating in such issues as acid rain and hazardous waste disposal. Most significantly, we observe that, although public pressure to act remains high, the political process no longer seems able to resolve important environmental issues. Of EPA's nine governing statutes, seven have been allowed to lapse.

We appear, in fact, to have lost much of our ability to turn environmental consensus into practical action. This is a startling and disturbing trend. We Americans have always prided ourselves on pragmatic idealism, but we now appear less capable in this regard then we were in the quite recent past. Part of the explanation lies, of course, in the vexed nature of the environmental issues that dominate the current decade. It was relatively easy to act against smoggy air and clouded waters, but in dealing with such problems as acid rain or toxic chemicals, the smog is in the data; what is clouded is the association between the presence of pollutants and the incidence of disease, or between proposed remedies and the damage we want to fix. Uncertainty can lengthen debate and stall action.

But more than that, our quandary springs from a peculiarity of American political life. It has been noted that the American people are ideologically conservative and operationally liberal. In theory they are against too much government until the elimination of a particular program affects their own well-being. From medicare to automobile import restrictions the message is the same—that government program is not what I mean when I say, there's too much government. In practice, we demand that our two-hundred-year-old political system do the wide variety of tasks we think are necessary to preserve our personal position in modern America. That often means a "liberal" governmental response. In the environmental area, in contrast, I believe we are ideological liberal and operationally conservative.

By this I mean we tend to establish environmental and health protection as absolute values rather than social goods in competition with other social goods. Oddly, of the many different kinds of risks attendant on membership in a technological society, we often single out those connected with environmental pollution as being totally unacceptable. Yet at the same time we are reluctant to make the changes in our way of life (even minor ones) required to attain such goals. Any time we suggest that an inspection and maintenance program be imposed on a municipal area to achieve the health goals the public has demanded in the Clean Air Act, the hue and cry is loud and clear—we want zero risk but not at my expense.

This position has led to some difficulties in the formation of an effective national environmental policy. While it is a fine thing to embody high ideals in legislation, laws should be written so that mortals can put them into effect on this imperfect earth, without either torturing the language or prescribing nonsense. I think it is clear now that in enacting several of our major environmental statutes we did not think through what strict interpretations would really mean. Environmental protection is an enormously complicated technical process; that it now shares the aura of Motherhood and the Flag makes it less, rather than more, likely that we will do a good job of it.

This is because we encourage public officials to strike extreme postures as defenders of the environment, while we shy away from requiring the hard decisions implied by such postures. As a result, in the typical environmental statute, concern for protection tends to overwhelm careful thinking about precisely how such protection will be accomplished. This passes the buck to the executive agency. Moreover, there is ample provision for judicial review, which passes the buck to the courts. And that's just on the Federal level; many statutes have State discretion built in—another set of bucks to be passed. Harry Truman's famous desk sign said "the buck stops here"; the trouble today is that the buck stops nowhere.

Unfortunately, the ordinary solution proposed, when hard decisions have been deferred, is for the Congress to order EPA to perform certain specified actions, usually within a strict timetable. The agendas of the Agency during much of its recent history have been set not by any sort of ordered, explainable, rational analysis, but by the press of public outcry and resultant political response. The public appears to be demanding immediate but not very painful solutions to long-standing problems that we don't know how to fix. Congress appears to believe that the way to satisfy this public demand is to load the statutes with specific constraints and directives. Motion is its own reward, whether or not it is in the right direction.

If I sound like I'm passing the buck back to Congress, I make no claim to be immune from the prevailing disease; but my point is that we should start thinking about how to cure the disease. This will not be easy, because these difficulties are rooted in some of the basic characteristics of American society. Like all other democracies, ours functions by means of a working consensus about the goals and values of national life. But our vast size and the relative isolation we have experienced during much of our history have made it possible for people who did not agree with the prevailing consensus to move on and, by and large, follow a different drummer. In many cases, nonconforming groups were able, by their example, to modify the existing national consensus; and so we have evolved as a nation.

This further spirit of independence and freedom of action remains part of our national consciousness and a source of our strength. It is a spirit embodied in our Constitution, which takes great pains to prevent tyranny by a majority, and which was designed by experts to enshrine our mistrust of concentrations of power by strictly separating the three branches of government. It's as if our national motto, instead of "one from many," was "not so fast."

The trouble is we no longer have a frontier to "hie off to." The world is shrunken by technology and closely linked economically. The fierce independence of spirit, the willingness to fight the consensus, the glorification of the maverick which has been our strength, can become our weakness. We don't have decades to let a new consensus evolve to fit the rapid change and consequent societal demands of modern life. If we are to remain competitive in the world we need to recognize the necessity of adjusting to change more rapidly, of harnessing our entrepreneurial spirit to a sense of national discipline, and that runs counter to the American tradition of independence. Our inability to drive toward consensus, to provide governmental processes which force decisions has very practical effects on our national well-being.

Think of what it now takes to site a major industrial facility. A firm often must obtain agreement from perhaps dozens of agencies and authorities at each of the three levels of government, not to mention the courts. And it doesn't help to satisfy a consensus or a majority of the interests involved; a single "no" anywhere along the line at any time in the process can halt years of planning, effort and investment.

Similarly, we have begun a major national commitment to properly dispose of hazardous wastes. Everyone is in favor of safe disposal, but not in their backyards or anywhere close. In some parts of the country, we are running out of places to put the stuff. It stays in improper places, piles up on the loading docks of the generators of the waste or has to be shipped around the country. The additional risk this may represent to the nation at large does not bother the local groups who resist disposal facility siting. This is the way to run a railroad only if you like what happened to the railroads

Unfortunately, it is not possible to say "not so fast" to the world in which we compete. Successful response to the changes driven by technology or the imperatives of global competition is essential to our survival as a free and prosperous society. We have been remarkably successful in refurbishing our 200-year-old system in response to the modern world, even if at a decreasing rate. But as I see what is happening in the environmental area—one manifestation of our efforts to cope with the unwanted by-products of technological change—I begin to get worried.

The key problem is trust. As I noted, mistrust and a tradition of encouraging maverick opinion are built into our system; the Vietnam war and Watergate, in which government appeared to fail the public, have simply exacerbated what has always been present in American thought. But from the standpoint of an American governmental agency charged with protecting human health and the environment, trust is the oil in the gearbox. That is, the public can object to what a regulatory agency does, or believe that it is going too fast or too slow, but when it ceases to believe that the agency is trying to act in the public interest, that agency cannot function at all.

I don't believe that's the situation at EPA today, although we came close. Our agency, with its extraordinarily wide scope of responsibility, is especially vulnerable to failures of public trust. Can you imagine what would have happened if the decision we made recently about allowable levels of ethylene dibromide (EDB) in food had not been broadly accepted? Each State would have set its own protective standards; many foods would have vanished from the marketplace; and the food production and distribution industry would have been thrown into chaos. We were closer to this condition than many realized. But EPA was trusted enough, its

judgment did prevail, and we avoided such needless disruption.

I don't believe that EPA must be whipped into doing its job, but it is undeniable that many people do, and Congress often agrees with them. In my view this is not the way to establish a sensible environmental policy. We need a better way; we need to find some means of converting the broad societal consensus on the environment into a practical system for solving environmental problems. It can be done; and although it is probably bad manners in this city, I must direct your attention to the example of Japan.

Ten years ago, when I first visited Japan, their environment was a mess. Tokyo's air was so polluted that people with respiratory problems literally could not live there, and many of the rest were wearing masks. Substantial numbers of people in seaside communities had contracted a gruesome disease from eating contaminated fish. I estimated that Japan was three to five years behind us in coping with pollution.

I returned to Japan this past winter and found that they have been able to design and put into practice environmental standards that are in many cases stricter than our own. In terms of ambient air quality, they are now more advanced than us. Need I add, they have been able to accomplish this without noticeable decrement in their industrial muscle.

Now it must be admitted that the Japanese nation has a unique ability to mobilize for massive social change. This ability is largely due to their culture and the techniques they have developed for harmonizing individual, group and societal interests. They realize that someone gets hurt whenever change must occur, but they do not give the injured party a veto, as we so often do. Typically, they will not move on a major social project until everyone is accommodated in some way, until the details of who does what and who gets what and who loses what are entirely worked out. Once that process is over they can move very fast indeed. Although the Japanese may disagree with particular administrative actions, few doubt that national success and survival are the pre-eminent considerations for all government leaders, and for industrial leaders as well.

The Japanese example has led many to advise the adoption of Japanese institutions to solve American problems. While my admiration for the Japanese way is great, we cannot become them nor should we try. We must first understand the necessity of responding more rapidly to changed circumstances. We no longer have the luxury of traveling a decades-long road of adjustment to technological or economic change. We all love mavericks but they make lousy leaders. American corporations understand the necessity of building teams to achieve institutional goals. So must all of us strive to think of our relationship to our country as that of an individual to a team. Like it or not, we are in this together.

Another part of the answer is to create new American institutions to carry out the consensus-building and accommodation functions they do so well in Japan. In a small way this is already beginning. We're starting to see meetings between environmental groups and industrial groups designed to thrash out mutually agreeable positions. More formally, as many of you are aware, we have created a Health Effects Institute jointly funded by EPA and the motor vehicle industry, and this is an important experiment. The institute was created to sponsor impeccable and broadly acceptable research on the health effects of mobile source emissions and thereby prevent what has long been a vexing problem for us all: the inability to agree on the data that forms the foundation of regulatory action in environmental health protection.

We are also exploring with a group of industrial governmental and environmental leaders the possibility of increasing the use of industry's skill and resources in cleaning up toxic waste dumps. There is no reason why the chemical industry—with all that it represents in terms of skill and resources—should sit around like a spoiled child while the society cleans up its past mistakes. The chemical industry agrees: they want to get on with the job. I said earlier that industry attitudes have changed, and this is a good example. Most industrialists today understand that environmental protection is good business. Investments in pollution control will not show as profits in the next quarter, or the next year; but in the long run the benefits in the form of a more supportive public, a healthier work force, and preserved resources will be enormous.

This taking the long view is an essential part of creating a more practical consensus on the environment. Somehow we have to create institutional frameworks that will buffer our country's environmental commitment from the two-year and four-year cycles of the political world. It is sad that, although many knowledgeable people agree that our environmental laws need recasting to reflect scientific and practical realities, there is almost no chance of accomplishing this in the current political climate. But that climate must someday change, and in that hope we are actively and aggressively exploring ways of making our environmental statutes more consistent and effective.

When I spoke with you last, the message I tried to convey was that the EPA did not represent merely a red light for industrial growth, but that it served a green light's function too, in directing movement toward the kind of society we all wanted, one in which a healthy economy and environmental values coexisted. The metaphor is, I think, still apt across more than a decade, except that now we find ourselves at one of those infuriating intersections where the red, green and yellow lights are all on at once. We must develop more efficient ways of coming to a practical consensus in response to new problems, or we are heading toward a sort of societal gridlock. Nations that can forge the requisite social unity will have the road all to themselves. We must get back on that road or be out of the race.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the majority leader arrange for me to retain the control of the leader's time on this side of the aisle under the standing order for later today and possibly prior to the expiration of the rule? I may have something to say about Afghanistan at that point. It would be out of order, if I did.

Mr. BAKER. Yes. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time allocated to the minority leader and the time remaining, if any, to the majority leader under the standing order may be reserved for their use at any time during the course of this calendar day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. President, I have nothing further, and I, therefore, reserve the balance of my time. I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

WHY SURVIVAL DEPENDS ON REDUCING STRATEGIC NUCLEAR WEAPONS BY 97 PERCENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in a recent article in Foreign Affairs, Dr. Carl Sagan lays down an extraordinary challenge to the world's nuclear powers. Dr. Sagan argues that nuclear arsenals are so immense today that if only a relatively few were used in wartime they might kill every survivor on the planet. Why do these nuclear arsenals pose such a terrible threat to human life on Earth? Because international scientists, including Dr. Sagan, contend that even a small fraction of today's nuclear weapons would trigger deadly, cold, dark radioactivity, pyrotoxins, and ultraviolet light following a nuclear war. The human species would very possibly disappear. Dr. Sagan's challenge is for the nuclear powers to recognize this grim threat and agree to drastically reduce the size of present arsenals.

Dr. Sagan proposes an astonishingly sharp reduction. He estimates that the climatic catastrophe could take place with the explosion of between 500 and 2,000 strategic warheads. He calls for us to negotiate levels below the minimum threshold—that is 500 strategic warheads. Since strategic warheads in the world's nuclear arsenals now are about 18,000 and at this time are on a rapid rise, the Sagan challenge could mean the elimination of 97 percent of present strategic warheads, leaving the nuclear powers with about 3 percent of their present nuclear armed strategic power.

Mr. President, there are at least two powerful forces working against the Sagan proposal. On the other hand, there is one nuclear weapon development working to make the Sagan proposal practical. Working against a drastic reduction in strategic nuclear weapons is the powerful momentum of a nuclear arms race that is now proceeding unrestrained, with no current arms control talks underway between

the superpowers. This country is pouring $60 to $70 billion a year into a headlong rush to win nuclear parity everywhere with the Soviet Union and build on our nuclear superiority wherever we have it. The Soviet Union is undoubtedly pouring at least as much into its determination to achieve parity where they believe the United States has an advantage and to maintain its nuclear advantage wherever they have it. Even if suspended arms control talks between the superpowers revive and achieve full success, they would still fail to cap the nuclear arms race, or even freeze the present dangerous level of arms, let alone drastically reduce strategic nuclear weapons as Dr. Sagan has asked.

The second obstacle to Dr. Sagan's plea for a drastic reduction in nuclear arms may be even more difficult. This is the rapid fire spread of nuclear arms to nations throughout the world. As I pointed out on the floor a few days ago, our military intelligence agencies now tell us that within the next 16 years more than 30 nations will have nuclear arsenals, including in many cases strategic nuclear warheads, unless we institute far more effective antiproliferation policies. Mr. President, if the time comes when 30 or more nations have nuclear aresenals, you can kiss goodby to any dream of reducing strategic nuclear warheads to 500 or less. And you can probably say hello to the extermination of the human species. It will be goodby from all of us down here on Earth.

But there is one technological development that suggests that there may be some hope for Dr. Sagan's plea in spite of the awesome difficulties it faces. When I last spoke on the floor I called attention to an article by General Gallois and Mr. John Train that points to the dramatic and potentially drastic shift by both the Soviet Union and the United States from strategic nuclear weapons with immense fallout and yield to pinpoint accurate nuclear weapons—many of them tactical with much smaller kilotonnage and strictly limited fallout. This continuing and decisive shift could conceivably make the Sagan proposal much more practical. Both superpowers have immensely improved the accuracy of their nuclear weapons by factors ranging from 5 to 10. This much greater accuracy has dramatically changed the nuclear war options.

In the Gallois-Train thesis, the Soviet Union recognizes that a strategic nuclear exchange with the United States would simply end in mutual suicide. This thesis contends, however, that nuclear weapons have now achieved such an amazing degree of accuracy that they can destroy military targets utterly with little or no damage to cities and with relatively very few human casualties and none of the catastrophic climate effects so vividly described by Dr. Sagan. Gallois and Train hypothesize a Soviet tactical nuclear attack on NATO forces in Europe. The attack would destroy all NATO military capabilities but leave the cities and the population intact. It would do this by diminishing the megatonnage of the nuclear weapons to a few, in fact, a very few, kilotons, with very little fallout and without the consequent fires that would incinerate cities and kill millions of people. Such a war—if it were contained at this level—would not ignite the nuclear winter. But it could accomplish significant military objectives.

Is it conceivable that such a nuclear war would remain tactical? Who knows? Certainly both superpowers today understand the uselessness of any kind of war involving strategic weapons. That is why deterrence is effective. But how about a world with strictly limited strategic nuclear weapons but bristling with highly accurate, low-yield tactical nuclear weapons? Would not such a world be at least as dangerous as today's world and very possibly more dangerous? Dr. Sagan argues that if the nations of the world agreed to limit strategic nuclear weapons to less than 500, they could still have an effective deterrence. This is at best doubtful. And certainly if we channel nuclear arms competition into tactical nuclear weapons, nuclear war would become far more likely, and escalation to strategic nuclear war very hard, indeed, to contain.

Where does all this leave us? It leaves this Senator with the conclusion that a comprehensive nuclear freeze, followed by a massive reduction of all nuclear armaments, should remain our prime objective.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the summary of Dr. Sagan's article appearing in the winter 1983-84 issue of Foreign Affairs Quarterly be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY

In summary, cold, dark, radioactive, pyrotoxins and ultraviolet light following a nuclear war—including some scenarios involving only a small fraction of the world strategic arsenals—would imperil every survivor on the planet. There is a real danger of the extinction of humanity. A threshold exists at which the climatic catastrophe could be triggered, very roughly around 500-2,000 strategic warheads. A major first strike may be an act of national suicide, even if no retaliation occurs. Given the magnitude of the potential loss, no policy declarations and no mechanical safeguards can adequately guarantee the safety of the human species. No national rivarly or ideological confrontation justifies putting the species at risk. Accordingly, there is a critical need for safe and verifiable reductions of the world strategic inventories to below threshold. At such levels, still adequate for deterrence, at least the worst could not happen should a nuclear war break out.

National security policies that seem prudent or even successful during a term of office or a tour of duty may work to endanger national—and global—security over longer periods of time. In many respects it is just such short-term thinking that is responsible for the present world crisis. The looming prospect of the climatic catastrophe makes short-term thinking even more dangerous. The past has been the enemy of the present, and the present the enemy of the future.

The problem cries out for an ecumenical perspective that rises above cant, doctrine and mutual recrimination, however, apparently justified, and that at least partly transcends parochial fealties in time and space. What is urgently required is a coherent, mutually agreed upon, long-term policy for dramatic reductions in nuclear armaments, and a deep commitment, embracing decades, to carry it out.

Our talent, while imperfect, to foresee the future consequences of our present actions and to change our course appropriately is a hallmark of the human species, and one of the chief reasons for our success over the past million years. Our future depends entirely on how quickly and how broadly we can refine this talent. We should plan for and cherish our fragile world as we do our children and our grandchildren: there will be no other place for them to live. It is nowhere ordained that we must remain in bondage to nuclear weapons.

TRIBUTE TO BRUNO BITKER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is with deep sadness that I announce the death of Bruno Bitker, a long time advocate of racial harmony, social justice, and world peace. My deepest sympathies go to his brave wife, Marjorie.

Bruno Bitker was one of the finest public servants Wisconsin ever produced. He dedicated his life to the strengthening of international organizations. It was his belief that without them, the world could not survive.

Bruno Bitker was the founding chairman of the Governor's Commission on the United Nations, serving in that capacity for nearly 20 years. He was also a member of the U.S. National Commission for Unesco, emphasizing his concern for educational, social, and cultural achievements worldwide. He helped form the World Peace Through Law Center in Geneva, Switzerland, served as an American delegate to the International Conference of Local Governments in Geneva in 1949, and to the First World Conference of Lawyers in Athens in 1963. He was also a member of the American Bar Association's Committee on World Order Through Law, and was a consultant to the U.S. State Department. Mr. President, the list goes on and on.

Bruno Bitker was a public servant in the finest sense of the word. He has a vision of a community of nations in harmony with one another, and he actively strove to translate that vision into a reality. He sought, more than anything else, a better understanding among peoples of the world.

Bruno Bitker was also a humanitarian, and his service to the world as a true champion of human rights should be an inspiration to us all. From 1947 to 1956, Mr. Bitker was a leading member of the Governor's Commission on Human Rights. He also served as chairman of the Wisconsin Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and chaired the human rights panel at the White House Conference on International Cooperation in 1965.

Bruno Bitker's extensive involvement and devotion to the cause of rights for all peoples continued with his selection by President Johnson to serve as a member of the President's Commission for the Observance of Human Rights Year 1968. He served as a member of that Commission's Special Lawyers' Committee charged with the important task of examining the Senate's treaty-making power involving human rights treaties. That same year, Mr. Bitker served with distinction as the American representative to the U.S. International Conference on Human Rights, held in Tehran.

Bruno Bitker was also a longtime, leading advocate of the Genocide Convention, and labored long and hard to bring the treaty to the attention of lawmakers and citizens. I am particularly indebted to this man for the help he has given to me in the attempt to secure ratification of this important human rights treaty.

We are not often blessed with the presence of so outstanding a citizen and human being in our lifetime. Bruno Bitker left behind a legacy of accomplishments, and a dream that will never die. He once said:

> Political entities are not eternal; like man-made structures, they can crumble with passage of time. But ideals and ideas never die. What is recognized through the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are those principles which are basic and essential to man's well being. It is in the support of these rights and in the dignity of every individual that I have directed my thoughts and my energies over the years.

Mr. President, the State of Wisconsin, the Nation, and the world have lost a peacemaker. Though we are saddened with his loss, we are proud to have known him, and the world is a better place because of his presence.

THE TOWN WHICH STOOD BOLDLY AGAINST THE HOLOCAUST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate today a small French village, Le Chambon-sur-Lignon, and its humble residents who heroicly defied the Holocaust for the good of humankind.

What was their heroic task? They concealed some 2,500 Jews and transported them to safety as the World War II Nazis swarmed through central France seeking to eradicate Jews and the underground. And the villagers did this knowing full well that anyone caught hiding Jews was subject to arrest, deportation, and even death.

Le Chambon was the main way station in an underground railroad spanning convents and farms from southern France to Geneva. This small town's revered clandestine effort was led by Pastor André Trocmé and his assistant, Edouard Theis. They collaborated with the American Quakers, the Salvation Army, and Cimade, an ecumenical service organization whose sole mission was to help refugees fleeing from German occupation and persecution.

Other towns within a 50-mile radius—as Protestant as Le Chambon—did little to help refugees. Many Frenchmen willingly hid Jews when they happened by. But Pastors Trocmé and Theis did more: They asked the Quakers to send refugees their way.

The courageous deeds of Pastors André Trocmé and Edouard Theis and the town people of Le Chambon remind us of everyone's obligation to shield each and every person in the world from the scourge of persecution. The Chambonese's sensitivity to the oppression of others is the sense of justice which built our great Nation and inspired the Constitution of the United States.

It is clear that the Chambonese's compassion and dedication to fundamental human rights reflects the highest ideals of our own Nation. Those sentiments dominate our own Declaration of Independence, Constitution, and Bill of Rights. It is also reflected in our diplomatic efforts time and again.

Yet it is curious that while our diplomats continue to champion the cause of human rights—a truly American concept—the Senate seems unwilling to follow their lead by ratifying human rights treaties designed to establish these same principles as a fundamental part of international law.

Of the 40 human rights treaties identified by the Library of Congress, the United States has ratified only 10; 5 originating at the United Nations and 5 originating at the Organization of American States. Further, there are seven other human rights treaties we have signed but not ratified.

It is tragic that none of those 10—not 1—is considered among the major human rights treaties of the post-World War II era. One of these major human rights treaties is the Genocide Convention—one of the seven which we have signed yet not ratified, and the first and foremost treaty of the post-World War II era.

The simple purpose Genocide Convention is to make the act of genocide an international crime, whether committed during peace or war. The treaty defines genocide and seeks to punish persons who commit this senseless act.

We can start to reverse our unsatisfactory record in regard to human rights treaties by following the meritorious example of the villagers from Le Chambon who tried to safeguard the fundamental rights of those persecuted during World War II. Ratification of the Genocide Convention will reassert our leadership in the field of human rights. We should not have to wait for another Hitler to knock at our door to realize the need for ratifying the justice inherent in the Genocide Convention, our first and principal human rights treaty.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR KASSEBAUM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Kansas (Mrs. KASSEBAUM) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

S. 2589—ACQUISITION OF SUBSTANTIAL ENERGY RESERVES HOLDERS

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill today dealing with the current wave of oil company mergers. This issue is one that should be of great concern to all of us. It is a consumer problem, an antitrust problem, and an energy policy problem. It also directly affects the lives of the employees involved.

The Senate has spoken on the issue of merger moratoriums. I agree that these mergers are not necessarily harmful, but I feel we need more information. I am not here today to reopen the moratorium debate. Rather, the bill that I am introducing, which is identical to the one introduced by Congressman FLORIO in the House, addresses a specific problem with the FTC's review of these mergers.

As many of my colleagues know, the FTC is charged with reviewing these mergers for antitrust violations. They currently have a very short time period in which to decide what action, if any, to take. When they identify certain antitrust problems, they often offer, through a consent agreement, to forego bringing suit if the acquiring company will sell the assets causing the antitrust problems. My concern here is that we have no way of knowing in advance whether the remedy sought by the FTC—divestiture—will be effective or not. If it should prove impossible to sell the assets in question, it would really be too late to stop the merger. The companies, by that time, would be fully integrated. It would be very difficult to persuade any court to unscramble a merger at that point.

The bill I am introducing today would simply require the prospective merger partners to hold themselves separate until any required divestitures have actually been accomplished. To me, this is simply the only sensible way to approach such a merger. The Federal Government should not be in the position of approving these mergers without knowing what the final product will look like. We must be able to assess the effectiveness of the remedy before pronouncing the patient cured.

This bill would not stop any mergers nor cause any to be undone. It would, however, restore some sanity to the Government review process for major energy mergers. The public deserves a thorough and effective review to make sure no antitrust violations have occurred. This bill would allow such a review. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2589

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Federal Trade Commission Act is amended by redesignating section 25 as section 26 and inserting after section 24 the following new section:

"SEC. 25. (a) A consent agreement proposed by the Commission, a consent decree proposed for submission to a court of competent jurisdiction, or an order issued by the Commission or a court with respect to an acquisition of a substantial energy reserve holder which provides for the divestiture of any part of the assets of the substantial energy reserve holder or of the person acquiring such holder may not become final before the required divestiture has been approved by the Commission or the court. If the divestiture required by a decree, agreement, or order is not approved, such decree, agreement, or order may be rescinded by the Commission or court and an action or proceeding may be initiated to obtain appropriate relief, including requiring the person making the acquisition to sell the substantial energy reserve holder as a single entity to an approved person or persons if there is a finding that such acquisition was in violation of law.

"(b) If a substantial energy reserve holder is acquired in an acquisition to which subsection (a) applies or if such a holder is acquired and an action or proceeding has been commenced on or after January 1, 1984, by other than a private party to declare the acquisition a violation of this Act or an Antitrust Act, the substantial energy reserve holder shall be maintained as a separate viable business entity, its assets shall not be commingled with the person making the acquisition, and the person making the acquisition may not elect more than 20 percent of the board of directors of such holder until (1) 60 days after the date the consent agreement, consent decree, or order relating to the acquisition becomes final, or (2) if the final agreement, decree, or order does not require divestiture, the date the agreement, decree, or order becomes final. If an action or proceeding to declare the acquisition unlawful has been commenced and if it appears that such action or proceeding may be protracted, the Commission or the court may, upon request of any party to the acquisition with respect to which such action or proceeding is initiated, modify or terminate the application of the requirements of this subsection if it finds that such modification or termination is in the public interest.

"(c) For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'substantial energy reserve holder' means any person who, individually or together with his affiliates, owns or has an interest in, 100 million barrels or more of proved reserves of crude oil, natural gas liquids equivalents, or natural gas equivalents worldwide, as reported in such person's most recent report to the Securities and Exchange Commission pursuant to the requirements of the Financial Accounting Standards Board Statement Number 69; and

"(2) the term 'acquisition' includes the acquisition of control of a substantial energy reserve holder through the purchase of voting securities or assets, or both.

"(d) The requirements of subsections (a) and (b) do not apply to consent agreements, consent decrees or orders of a court which are proposed or issued in connection with an action brought by a private party.".

(b) Section 25 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as added by the amendment made by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to consent agreements proposed on or after January 1, 1984, by the Federal Trade Commission, consent decrees proposed on or before January 1, 1984, for submission to a court, and orders issued by a court or the Federal Trade Commission on or after January 1, 1984, respecting the acquisition of substantial energy reserve holders, except that the requirement of subsection (b) of such section respecting the electing of board of directors shall only apply with respect to agreements or decrees proposed after the date of the enactment of this Act or orders issued after such date.

SEC. 2. Subsection (e) of section 7A of the Act of October 15, 1914 (15 U.S.C. 18(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) The Federal Trade Commission or the Assistant Attorney General, in its or his discretion may extend the 30-day waiting period (or in the case of a cash tender offer, the 15-day waiting period) specified in subsection (b)(1) of this section or extended under paragraph (2) of this subsection for an additional period of not more than 60 days if the net sales or total assets of the person proposed to be acquired exceed $2,000,000,000.".

BUDGET FREEZE

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, along with the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), I will be sponsoring legislation to freeze all Federal spending across the board for 1 year. We anticipate offering such legislation as a substitute amendment for the Senate Republican leadership deficit downpayment plan.

Mr. President, at present we are convinced of a strong economic recovery. Figures in this morning's paper indicate the new first quarter figures of the CPI at a 0.2-percent increase. I think it is a healthy figure. I believe this is an important time for us to take this type of budget approach.

Mr. President, as we are all painfully aware, over the past 3 years, the issue of Federal budget deficits has consumed more time and occasioned more debate than any other subject to come before the Senate.

Since January 1981, we have debated and adopted three budget resolutions. We have also deliberated the merits of three budget reconciliation bills—two of which were enacted; the third is currently pending action. In addition, we have passed two major tax acts and a number of lesser revenue measures. We now have deficits in excess of $200 billion a year.

Mr. President, something is clearly wrong. Our existing approach to deficit reduction must be reexamined in light of the highly unsatisfactory results we continue to achieve.

At present, we are in the midst of a strong economic recovery. We have a unique opportunity, I think, to take effective, decisive, credible action against the structural imbalances in the Federal budget which are generating huge—and growing—deficits. The time we have in which to act, however, is not unlimited. This recovery will not last forever.

An immediate 1-year spending freeze will provide time for the development of a long-term solution to structural deficit problems without further aggravating the situation. In addition, such a freeze would provide the financial markets with the first credible evidence in over 2 years that Congress is serious about deficit reduction.

Let there be no misunderstanding about the consequences of Congress failing to seize this opportunity. If we fail to act this year—when the economy is strong and inflation is under control—we shall reconvene next year under less favorable conditions.

If we are unwilling to address budget reform when inflation is below 5 percent, we are choosing—by our inaction—to address COLA's and health care cost containment at a time and in a fashion that is guaranteed to cause massive economic and political pain. COLA reform in the face of double-digit inflation is not a pleasant prospect.

By the same logic, and for the same reasons, the time to address defense spending and revenues is also—not next year, or 1987—but now. To those who argue that spending for national defense is not a luxury, I grant the point. In response, however, I add that indifference toward the destruction of the economic base on which military power must depend is shortsightedness of the first order. If we do not begin now to voluntarily rationalize

the surge of military spending in which we continue to indulge, economic deterioration will leave us no choice in the matter. We can either choose to provide for controlled growth of Pentagon spending now, or we shall be forced—out of economic necessity—to accept drastic reductions in the future.

Providing for an adequate national defense is an absolute necessity. On that issue there can be no question. The question we must ask ourselves, however—independent of the question of protecting the economic base on which funding for defense depends—is a question of magnitude. If we are not providing an adequate national defense through average annual real increases in defense spending of 8 percent since 1980—are we spending too little or are we securing too little defense for what we spend? In all candor, I suggest that $264 billion—the amount we are spending for defense this year—is not an inconsequential sum. If we cannot provide for an adequate national defense by adding another $264 billion on top of that in fiscal year 1985, our future is bleak indeed.

Freezing the budget is a drastic step. That is a fact that I do not deny. Many have called it simplistic. My hope for favorable consideration of this proposal is twofold. First, I believe many in this body are beginning to realize the necessity for drastic action; and, second, the equity of sacrifice inherent in an across-the-board freeze affords the proposal political acceptability. Americans are willing to sacrifice for a cause if that sacrifice is considered fair and the intended result is deemed worthwhile.

Failure to enact legislation requiring reasonable sacrifice now will mean we must mandate severe, forced sacrifice in the future. Current signals about the future of both interest rates and inflation are ominous. The prime rate recently has increased twice during the past 3 weeks.

The financial markets are looking for a tangible sign that Congress is serious about deficit reduction. As the climb in interest rates attests, so far they have not received it.

The Republican leadership agreement with the White House was greeted by Wall Street with a reaction that William Melton, vice president of Investors Diversified Services, said "could best be described as cynical."

Little wonder. This marks the fourth year running that Congress has announced a major 3-year, deficit-reduction package with declining deficits. The leadership plan follows the past pattern of savings heavily weighted toward the third year with steadily declining interest rates and stable inflation.

Financial managers have seen the results of multiyear plans and have greeted the deficit downpayment plan accordingly. Samuel Thorne, senior group vice president of Scudder, Stevens & Clark, said the package was void of any major significance and added, "The market seems to think this is just some kind of ceremonial dance."

Henry Kaufman, chief economist of Salomon Bros., responded to the leadership plan by remarking that he had seen nothing to suggest that the upward drift in interest rates would be reversed or tempered. What Henry Kaufman and friends are telling us is that the markets have fully discounted business as usual in the Nation's Capital.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that it is time to really decide whether we are going to continue to finesse our deficit problems or if we really are ready to address them.

Unless we act decisively—and act soon—on deficits, interest rates are going to produce dramatic long-term problems. They are going to choke off borrowing for residential and commercial property, new construction, automobile purchases, and, perhaps something I feel most keenly, being a Senator from Kansas, agricultural production. Farmers, who have yet to recover from the recession, will be forced to liquidate in record numbers in the event of a new runup in interest rates.

If interest rates average just 2 percent higher than we are currently projecting over the next 5 years—and we are projecting steadily declining rates—the cumulative increase in the deficit will be almost $200 billion; $60 billion of that increase would occur in 1989 alone. The 1-year increase of $60 billion is greater than the entire 3-year spending reduction savings contained in the leadership's deficit downpayment plan.

If we are to avoid such an eventuality, we must make some tough political as well as economic choices. Those choices cannot be made in an atmosphere of partisan recrimination.

Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that I believe this body has historically risen above partisan politics in times of crisis. On such occasions, the collective wisdom of the Senate has been manifest in the individual decisions of a majority of its Members to act decisively—and act independent of party affiliation for the good of the country. In that tradition, I appeal to my colleagues to seize this opportunity. Deficit reduction is imperative.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR GRASSLEY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Kansas for her outstanding remarks and the brave stand she is taking on this issue this year. I want to say to my colleagues that the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from Delaware, and the Senator from Montana are original cosponsors of this effort to freeze the budget, to get our deficit under control. I thank each of my colleagues just mentioned for joining in this effort. Their help in individual ways has been invaluable in bringing to the public's attention and the attention of this body a real alternative, a viable alternative, to the morass of budget difficulties and deficit problems that the Federal Government is mired in because past Congresses have not been willing to take daring stands on getting the Federal budget under control.

I think if the Members of this body would look at the political philosophies embodied in the individual beliefs of the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from Delaware, and the Senator from Montana, they would see all shades of political opinion unified behind this approach. I think that speaks for itself. But also the statement by the Senator from Delaware that this is the most responsible stand he has taken on any issue in the period of time he has been in the Senate I think speaks to the necessity for each of the other 99 of us to look at how serious the problem is and how a review of that problem then ought to dictate that each one of us take very dramatic action.

This is the third year that I have been involved in a proposal to freeze the succeeding year's level of expenditure at the present year. Three years ago, too many of my colleagues said, "Well, we do not need to do anything like that because as we look out 5 years, we will have deficits down to about $40 or $50 billion."

Well, obviously that did not materialize.

Two years ago I was told that this approach was not needed because we had declining budget deficits for each year in the 5 outyears that would take us down to $70 or $80 billion of deficits. And so the proposal got no attention.

We are being told by some this year that the alternative that comes from the "rose garden" is a solution to our problems because as we look out 5 years we will have declining deficits ending in $120 billion deficits in 1989. On the other hand, the partnership of the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from Montana, and the Senator from Delaware would suggest there is a growing number of people beyond just this Senator, the Senator from Iowa, that believes there needs to be something more dramatic done. And so we are proposing, the four of us, this very dramatic alternative of freezing the budget in 1985 at the 1984 level.

For 3 years we could have taken dramatic action, and we did not. The situ-

ation has gotten worse. Hopefully, we learn from the mistakes of the past. The philosopher George Santayana said that those societies that do not know about the mistakes of the past or learn from them—and I am paraphrasing—are bound to repeat the mistakes of the past.

So in that vein I am asking each of my colleagues to look at what our track record has been, and then understand the philosophy behind the 1-year freeze and the necessity for it. What has happened is that the situation is always worse than we anticipate. I am suggesting to the backers of the "rose garden" proposal that it is a dream to think that we can end up in 1989 with just a $120 billion deficit. That is too much business-as-usual. What we must do is send a dramatic signal that it is no longer business-as-usual on the Hill or in Washington. We have to realize that the Christmas season is behind us. We have to realize that the congressional Santa Claus is now dead, buried, and breathless under a mountain of deficits now $200 billion for 3 years in a row as we project if we do nothing. As Christmas is over, the love feast of the valentine season is beyond us and we are right now, the last week in April, in the season of the resurrection, the new life, and there ought to be some new ideas coming forth. If there are better ideas to look at than the freeze proposal, with a $23 billion lower deficit than the other proposal that is laid before this body, I am willing to look at that proposal. But there have been none proposed that gives an opportunity to dissect what the problem is with the various programs that have led us to a $200 billion deficit; an opportunity to make changes and to bring reform, and an opportunity then in future years to budget in the reality of the real world.

What I have said heretofore is how I approach this matter philosophically, but I also want to approach it in a very practical manner and take time during this special order to lay out what I think are some of the real problems.

Mr. President, the current fiscal predicament is a symptom of a process gone berserk. There is abundant evidence to suggest we are racing toward the edge. I would like to have you consider the sensitivity of the situation. Baseline deficits are projected to surpass $300 billion by 1989. In that scenario, as the good Senator from Kansas pointed out, interest rates, amazingly, are projected to decline if we do nothing; but as she said, that is not going to happen. If interest rates remain level, I want to hypothesize, over the next 5 years, instead of declining, the fact is a $300 billion deficit would become then a $400 billion deficit. Even worse, if interest rates rise from the current level, the 1989 baseline deficit would approach $500 billion.

Over the period of 1984 to 1989, the gross national product is projected to rise by an average real growth rate of 4 percent. But if the average real growth rate is just 1 percent less, just 1 percent less on the average than our projections, the 1989 baseline deficit would top $400 billion. If there is anything we do know for sure, it is that baseline deficits projected out to 1989 are much higher than we are being told either by CBO, OMB, or whomever. Who in the world believes that we will have 7 straight years of 4 percent growth or 3.8 percent real growth without a downturn if we do nothing between now and 1989 to lower the deficits? And who in the world believes that short-term Treasuries will decline over the next 5 years if we do nothing between now and 1989 to lower the deficits? Yet these unrealistic assumptions are part of our budget baseline. They rose color the magnitude of the problem we face in those outyears. A $300 billion baseline deficit for 1989 is absurdly optimistic. The markets know this. OMB knows this. CBO knows this. In fact, we all know this. Then we must question why do we pretend that it is not the case?

The problem with the way we currently do things is that we always delude ourselves with rosy expectations. We overestimate the amount of available resources out into the future, and that allows us to make less-disciplined decisions on spending. We simply bite off more than we can digest. When the resources do not come in as planned, we get deficits, big deficits.

Pretty soon, the Congress is going to figure out that the real cause of these deficits is planning incompetence.

I think this is the best argument to be made for doing only a 1-year budget, until we can figure out what we are doing.

Our budget freeze proposal is intended as an initial step to address an unfolding fiscal crisis. It is an attempt to slow down the momentum of uncontrolled deficits. It is a response to a perception that the problem is much more severe than current wisdom will allow.

The bipartisan freeze is a 1-year budget. All budget savings are up front, in the only binding year, under the law, the first year. There is no smoke, there are no mirrors, there is no blue sky, there is no rosy scenario, there are no overly optimistic assumptions of future-year decisions by which we will repeat past mistakes this year if we do not do something about it.

The distribution of savings in the first year under the bipartisan freeze is completely balanced. No other budget even comes close. There are equal savings in defense, entitlements, and revenues. And the fiscal year 1985 deficit is reduced by about $40 billion from the CBO baseline.

The bipartisan freeze asks each program, department, or individual to get by next year with the same level of income as this year. It is simply this: If we can get by for 365 days during 1984, can we not, in the same programs, out of necessity to reform, get by for just 365 more days during 1985?

It is a shared sacrifice. It is fair. And it would provide us time to sort out the fundamental causes of our predicament. Any program or department or institution, including Congress, that claims it cannot cope with a 1-year freeze should take a serious look at its internal planning structure.

Any planning structure that responds to real-world circumstances with resistance and rigidity will only transform an otherwise curable problem into a critical one, and that has been the situation for the last several years.

Mr. President, structural disorder in the Federal Government is the driving force behind the deficit problem we face. Deficits in and of themselves are not the real problem. They are merely symptoms, warnings, a barometer of the structural disorder. It is that structural problem that we must get a handle on if we are to gain control of the deficits.

The spending process is driven by a subsidizing of cost. The bureaucrat is promoted on the basis of how much of a budget he can raise. The industry, producing for or servicing the Federal Government, receives a profit as a percentage of cost—an undeniable incentive for cost growth in any program. And the politician is reelected by making everyone happy; that is, spending more money. The politician puts the spending process on automatic pilot, and then hides the outyear consequences by using a rosy future scenario.

The bottom line is that the dynamic of the spending process assures us that we will never have enough money to cover what is in the budget. The use of optimism in predicting resources assures us that we will never have enough revenues. And the path of least resistance then leads us automatically, as it has for the last several years, since the last budget surplus in 1969, to ever-increasing and ever-inflated deficits.

We have a chance to do something this year, Mr. President, before we voluntarily take the plunge. We can act right now to prevent a crisis. We can adopt this budget freeze proposal this year, and get down to the task of restructuring the process. And we can give the current recovery a real chance at long-term survival.

Or, or course, we can leave the process on automatic pilot, sweep its long-term consequences under a bed of

roses, and volunteer ourselves as hostages to what will unfold.

Mr. President, I am pleased to be working toward solving these problems, in the spirit of bipartisanship, with my friend and colleague from Kansas, Senator KASSEBAUM, and my two friends from across the aisle, Senators BIDEN and BAUCUS. It is my hope that Congress will take this very responsible and necessary step this year to prevent serious fiscal disorders that are sure to come.

RECESS UNTIL 2 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until 2 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:46 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. KASSEBAUM).

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, at this point two Senators are entitled, under the order previously entered, to claim their special order time, to wit: Senators BAUCUS and BIDEN.

I yield the floor so that the Senators may claim their special order time.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BIDEN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the special order be changed so that I may precede Senator BAUCUS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BIPARTISAN BUDGET FREEZE

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, I am not sure that I am going to take the full 15 minutes allotted me under this special order. The subject which I rise to speak to this afternoon is the same subject that our colleagues, Senators KASSEBAUM and GRASSLEY, spoke to earlier; that is, within the next 12 to 18 months this country will face an economic and political crisis of extraordinary proportions if Congress refuses to take decisive action on the deficits that we face.

That is why some of my colleagues and I are proposing what is referred to as the bipartisan budget freeze which will stop the runaway deficits in their tracks. Why do I believe we face such a major crisis? Let me just review for a few moments what I consider to be the economic facts of life that allow no other interpretation.

We have been running huge deficits for 5 years, and now we are clearly headed for continued huge deficits as far as the eye can see. We have emerged from what may have been the worst recession since the 1930's, but we have emerged with incredible major economic weaknesses. We continue to have very high interest rates. Notwithstanding the economic recovery, interest rates historically remain high in real terms; that is, the difference between the rate of inflation and the cost of money. That is the real interest rate. And the second major economic weakness is that we have emerged from the recession with an unprecedented trade deficit; and, third, unlike other post recession periods, we face an ever-escalating Federal deficit.

These are intimately related problems and they spell disaster ahead. If we do not take immediate, important action on these deficits, we will have lost the opportunity to stem them and their serious consequences. We are experiencing a dramatic recovery, at least in part, because of the massive stimulative effect of hundreds of billions of dollars of deficit spending. Is it not somewhat ironic that it was policy that brought on these deficits that we call supply side? And supply side was in effect a direct refutation of Keynesian economic theory, yet in fact what we have, what we are observing is a classic Keynesian recovery. We are deficit spending our way out of recession.

In addition to that, we expected, we were told by our supply side disciples, that we were, in fact, through the major tax package the President proposed going to see all of this new investment in plant and equipment; that, in fact, that was going to bring about a major change in the way in which the economy functioned; and, that we were going to have to look to a recovery that was a consumer-led recovery.

What is leading us out of the recession? It is all of those folks sitting up in the gallery. Those are the ones leading us out of the recession. They are the ones out there spending their money. They are going out there and buying. They are, in fact, borrowing and buying. They are buying cars, refrigerators, and the like, and I would argue some of them in an anticipatory sense because they figure if they do not do it now, it is going to be worse 6 months from now with inflation. It is going to be worse 6 months from now with interest rates. So they had better do it now.

Yet we continue to talk about supply side economics. As interest rates move upward, I believe we will see the recovery being choked off. At the same time we will be heading toward higher inflation. We may well be heading back to the same combination of weak economic activity and high inflation that haunted us in the 1970's.

What others say about the outlook for the economy is also interesting. Perhaps the most important economist in Washington is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Paul Volcker. During our budget hearings I asked him "Can economic recovery be sustained in 1985 if we do absolutely nothing about the deficit * * *?" Chairman Volcker responded that, of course anything is possible, but that in such a situation "the risk of accidents * * * multiply."

He went on to expand on this theme saying, "These accidents could grow out of the international financial situation; they could arise out of the foreign equation. They could arise out of the market anticipating pressures and pushing interest rates up higher than those models suggest, and causing an interruption in economic activity. Those risks increase over a period of time * * *"

Translated to everyday language that I understand as a plain old lawyer, that means if we do not move drastically, interest rates are going to go up, economic recovery is going to come down, and we are going to find ourselves in a real dilemma.

The Director of the Office of Management and Budget is not willing to stand behind the continued health of the economy either. In a Senate Budget Committee hearing on February 2, he said:

> But for the years beyond fiscal year 1985, we have very clearly stated that much more needs to be done, that deficits that remain at 180 or more for sustained periods of time, are not acceptable, and that we will be back with additional recommendations next year.
>
> So the whole economic path, out through 1989, in this budget is dependent on (A), a down payment this year, so that 1985 is $180 billion or below, and a major improvement next year, and the succeeding years, so that by 1988 the deficit would be under two percent of GNP, or in dollar terms, at least under $100 billion.

Neither of these men, Madam President, wants to overstate the economic danger ahead. In fact, I suspect that both of them have understated it for obvious reasons. Large and immediate deficit reductions such as those proposed by the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Kansas, and the Senator from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, the so-called bipartisan budget freeze, I believe, can give the markets a hope for the future that they will not otherwise have. The financial markets do not want outyear promises which in fact all the other plans rely upon. They have been down that course before, my fellow colleagues. They understand the promise by the President and the Congress that although we are not going to do anything big this year about the deficit, we will do it next year, and then the following year we will even do more and the following year we will even do more.

See what happens? They believe what they see and what they see is the

needed action that the House, the Senate, and the President are willing to take. Our bipartisan freeze is immediate, unequivocal. There is no mistake about it. If, in fact, it is passed, the savings are real and you see them. You do not have to worry about promises.

Madam President, as I said before, a large and immediate deficit reduction such as that proposed in the bipartisan budget freeze can give the markets a hope for the future that they will not otherwise have. The financial markets do not want outyear promises which is all the other major plans give them. They want to stop the growth of deficits now. The leadership plan deficit in fiscal year 1987—after implementing a 3-year plan—is $203.5 billion. That is $41.5 billion higher than under our 1-year freeze. Our lower deficit of $162 billion in fiscal year 1987 flows only from the 1-year freeze, with no further outyear action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two tables comparing the major budget proposals be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFICIT REDUCTION PLANS COMPARED, FISCAL YEARS 1984–87 (USING CBO ESTIMATES) [1]

[In billions of dollars]

	Republican plan	Senate Democratic plan	House Democratic plan [2]	Hollings-Exon-Andrews	Kassebaum-Grassley-Biden
Total deficit reductions (total outlay savings plus revenue increases)	89	149	132	268	187
Defense reductions	+7	−11	−52	−22	−73
Total domestic reductions	−37	−39	−16	−81	−61
Interest savings	−11	−17	−16	−31	−23
Total outlay savings (defense plus domestic plus interest)	−41	−68	−83	−134	−157
Revenue increases	+48	+81	+49	+134	+30
1987 deficit	204	169	181	104	162

[1] Totals may not add due to rounding.
[2] Figures do not include fiscal year 1984 savings.

Note.—Prepared by: Minority Staff, Senate Budget Committee, April 25, 1984

DEFICIT REDUCTION PLANS COMPARED, FISCAL YEARS 1984–87 (USING REPUBLICAN ACCOUNTING) [1]

[In billions of dollars]

	Republican plan	Senate Democratic plan	House Democratic plan [2]	Hollings-Exon-Andrews	Kassebaum-Grassley-Biden
Total deficit reductions (total outlay savings plus revenue increases)	144	204	182	316	242
Defense reductions	−40	−59	−96	−70	−121
Total domestic reductions	−37	−39	−16	−73	−61
Interest savings	−18	−25	−22	−36	−30
Total outlay savings (defense plus domestic plus interest)	−95	−122	−134	−179	−212
Revenue increases	+48	+81	+49	+137	+30
1987 deficit	204	169	181	108	162

[1] Totals may not add due to rounding.
[2] Figures do not include fiscal year 1984 savings.

Note.—Prepared by Minority Staff, Senate Budget Committee, April 25, 1984.

Mr. BIDEN. We must give the financial markets the reality of a $41.5 billion lower deficit in fiscal year 1987. We must also give them the decisive action this year that will lead to further decisive action in 1985. If we do not, then the upward march of interest rates and inflation will most likely bring down the economic house of cards that we have erected upon deficits.

Such an event will mean misery for untold millions of people. Just that single fact alone is sufficient reason for moving to take action on deficits now. The risk of another recession—the third in 6 years—is both unnecessary and irresponsible.

But for the purposes of our budget debate today, let us look at just the budget impact of such a grim economic scenario. The pressures to act on deficits will be irresistible. And the call will be for dramatic action. And that will be the point at which we may well see the devastation of all of the Federal activities—defense and nondefense—that are essential to our survival as a great nation. We will not be faced with a freeze on defense, we will be talking about real reductions. We will not be talking about 1 year without COLA's—we will be talking about many such years and quite possibly cuts into current benefits. We will be talking about major cuts in virtually every area of Federal activity.

But actually, we do not need to speculate on what those reductions will be. The hidden agenda so often referred to is not really all that hidden. Let me just give you a few examples.

Let us take a look in the budget document first. On page 3-12 appears the following:

Given the pending solvency crisis in medicare, excessive annuity levels embodied in Federal pensions, and the potential for further reform of benefit indexing mechanisms, it is apparent that opportunities for such savings do exist.

There is next year's budget agenda in one sentence: Cuts in medicare, cuts in Federal pensions, cuts in indexing for social security and other indexed programs. That is what we will see next year. The administration's budget proclaims it.

In his prepared testimony before the Senate Budget Committee, which was not delivered, Budget Director Stockman listed areas for budget cutting next year, not this year. Here they are:

Farm Price Supports.
Student Aid and Higher Education.
Veterans Health Care System Efficiencies and Improvements.
Medical Entitlements (Medicare and Medicaid).
Federal Military and Civilian Retirement Pensions.
Federal Civilian employment.
Improved Federal procurement.

Special interest economic subsidies (including subsidies in the following areas: inland waterways, air traffic control system, Coast Guard, deep water ports, rural electric and telephone cooperatives, local mass transit systems, maritime operators, fees for use of Federal parks and lands, economic development subsidies through EDA, HUD, FmHA, Corps of Engineers, and the Tax Code.

The only thing not covered in these statements is Defense. But there is no reason to believe that it can escape unscathed in such an atmosphere. In fact, history suggests that it will be severely cut and we will be into the same feast or famine situation that has harmed our defense efforts in the past.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of Mr. Stockman's prepared testimony for the Senate Budget Committee on February 2, entitled "Eight Possible Areas for Future Structural Reform and Major Budget Savings" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EIGHT POSSIBLE AREAS FOR FUTURE STRUCTURAL REFORM AND MAJOR BUDGET SAVINGS

(By David A. Stockman)

While major strides in budget control have been achieved over the past three years, it should not be concluded that all savings possibilities have been exhausted. Some programs such as agricultural price supports and student aid have escaped the general regime of fiscal restraint since 1981 and must now be firmly curtailed. Consideration of other major reform candidates—such as military and civilian retirement—has been deferred, but these programs must be subjected to fundamental scrutiny and revision next year. Finally, the Grace Commission report contains literally hundreds of suggestions in the areas of federal overhead reduction, procurement reform, and unjustified economic subsidies which, after further analysis and refinement, can be expected to generate substantial savings proposals for next year's budget.

In particular, the following eight budget categories illustrate the opportunities for significant future savings beyond the limited measures proposed in the 1985 budget. In most cases, the detailed analysis necessary to estimate savings and justify proposed policy changes is still underway—with much work yet to be done. Nevertheless, they illustrate both the major opportunities as well as the kind of hard choices which will face the Administration and Congress next year in what must be a full-throttle effort to close the budget gap, if economic recovery is to be sustained.

(1) FARM PRICE SUPPORTS

As is shown below, the 1981 farm bill will result in the highest constant dollar net outlays of any 5-year period in recent history. Fortunately, this counter-productive law expires beginning with the 1986 crop year. This presents an opportunity for major savings beginning in FY 1987 if a more market-oriented price support and subsidy program can be fashioned next year. The current wide gap between out-of-pocket production costs and price support and target levels must be substantially closed if costly sur-

pluses and major commodity market imbalances are to be avoided in the second half of the decade:

POTENTIAL FOR FARM PRICE SUPPORT AND SUBSIDY SAVINGS: CONSTANT DOLLAR COSTS OF 1981 FARM BILL COMPARED TO PRIOR PERIODS

[Dollar amounts in billions of constant 1985 dollars]

	Average annual constant dollar outlays	Percent of 1981 farm bill (1982–86)
1962–66	$9.4	76
1967–71	10.0	81
1972–76	4.9	40
1977–81	6.1	50
1962–81 average	7.6	62
1981 farm bill, 1982–86	12.3	100

(2) STUDENT AID AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Between 1970 and 1978, constant dollar federal support for student aid and higher education increased from $3.6 billion to $5.5 billion or about 53%. This substantial rise in real spending levels was generally consistent with the 80% constant dollar increase in overall domestic spending, excluding social insurance and low-income entitlements, which occurred during this same period.

Since 1978, however, constant dollar spending for non-entitlement domestic spending has declined markedly as shown in the table below. By contrast, 1984 enacted student aid and higher education constant dollar outlays will be 46% higher than 1978 and only slightly below peak levels reached in 1981 ($8.3 billion). Thus, this category of the budget has escaped the general retrenchment of non-entitlement spending almost entirely. Since federal support of nearly 50% of all students enrolled in institutions of higher education is more than the Nation can afford, a substantial funding rollback will be an unavoidably imperative on the structural reform agenda for future budgets:

CONSTANT DOLLAR STUDENT AID AND HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING TRENDS VERSUS OTHER DOMESTIC SPENDING

[Dollar amounts in billions of constant 1985 dollars]

Year	Domestic spending excluding social insurance and low-income benefits [1]	Student aid and higher education
1970	$115.4	$3.6
1978	$207.7	$5.5
Percent change from 1970	+80	+53
1984 enacted	$158.4	$8.1
Percent change from 1978	−24	+46

[1] As detailed in pt. III, fiscal year 1985 budget.

(3) VETERANS HEALTH CARE SYSTEM EFFICIENCIES AND IMPROVEMENTS

The operating and contruction costs of the nation's veterans health care system nearly doubled in real terms between 1970 and 1980. Moreover, unlike most other categories of discretionary spending, constant dollar costs have continued to rise—with the 1984 enacted budget up a further 8% in real terms from the 1980 level. Under the 1985 budget proposals, projected future costs continue to increase in real terms, rising by 30% between 1980 and 1989.

This rising cost trend represents both increases in medical care costs generally and the increasing pressures brought on the existing, inadequate VA system by a rising number of eligible veterans. Within the framework of current eligibility criteria, delivery system organization and hospital capacity, it is extremely doubtful that this continued rise in real budget costs can be avoided. However, the Grace Commission findings, as well as those by many medical economists, suggest that the nation's health care commitments to its veterans can be met at substantially less cost over the longer run if the current policy framework is adjusted. Such structural reform options include greater internal economic incentives, wider use of excess facilities in the private health care system, tighter implementation of the "inability to defray" standard, firmer service-connected disability requirements, and cost-sharing and third party cost recovery mechanisms. The Administration will be studying these options intensively within the coming years, with a view to finding ways to meet existing veterans health care commitments at significantly lower costs in the years ahead:

Constant dollar trend in VA health care system

Year	Amount [1]
1970	$4.7
1980	$8.7
Percent change from 1970	85
1984 enacted	$9.4
1987 proposed	$10.6
1989 proposed	$11.3
Percent change from 1980:	
1984	+8
1987	+21
1989	+30

[1] Constant dollar budget; billions of constant 1985 dollars.

(4) MEDICAL ENTITLEMENTS

The rapid, sustained constant dollar growth of the medicare and medicaid programs are nearly unprecedented in federal budget history. Between 1968 and 1981, the constant dollar cost of these entitlements rose from $17.8 billion to $65.8 billion—or at a compound annual rate of 10.4%. Despite a variety of cost-saving reforms adopted since 1981, 1984 constant dollar spending will be up another $17 billion reflecting a 7.9% rate of annual increase. By contrast, overall domestic spending has actually declined in real terms during the same period.

Moreover, even assuming the tight reimbursement restraints embodied in the prospective payment system for medicare (DRG) and similar state level medicaid reforms, constant dollar current services costs are projected to rise another $36 billion by 1989—representing a 7.5% rate of annual real increase from the 1984 level.

These trends make clear that much more must be done to restrain the cost growth of the federal medical entitlements. Without such additional efforts there is virtually no prospect of maintaining medicare solvency in the 1990s, nor of meeting the rising needs of the low-income elderly and families assisted by medicaid.

Since the underlying source of this enormous, sustained cost growth lies in the structural inadequacies and inefficiencies of the U.S. health care system and the lack of economic incentives for providers and beneficiaries alike, only generic reforms of a fundamental and far-reaching nature offer the potential for significant long-term cost reduction. Such generic reforms in the areas of reimbursement, health care delivery system organization, provider risk absorption and beneficiary cost-sharing are therefore essential items for future consideration.

Constant dollar trend for medicare/medicaid (billions of constant 1985 dollars)

Year	Amount [1]
1968	$17.8
1981	$65.8
Annual real growth from 1968 (percent)	10.4
1984 enacted	$82.7
Annual real growth from 1981 (percent)	7.9
1989 current services	$118.8
Annual real growth from 1984 (percent)	7.5

[1] Constant dollar budget level; billions of constant 1985 dollars.

(5) FEDERAL MILITARY AND CIVILIAN RETIREMENT PENSIONS

Federal civilian and military retirement pensions have historically been more generous than their private sector counterparts for reasons that have now been largely surpassed by events and policy changes over recent years. It was argued that low military pay levels prior to 1974 justified large pensions and generous early retirement privileges as a form of "deferred compensation." Likewise, until the 1983 Social Security Act, federal civilian pensions served the dual purpose of providing both a basic social insurance equivalent as well as a private pension supplement.

Nevertheless, even on the basis of these often tenuous justifications, military and civilian pension benefits have skyrocketed since the late 1960s. Whether measured in terms of cost of payroll or replacement of prior earnings, they vastly exceed comparable retirement annuity levels available in any sector of private employment. For instance, the normalized cost of current civilian annuities is estimated at 36% of payroll, compared to a 22% cost average for combined social security and private pensions in the better private sector plans.

These excessive pension levels have had an enormous adverse impact on the federal budget. As shown below, constant dollar budget costs rose from $6.5 billion in 1962 to $38.5 billion in 1981—an average annual growth rate of 9.8% per year. Constant dollar pension costs have increased another 6% since 1981, and current services real costs are projected to rise an additional 12% by 1989. Stated differently, by 1989 current services federal pension costs alone will exceed 1% of GNP.

These trends make clear that the fiscal burden of federal retirement pensions must be reduced substantially in the future. With both military pay at competitive rates and new federal civilian employee coverage under social security, next year's budget will present a long-overdue opportunity to constrain the cost of existing annuities, and prospectively bring federal pension benefits in better alignment with those available to private employees throughout the U.S. economy.

Trends in constant dollar Federal military and civilian pension costs

Year	Amount [1]
1962	$6.5
1981	$38.5
Average compound annual growth rate (percent)	9.6
1984	$40.8
1989 current services	$45.7

[1] Constant dollar budget level; billions of constant 1985 dollars.

(6) FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT

In 1985 the 2.1 million federal civilian payroll will cost $61 billion for basic compensation, health benefits, unemployment insurance and disability benefits. While considerable progress has been made in reducing excessive staffing levels in many agencies, total civilian employment remains near its 1981 level.

The detailed analysis offered by the Grace Commission of both government-wide personnel policies and individual agency staffing patterns strongly supports the presumption that major costs savings in this area are feasible. The more promising options include more aggressive contracting out through A-76 procedures; reduced staff layering and overlap between operating bureaus and departmental levels; reduction of excessive sick leave, vacation and annual leave entitlements which would permit equal work to be done with fewer FTE's; and more appropriate job classification procedures and pay comparability methodologies.

Due to the size of the federal work-force and the high rate of attrition, it would not take draconian staffing reduction to generate significant savings over a reasonable period of time. On a fully implemented basis, a 5% reduction in the federal work force by 1988 would yield savings of $3.7 billion per year.

1985 cost [1] of Federal civilian work force

	Billions
Basic compensation	$56.6
Health benefits	3.4
Unemployment insurance	.2
FECA	.8
Total	61.0

[1] Excludes pension costs and indirect costs (e.g., office space).

(7) IMPROVED FEDERAL PROCUREMENT

Federal procurement costs in 1985 are projected to be $207 billion—an 88 percent increase from the 1980 level. While the unique nature of many federal procurements—particularly in the defense area—makes cost comparisons with private sector practices difficult, there is little doubt among informed analysts that major cost reductions are possible with changes in existing policies and methods. Over the past three years, the Administration has launched sweeping efforts to simplify and consolidate federal procurement regulations—and these efforts are beginning to produce tangible results.

Nevertheless, large savings depend upon basic policy changes—most of which must be approved or supported by the relevant congressional committees. These include more extensive use of multi-year contracting, increasing the share of procurements subject to competitive bid, minimizing the impact of social policy restrictions on the procurement process, increasing accountability within procurement management organizations, simplification of product specifications for commercial type products and greater emphasis on economically optimum quantities in procurement orders.

While many initiatives in these areas have been proposed by the Administration, particularly by DOD, they have been consistently thwarted by restrictions and outright prohibitions in appropriations and authorization bills. Given both the gravity of the budget situation and the extensive list of procurement reforms proposed by the Grace Commission, a renewed major procurement reform effort in future budgets is both warranted and a promising opportunity for significant cost reductions.

(8) SPECIAL INTEREST ECONOMIC SUBSIDIES

Despite major progress in eliminating or reducing special interest economic subsidies over the past three budget rounds, substantial opportunities for savings still exist. The major obstacles are the natural, parochial political pressures to retain previously granted advantages, and the more compelling argument advanced by individual interest groups that subsidies should be eliminated across-the-board or not at all.

Fashioning a consistent set of federal policy standards against which to assess local, regional and industrial sector subsidies would be a difficult and demanding task. Yet an even-handed set of criteria fairly applied could produce billions in annual budget savings. A policy framework based on user fee principles and national vs. purely local or sectoral economic benefits could be expected to reduce outlays significantly in the following illustrative areas. Most of these have been previously proposed by the Administration, but not in the context of a comprehensive policy framework:

Capital and maintenance costs for inland waterways;

Operating costs of the FAA air traffic control system;

Search and rescue, inspection and licensing costs of the Coast Guard;

Capital and maintenance costs of deep ports;

Debt repayment and interest charges on outstanding federal loans to the federal power marketing administrations;

Large interest subsidies to rural electric and telephone cooperatives;

Operating subsidies for local mass transit systems and maritime operators;

Subsidized insurance premiums offered by the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation and many other federal insurance agencies;

Inadequate user fees for a variety of federal commercial inspection, licensing and information services offered by USDA, Commerce, HUD, Treasury and many of the regulatory agencies;

Charges and fees for use of federal lands, parks and other facilities;

Subsidies for local economic development which merely shift the geographic location of investment and development such as those offered by EDA, HUD, Farmer's Home Administration, Corps of Engineers, and through such tax code features as industrial development bonds.

This partial list of remaining unwarranted economic subsidies provides ample evidence that potential savings of billions per year are possible if an acceptable policy framework for subsidy phase-out can be developed, and intense special interest pressures overcome. To be sure, many of these proposals have been repeatedly rejected by individual congressional committees. Nevertheless, the overriding requirement for structural budget reform to bring future spending and revenue into alignment at an acceptable share of GNP necessitates that a comprehensive program to root out unjustified economic subsidies be considered in the next budget round.

Mr. BIDEN. Yet, Mr. President, if we fail to act decisively on deficits, if we allow the economy to come crashing down, this future agenda of the administration may well be only the beginning. We will be facing draconian measures in all aspects of budget, indeed in all aspects of our lives. That is why I feel so strongly that we must act now to prevent such an economic disaster.

Let me describe briefly what our bipartisan freeze will do, why it is more fair and more effective than any other proposal.

The only way that Congress will ever be able to come to grips with deficits is by dealing with all Federal programs as a package. This can happen when the beneficiaries of each program see that all others are being treated similarly. Most proposals I know of—including the leadership proposal—do not even pretend to seek equal sacrifice. As a result they treat many groups unfairly. And, equally important, they fail to stop the rise of deficits. Other plans deal across the board with most Federal activities, but they do not treat them in an even-handed manner.

Only our bipartisan budget freezes all aspects of the budget. It holds defense activities to the same budget that it has in fiscal year 1984 with no allowance for inflation. It similarly proposes no cost-of-living adjustments for 1 year for all indexed programs. It freezes reimbursements for health care providers, doctors and hospitals, for 1 year. It freezes budget authority for all discretionary programs at 1984 levels for a year. For farm price supports, it freezes target prices and loan levels at 1984 crop year levels. It provides no pay raise for Federal employees in fiscal year 1985.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that a brief fact-sheet describing the proposal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the fact-sheet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GRASSLEY-KASSEBAUM-BIDEN BUDGET FREEZE

NATIONAL DEFENSE

FY 1985: freeze budget authority at the FY 1984 baseline level.

DOD civilian and military pay raises: For FY 1985, no pay raise. Assume all future pay raises to be on January 1.

ENTITLEMENTS AND OTHER MANDATORY PROGRAMS

COLAs:

FY 1985: No COLAs in any program.

COLA date: Assume all COLAs, when resumed, move to January 1, per reconciliation bill.

Medical costs: FY 1985: Freeze doctors and hospitals at FY 1984 level; allow baseline increases for caseload and increased medical care utilization.

Farm price supports: FY 1985: Freeze target prices and loan levels at the 1984 crop year levels.

All else: Assume the baseline.

NONDEFENSE DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS

FY 1985: Freeze budget authority (or program level, where relevant) at the FY 1984 baseline level.

Civilian agency pay raises: Same as for DOD employees (see above).

SPENDING IN FY 1986-89

Except as noted above, provide increases as assumed in the baseline, but starting at the lower FY 1985 level contained in this plan.

NET INTEREST

Calculate interest reductions for each year FY 1985-89 based on the other deficit reductions in the plan.

REVENUES

Assume the following unspecified increases in revenues compared to the baseline:

Unspecified revenue increase (in billions of dollars)

Fiscal year:	
1985	10.0
1986	10.0
1987	10.0
1988	10.0
1989	10.0

Mr. BIDEN. On the revenue side of the equation, the bipartisan budget freeze is notably conservative. We have not chosen to raise $1 in taxes for each dollar in spending cuts, as the President's proposal suggests. Instead there is only $1 in tax increases for every $3 in budget savings. The purpose of our 1-year freeze is to give breathing room to develop new strategies for dealing with deficits. I believe that one of the most important of these new strategies will be a complete overhaul of our tax system along the lines that Senator BRADLEY and I have proposed in the Fair Tax Act. Until we can plan that overhaul, major new tax legislation would not be put on the books.

The bipartisan budget freeze is a 1-year action, as I said before, to allow time to take further decisive actions on budget deficits. All of the other plans would take 3 to 5 years to implement, and, of course, there can be no assurance that they ever would be implemented. In fiscal year 1985, the bipartisan plan makes the greatest spending reductions of any plan. By fiscal year 1987 the effect of our 1-year cuts in 1985 will have reduced the deficit to $162 billion as compared with $203.5 billion for the leadership plan and $169 billion for the Democratic alternative. In fiscal year 1987 our 1-year freeze will reduce spending by $73.2 billion, compared with a $22.6 billion and $39.2 billion for the Republican and Democratic alternatives respectively.

That is why our plan is such a good base to build on. Its 1- to 7-year actions continue their effect over 3 years providing a good springboard for yet further deficit reduction actions. Long after our plan is fully implemented, other plans will still be seeking full effectiveness while their authors propose more, larger budget changes. And let us be clear: there will be more deficit reduction measures in future years no matter what package is adopted. The question is: Does it not make more sense to have a one-shot major deficit reduction in fiscal year 1985, before further action is taken than to have a plan straggling into effect over 3 to 5 years while yet more deficit reductions are being proposed?

Finally, let me just say a word about "Truth in Budgeting." The bipartisan budget freeze will deliver what it promises, when it promises it, based on the best Congressional Budget Office information available. We do not use overly optimistic economic assumptions, with interest rates declining to 5 percent. There are no future year actions to be taken, no possibilities for repeal. Our budget results are consistent with the best economic forecasts available. This plan can provide immediately what it promises.

The impact of that on financial markets, on the level of interest rates, economic activity will be dramatically good. We will have a fighting chance to avoid another recession. We will have breathing time to adopt further good, solid deficit reduction measures. And we will do all this with more deficit reduction impact in a shorter time. We will ask sacrifice from everyone but we will treat everyone fairly. To do less than this threatens economic disaster.

Let me conclude in the remaining minutes by suggesting several salient features of this plan.

Although Senator GRASSLEY and I do not share the same political label, although we are not necessarily of the same political philosophy; although Senator KASSEBAUM and Senator BAUCUS have differences; although those who voted for the plan in the Budget Committee are very different in terms of how they view the future of this country, why they supported this plan, let me state my primary reason for this plan, which is in fact drastic, which does, in fact, take a very, very severe and significant action for 1 year, why I worked on it, why I sponsored it, and why I believe so strongly in it. It may be different, I emphasize, than the primary reason why my Republican colleagues who support the plan took the same position.

I truly believe that unless we are able to take drastic action this year—and I would emphasize I believe the leadership plan, with all due respect to the chairman of the Budget Committee who is on the floor, does not fall in that category as far as I am concerned, and I understand it is an arguable issue—I believe unless we take drastic action, we will be faced this time next year with a lagging economy and a deficit exceeding what we have right now. If we cannot cut the deficit substantially in a year when there is robust economic growth, in a year when, in fact, there seems to be the will to take significant action, when we are, in fact, growing, how are we going to be able to do that at a time when we, if I am correct, are faced with higher interest rates, higher inflation, and a lagging economy?

And then I believe we will see a development that I, in fact, am not prepared to support, but one which I believe I will be faced with as a U.S. Senator. That is, assuming I am right and the economy is lagging this time next year rather than growing, and assuming I am right that we find deficits exceeding what they are this year for next year, I believe the question put before this Congress will not be whether or not we freeze defense spending for 1 year, not whether or not we freeze spending on social security cost-of-living increases for 1 year, not whether or not we freeze education for 1 year. It will be a fundamental debate over whether or not there should be COLA's in social security; it will be a fundamental debate over whether or not the Federal Government should be involved in any education funding; it will be a direct outright assault on all the portions of the Federal programs that I feel most strongly about.

I will be faced with the dilemma of having to emasculate the social agenda of this country beyond what it has already been emasculated, or live with gargantuan deficits that are unacceptable.

So, when those of my friends in the Democratic and Republican Party say to me, "How do you expect me to vote for your proposal? Does it not freeze social security COLA's for 1 year? Are we not saying there will be no cost-of-living increases for 1 year?"

The answer to that is "Yes," that is what I am saying. But I believe if we do not do it for 1 year, we will be debating next year whether we will have it at all again. That will be the issue, not whether or not we stop it for a year. It will be whether or not it is going to be permanently reduced or permanently eliminated, and whether or not we make other significant changes in medicare and significant changes in social security generally.

To those who come to me and say:

Biden, you have been out front for increasing money for the Justice Department to fight organized crime, international drug trafficking, and all those issues that, as ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, you have been hollering about for so long. How can you say now you will freeze and say to the Justice Department they will only get this year what they got last year when you know in fact they need more?

My answer is that, in an economic crunch, which I believe will occur next year if we do not take this drastic action, we will not only not be able to increase the money we need for drug interdiction, but you will have people standing on the floor saying we must cut the budget of the FBI, cut budget of the DEA, of the Defense Department in the name of the economy. And that will probably pass because

the alternative will be budget deficits that continue to choke us.

In summary, the point I want to make and the part of the debate that I hope to shed the most light on among my colleagues who support this proposal, and again we approach it from a different perspective: I truly believe that without this drastic action for 1 year to give us time to put our house back in order that we will be faced with decisions on the floor next year that will call for fundamental alterations in social security, in medicare, in education, in health care programs generally, in veterans' benefits—all the things that I want to protect as a U.S. Senator. I did not run for the U.S. Senate because in fact corporate entities in my State needed my protection. I hope they continue their strong economic growth. I am delighted for it. But they do not need me here to protect them.

It may be presumptuous for me to suggest that anyone needs me here. But the people who benefit from those veterans' programs, those social security programs, those education programs, those health care programs need people in the U.S. Senate, in Government, making their case for them. It is going to be hard for us to make the case for them when in fact we are being strangled by deficits in an economic recession.

Madam President, you have been patient and I want to sincerely thank you for doing what I am not sure I always did when I was in the chair, and that was to look down here and act like you have been paying attention. For that I am flattered. With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAWKINS). The Senator from Montana.

THE PROPOSED BUDGET FREEZE

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I want to first thank the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Iowa. As the Senator from Delaware pointed out, we are Senators of different political stripes, but we have joined together, in a bipartisan effort, to do what we think is proper for our country.

THE DEFICIT CRISIS

Madam President, let me review where we are today.

During the first 208 years of our Nation's history, we accumulated a total national debt of about $1.4 trillion. Most economists agree that, at the rate we are going now, this debt will more than double over the next 8 years. If we pay an average interest rate of 10 percent on our debt, we will have to pay about $280 billion a year, just for debt service, by 1990. Of course, if Federal debt rises that high, interest rates are going to be much higher than 10 percent. And, as we all know, higher interest rates mean less economic activity, especially in interest-sensitive industries like housing and agriculture.

But that is only part of the problem. Another part is how this accumulating national debt affects American trade with other countries.

The United States now has an annual trade deficit approaching $100 billion. That is, we are buying about $100 billion more of foreign countries' products than they are of ours. That difference is the trade deficit, which has risen almost exponentially in the last several years.

Our trade deficit is closely related to our budget deficit.

Why? Because a large part of the increase in the trade deficit is due to an imbalance in exchange rates; that is, in the value of the American dollar compared to other countries' currencies. Our budget deficit increases interest rates. These, in turn, increase the international value of the dollar. As the dollar's international value rises, the relative value of other countries' currencies falls. In effect, this means that American exports are hit with about a 25-percent surcharge, and foreign imports receive about a 25-percent subsidy. Given this situation, it is not surprising that our exports are declining and our imports are rising.

And, perhaps worst of all, huge budget deficits mortgage our children's future, by forcing them to pay for our mistakes.

DEFICIT REDUCTION

Clearly, we cannot keep borrowing this way.

We have got to reduce the deficit.

The conventional wisdom says that, in an election year, Congress will not act.

But the deficit is increasing by $22 million an hour.

The fact of the matter is that we cannot afford not to act.

We must significantly reduce the budget now—not a year from now.

Madam President, Congress currently is considering several deficit reduction plans. There is the Republican leadership plan; there is the President's plan; there is the House Democratic plan; and there is the Senate Democratic plan. I submit, Madam President, that all of these plans go a step in the right direction. But, at the same time, they all suffer from similar defects. All of them reduce deficits only slightly. For example, the CBO estimates that, under the Republican leadership plan, deficits still will average about $185 billion each year for the next several years. The other plans do not do much better. As a result, the financial markets are going to discount these plans, and interest rates are not going to come down, but instead are going to rise.

And there's another problem with these deficit reduction plans. All of them are 3-year proposals, and all of them are "end-loaded,"so that most of the savings come in the elusive "out years." In other words these plans largely just put the problem off.

SPENDING FREEZE

It is for this reason that I have joined with Senators KASSEBAUM, BIDEN, and GRASSLEY in a bipartisan call for a 1-year spending freeze.

I have come to the conclusion that this is the only way we can build a consensus this year to bring the deficit down.

The plan would freeze all Federal spending for 1 year and raise $10 billion in new revenues. This would lower the deficit by $23 billion more than a plan proposed by the administration and Senate leaders.

This freeze is the most fair and balanced approach to take.

The freeze applies to everyone, it is equally shared sacrifice, across the board. Furthermore, this will give Congress a 1-year opportunity to get our act together.

This 1-year pause will give us time to make realistic, efficient, and fair long-term budget decisions to permanently stop the growth of the Federal deficit.

BALANCE AND FAIRNESS

As I have worked on deficit reduction efforts for the past half year, I have continuously argued that a deficit education package must meet three fundamental standards:

The first standard is fairness.

No groups should be singled out for cuts. For example, the elderly and the poor must not be forced to accept cuts in social security, medicare, and medicaid, unless the wealthy are forced to make equally significant sacrifices.

The second standard is balance.

Any package must include cuts in the defense budget as well as increases in revenue and reduced domestic spending. No programs should be off limits. There should be no sacred cows.

The third standard is bipartisanship.

The deficit is not a partisan problem. Republicans and Democrats must work together to find a bipartisan solution.

The beauty of this bipartisan freeze plan is that it meets all three of these criteria.

It is fair because every category of Federal spending will be subject to the same deficit reduction approach.

It is balanced because defense spending restraint would be as significant a component of deficit reduction as entitlement program restraint and revenue increases.

It is bipartisan because Senator KASSEBAUM, Senator BIDEN, Senator GRASSLEY, and I all believe there is no other way to get the job done.

THE "FRONT-END" APPROACH

But being fair, balanced, and bipartisan is not enough, Madam President.

A deficit reduction plan also must be effective.

The other plans being discussed are 3 years long. And they do not have a substantial impact until 1986 or 1987.

That approach represents more of the same old smoke and mirrors that the American public is skeptical of.

Our proposal is just the opposite.

It is only a 1-year proposal.

And its entire impact comes in that 1 year.

That is the kind of strong medicine that will get our financial markets to sit up and take notice.

That is the kind of strong medicine that can send out the message it will take to keep interest rates down.

In short, that is the kind of strong medicine we need.

TOUGH CHOICES

I know that the freeze is a controversial proposal, Madam President.

We are asking many individuals and groups to hold the line on spending.

But that is the only way we can get the job done.

At the same time, no paychecks or programs get cut.

In fact, when it comes to domestic discretionary programs, this plan stops the hemorrhaging that has occurred over the last 3 years.

And while we ask many individuals to forgo increases, we also ask the Pentagon and corporate America to forgo their increases.

Some will argue that we go too far in holding the line on defense spending.

But I do not know how we ask our veterans, our seniors, and our working men and women to hold the line if we do not ask the Pentagon to do the same.

Furthermore, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that there are $18 billion in funds that Congress has already authorized that will be available to the Pentagon.

That means that even with this freeze in place, the Pentagon will have a 7 percent in available funds.

What is more, it is important to remember that the defense budget has doubled over the past 3 years.

This proposal freezes that 100-percent increase in place for a year.

At the same time, the Pentagon can do a better job of cutting waste.

The Grace Commission said the Pentagon can cut $28 billion from its budget just by eliminating blatant waste and inefficiency.

This budget freeze gives the Pentagon a real incentive to do just that.

In fact, the freeze will force every Government agency to do a better job or housecleaning.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Madam President, we are faced with an emergency.

The problem of the deficits is serious and every day we delay solving it, the problem compounds.

That kind of emergency demands immediate action.

We have to pay a price now—to avoid paying a much higher price later.

That is what this freeze proposal is all about.

Senators KASSEBAUM, BIDEN, GRASSLEY and I are really saying this: Let us act now.

Let us stop the fingerpointing.

Let us stop the rhetoric.

Let us stop the partisanship.

Let us join together, as Republicans, as Democrats, as liberals, and as conservatives.

Let us join together on a plan that can make a difference.

Let us join together on a plan that is balanced and fair.

That is what the bipartisan freeze is about.

That is why I am proud to be an original sponsor of it.

That is why I urge my colleagues to join us in our effort to get the deficit down now.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the attached table comparing the 1-year freeze to other deficit reduction plans be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARISON OF BUDGET PLANS

[In billions of dollars]

	CBO baseline	Fiscal year 1985 changes from CBO baseline				
		President's original budget	Republican leadership plan	Chiles-caucus plan	Hollings freeze	1 yr bipartisan freeze
Revenue	733	+8	+11	+16	+23	+10
Spending:						
Defense	263	+10	+3	0	−1	−11
Nondefense discretionary	161	−2	−3	−2	−3	−4
Entitlements	425	−4	−4	−5	−12	−11
Interest	127	−1	−1	−2	−2	−2
Total spending	930	+3	−5	−9	−18	−28
Deficit	197	−5	−16	−25	−41	−38

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, there is now a provision of time for the transaction of routine morning business; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to exceed 5 minutes.

ORDER FOR RECESS FOR 3 MINUTES

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, we are honored today in having a group of distinguished visitors, fellow parliamentarians from South Korea. I see the distinguished junior from Hawaii is on the floor to introduce our guests.

I ask unanimous consent that after Senator MATSUNAGA has performed that function, the Senate then stand in recess for a period of 3 minutes so that we may have an opportunity to receive and greet our guests in the Chamber.

I also ask unanimous consent that that time not be charged against the very brief time heretofore provided for the transaction of routine morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE KOREAN NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Madame President, it is a great privilege and honor for me to call to the attention of my colleagues the presence of distinguished visitors from Korea, a great friend and ally of the United States. Here on the floor of the Senate are five members of the Korean National Assembly. Led by its majority leader,

the Honorable Jong-Chan Lee, they are the Honorable Duwon Pong, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Honorable Chung-Soo Park, the Honorable Churl-Soon Yim, and the Honorable Duk Kyu Kim. They are accompanied by the affable Korean Ambassador, Mr. Lew.

Along with a number of prominent Korean businessmen, the National Assemblymen have just completed a 2-day conference here in Washington, DC, with their American counterparts, under the sponsorship of Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies. The theme of the conference was "Peace and Prosperity in Northeast Asia." As a co-chairman with the distinguished Senator from Florida, Mrs. PAULA HAWKINS, at one of the sessions, I was most pleased to participate and to learn that the basic approach suggested at the conference was peace through amicable international trade and economic cooperation among nations.

RECESS UNTIL 2:35 P.M.

So, Madam President, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate now stand in recess for a period of 3 minutes.

The motion was agreed to, and at 2:33 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:35 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. HAWKINS).

Mr. BAKER. Madam President, I thank our friends and parliamentarians from South Korea for joining us in the Chamber today. It is always a great honor to have foreign dignitaries with us under these circumstances.

(Mrs. KASSEBAUM assumed the chair.)

THE FLYING FORTRESS

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, even as we speak, a B-17G "Flying Fortress" is flying to Washington, piloted by its former owners, Arnold and Nathan Kolb of Alamagordo, NM. This World War II bomber now belongs to the Smithsonian, and when restored will be placed on permanent display. Such a last flight is remarkable since this airplane is one of the few B-17's which is still airworthy, and this father and son crew from New Mexico are retiring a piece of history.

The B-17, as my distinguished colleagues may remember, was one source of hope during the darkest hours of World War II, and was instrumental in our victory. The "Flying Fortress," so called because of its heavy armor and defensive machineguns, was the weapon for a different and more precise strategy: victory through airpower.

In contrast to the strategies of our day, the Flying Fortress was designed to fight through flak and fighter defenses and destroy the oil refineries, factories, and submarine bases of the enemy's war machine. This method of attack sought to avoid unnecessary casualties and by depriving the enemy of the means to wage war, significantly reduce the conflict's length. While there is still some debate over how well this strategy worked, there is no doubt that the rugged Flying Fortress performed its mission well. Flying in tightly knit formations which massed their defensive firepower, B-17's flew hundreds of treacherous miles to use their Norden bombsights—reputed to drop "a bomb into a pickle barrel from 20,000 feet"—in precision daylight bombing. Historian John Keegan, writing in Smithsonian magazine, has pointed out that this approach to war fighting was uniquely American because it "combined moral scruple, historical optimism, and technological pioneering, all three distinctly American characteristics."

Arnold and Nathan Kolb, who used their B-17 to fight fires for the Forest Service, are bringing a piece of history to Washington. I am proud of my country's history in applying technology to use force precisely and not indiscriminately, and I am proud that two New Mexicans have such a role in seeing that this history is preserved.

CENTRAL AMERICA: REFLECTIONS ON A REGION

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, among the many publications on Central America that come across our desks each day, few have lasting impact. One of these is the article, "Central America: Reflections on a Region," that was published in the winter edition of the Washington Quarterly.

Georgie Anne Geyer, the author, has more than 20 years experience in the region, and has witnessed some of the major events there. An independent-minded reporter of the old school, she bases her analysis on solid experience. Neither the guerrillas nor the anti-Communist military leaders of the region escape her critical eye, but she retains the ability to understand the motivation of both groups.

Madam President, I have shared this important article with several of my colleagues and would like to make it available to a broader audience. I ask unanimous consent to insert Georgie Anne Geyer's "Central America: Reflections on a Region" in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL AMERICA: REFLECTIONS ON A REGION

The real question about the tragedy in Central America today is one that is not being asked: How can a Great Power have allowed such a poisonous situation to have developed on its borders, given the utter obviousness of the political dynamics in the region? How can it still so misunderstand the roots and the solutions to the bitter conflict?

I will attempt to penetrate and to answer these questions through some personal remembrances of a lifetime involvement with this tormented, beautiful, and strategic isthmus.

Memory 1: In October, 1966 I went to Guatemala as a foreign correspondent for the old Chicago Daily News. I was the first American correspondent to go to the mountains and live with the first Central American guerrilla movement, the Rebel Armed Forces or F.A.R., the forerunner of all the movements we see today.

It was a tortuous experience, and one that convinced me that the primary trait shared by the guerrillas is some strange compulsion to walk endlessly through mountains. We were in the rugged Sierra de las Minas and we would sleep a few early morning hours on the edge of various similar precipices (my favorite would have had me falling to a waterfall) and spend the day talking with guerrillas of various sizes.

Who were these first guerrillas? Well, they were not a creative mix at all, but basically middle class university students with a few genuine Marxists like the leader Cesar Montes, whose parents had been traditional Moscow-line communists. There were no working class boys and no peasants, although the ostensible reason for the revolt was for the campesino-Indian population.

They talked endlessly about what was then the fashion: the countryside revolution, or the idea of the noble guerrilla sweeping down on the evil cities and destroying them from his base in the pure country.

"We are only entering the first stage," Montes told me at one point. "We are teaching the peasants and preparing for the moment when we can fight the army and take power. The second stage will be to transform the guerrilla war to a regular war, and the third stage is the general offensive when the whole people will rise in regular and irregular fashion."

What struck me even then was how this kind of ideology already was being grafted onto the real cause of the conflict, which was not the peasantry at all but the middle class politicized young: the constant, murderous denial of free elections by the rightist military and land owners. Had there been an electoral way out for these middle class young people, there would have been no such resort to the "countryside revolution."

The next two years, in their own inimitable way, the Guatemalan army swept through the Sierra de las Minas, killing, even by conservative U.S. embassy figures, at least 10,000 peasants in a country of 4 million. Since there were no more than 400 or 500 guerrillas at best, the war was now broadened, the conflict enjoined.

Memory II: It was August of 1979. San Salvador, the capital of El Salvador, was enveloped in that eerie silence that always presages some terrible historic turn. I wrote in The Washington Post of August 10, "The country has about it the evil smell of social rot. It is falling apart into violent and anarchic pieces before your eyes. Everybody knows it, but everybody is paralyzed. Every conversation, from whatever sector, now ends with, 'If there still is time.'" I concluded the column, after comparing it to the newly-victorious Sandinista revolution in neighboring Nicaragua, "This will not be another Nicaragua, with a nice, clean revolu-

tion. Salvador will be a filthy, endless fight. It is already."

What worried me then, and had worried me since my first trip in 1972, was the manner in which the young guerrillas, unlike "my" Guatemalan guerrillas of 1966 who loved to have their names splashed all over printdom, did not want to be named or known. They used letters for their names. Their communiques were unsigned. This sent chills through me, for it is an unmistakable sign of the most extreme revolutionary. It was like the Khmer Rouge, who took numbers for their names. Revolutionary anonymity is always the most terrifying, first warning of the worst horrors. We had gone to the next stage: from the simple countryside revolution to the urban, anonymous revolution.

That same August, I had the great pleasure of interviewing the late Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero of El Salvador. Within nine months he, and with him much of the hope for the center that no longer was holding, would be dead. He was gunned down by rightist death squads (who also originated in Guatemala in the 1960s as La Mano Blanca or The White Hand) while saying mass.

He was a beautiful man. Of Indian ancestry, his skin was a rich, cocoa brown and, in his white priest's robes, he was a figure of eloquent colors. A radiance seemed to flow from him as though he were infused with so much good that his body could not hold it all.

He has been painted, however, by both the cruel right and the ruthless left as a one dimensional man. He was not, as he made eminently clear to me that day. He was of the impassioned center that was and is the only hope Central America. Speaking of the controversial Catholic "liberation theology" which is part of the search for the "new personality" in Latin America today, and which hovers philosophically and religiously somewhere between Catholic French worker-priests and extreme Marxists, he said clearly and critically, "This always risks being misinterpreted. If it is only temporal, it is not complete. I've always said that such a 'liberation' is not Christian. It must be total—social, yes, but eternal and transcendent. The fear today is that they consider liberation only temporal."

Nothing could be clearer than this man's realization of the complexities. He also further criticized the Marxists (who now claim him) by saying, "When I returned from Rome in April, there were bombs in the cathedral. Extremists (Marxists) had taken over our Catholic base organizations. . . ."

Memory III: It was the winter of 1978. The Sandinista revolt against the three decade reign of the Somoza family was well into its last phase. The guerrillas were closing in on Managua, where a decadent and sick Anastasio "Tacho" Somoza waited like a tropical Nero.

I found "Tachito", as always in those last years, in his famous "bunker." Visitors had to pass through a secured army post right next to the downtown Intercontinental Hotel. Somoza, quite literally, lived in the bunker at that point. It was dark and shadowy but filled with stylish modern furniture. I remember how the silver edges of some of the furniture shone in the deep shadows.

Somoza was an unlikely-looking dictator. No medals. No uniforms. He was a tall, incongruously laconic man with a rangy American southern accent. He looked cadaverous for he had sustained several serious heart attacks. The conversation was filled with endless talk about "international Communism" and degenerated into absurdities. At one point, for instance, he suddenly stopped then looked at me and said "Say, didn't you write a book about Latin America?"

When I said I had, he said ruefully, "You caused me a lot of trouble. My wife was reading it and she looked up at me and said, 'Do you have a mistress?' I had to tell her I did."

I had indeed written this in the book. But I was then forced to suggest, in the appropriate spirit. "If she didn't know it, she must have been the only person in Central America who didn't," and he nodded and said, "She was!"

Equally blatant among international policy circles was the doomed future of Somoza's regime. I have to ask: Why, when it was so abundantly clear to anyone with an ounce of political sense that a man like Somoza could not survive, did the United States not act in time to get him out and usher in a moderate democrat? Why is it that the United States could do such a magnificent job of rebuilding Europe and Japan but cannot anticipate when revolutionary change can still be evolutionary—and act upon it.

A year and a half later, I was again in Managua the week after the Sandinistas marched victoriously on the city. By then, Somoza had fled to Paraguay, where he was eventually assassinated, but not before bombing the country and killing at least 50,000 Nicaraguans in a country of only 2.5 million.

Comandante Daniel Ortega, later to become the main leader after that, told me soberly and clearly that there would be a "compromiso" or agreement of all the forces which had taken part in the Sandinistas revolution. This included, he said, the political parties, the Catholics and the Catholic organization, the businessmen, and the press. But somehow the stage for the denial of this scenario was already being set.

Eden Pastora, the famous "Commandante Zero," already was standing outside the Intercontinental Hotel looking into himself, a tropical Hamlet who already knew things were going wrong in the "democratic" revolution. But it was Tomas Borge, the cold-eyed and cold-minded Minister of the Interior, whom I found most revealing.

One night returning from the pool about 10 o'clock, I found the little, gnomelike Borge, who had suffered unspeakably under Somoza, in a clutch with a small, top-level group of Latin diplomats. As I stood there dripping and unnoticed by the group, Borge actually outlined all of their plans for Latin America.

"The fewer problems we have, the more Latin America will be attracted to us," he was saying in a low, conspiratorial voice. "The more problems we have the less." He went on to say that the Nicaraguan revolution would be less sanguinary in its aftermath than the Cuban, but he made it clear that this was only tactical. "Me," he said, "I would shoot the Somozistas, but we won't because we do not want to turn the rest of the Latin American revolution against us."

It did not, therefore, come as any great surprise to me when, in the next 18 months, these types of totally indoctrinated leaders (against the wishes of the great majority of the Nicaraguan people, who wanted a democracy) went like lemmings to the extreme Soviet side (even against the advice of Cuban President Fidel Castro). But it was also important that in those 18 months the United States kept a totally open and generous posture toward the Sandinistas. It is important because now we know that we are dealing with hard-line ideologues and not people we pushed—as many believe we did Castro—to Marxism.

These reminiscences may at first glance seem to some to be irrelevant, even selfindulgent. They are not. Actually, they are at the very heart of the looming tragedy. For the fact is that we, as a nation, and particularly as a government, have had painfully little realization of the intrinsic qualities of the struggle on Central America; a struggle that is at heart ambiguous, grey, of John F. Kennedy's classical "twilight" genre.

Part of the potential tragedy, too, is that we today have so little institutional memory that we often do not know we are repeating old wrongs because we do not remember the mistakes that were made in the beginning. We impose the Cuban analogy on every situation—or we don't impose it at all. There is no accountability for those who repeat the old mistakes, no analysis, no understanding of the solid, sullen, often sordid roots of the problem.

In discussing the Nicaraguan problem with one of the leading American policymakers, I mentioned the 50,000 Nicaraguans killed by Somoza. He was stunned. Three days later, he mentioned again to me that he had not known this. How can a government devise a policy which speaks to the intrinsic qualities of such a situation, when the leading decisionmakers do not know these basic facts and speak to these basic wounds of a people?

It is my own judgment that President Reagan is right in about 80 percent of his policy toward Central America. Certainly we need economic aid, military strength, and negotiation. But I am also convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt that there remains 20 percent of the problem that the president and his advisers still do not understand. The problem is that this area could and will be fatal if it is not addressed. It is this crucial grey political area which I will now address:

Point No. 1: The struggle is not at core economic (arising out of economic poverty as the liberals think) and it is not basically military and a problem of communist infiltration (as the conservatives think). It is a political problem. These revolutions were and are made by middle class young people, a class created by economic development and then ostensibly moved by economic misery and oppression of the "masses" when they are denied political power in legitimate ways and then become radicalized.

The brilliant Mexican writer Carlos Fuentes spoke at the Harvard commencement in 1983 about how this syndrome can be traced across the fiery little countries of the exploding isthmus. "The conflict in El Salvador," he said, "is the indigenous result of a process of political corruption and democratic impossibility that began in 1931 with the electoral fraud of the Army, and culminated in the electoral fraud of 1972, which deprived the Christian Democrats and the Social Democrats of their victory and forced the sons of the middle class into armed insurrection. The army had exhausted the electoral solution."

The first imperative demands that there be a political solution above all, even though the hour is late because of the radicalization of these factors. U.S. policy must offer some vehicle for the political expression of this group, or for the democratic groups that remain, or for the democratic

groups that remain. And ironically, there is still a healthy liberal democratic center particularly in Salvador. Much of this will of necessity be rhetorical, but more about that later.

Point No. 2: Whatever either the far right or the far left argues about Central America, it isn't true. There is only one truth in Central America today: that this is an ambiguous struggle, John F. Kennedy's "Twilight stuggle", in which there are only shadows of grey and men on grey horses and no assurance of the outcome. It is exactly the kind of struggle that Americans, with their love of black and white and of easy-to-hate, clear devils like Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini, are most incapable of confronting—but now must.

Point No. 3: There are real Marxists in Central America and many of them do not emerge from or care about social misery or reform at all—many just want power.

To digress a bit, in 1965 I was the first correspondent to write about the Tupumaros, a group of guerrillas trained by Castro for Uruguay. At first, the Tupumaros appeared to be rather amusing Robin Hoods, robbing the Punta del Este casinos and giving the money to the poor. They then proceeded to become the most vicious, murderous group in the hemisphere, kidnapping innocent professionals and holding them for years in underground "people's prison" cells and murdering others.

Uruguay, at the time was a near-perfect democracy. Furthermore, it was one of the original socialist countries, with wealth deliberately and consistently redistributed. But Castro's Tupumaros proceeded to destroy both Uruguayan democracy and Uruguayan socialism, and the nationalistic military of the right took over to stop the anarchy—and still ruthlessly hold power today in that once peaceful and prosperous nation.

The point is that the Castroite intention is not only to attack countries with terrible social grievances, like Salvador and Guatemala, but to destroy the democracies as well. The Nicaraguan Sandinistas, who came to power only through the generous aid of the Costa Rican government, now are trying to overthrow that democratic government. The murderous Castroite colonel who has taken over Surinam, once another prospering nation, has now murdered all of the opposition and declared himself a "Marxist." One has to differentiate, to see where social grievances leave off and the sheer lust for power—the total power that only Marxism can offer these men—picks up.

Point No. 4: There has been remarkably little serious discussion about what the Soviet intentions really are in Central America. The Soviets, of course, are not basically classical imperialists but exploiters of poisoned situations. The Soviets are exploiting a situation that offered itself to them and to the Cubans in Central America. But I am convinced that their intentions is not really to stay there, if any cost is involved.

The Soviet intent is to exploit the propaganda potential, which they have done brilliantly. (Consider the world's damning of the 55 American military advisors in Salvador, compared to 154,000 troops in Afghanistan!) It is to spread neutralism and pacifism within the United States and—most of all—it is to divert the American navy away from other trouble spots. Central America itself is a diversion to them and will remain so unless it is balanced by some cost on their side, like greater Western aid to the Afghan resistance.

Point No. 5: The most subtle and in the end most important part of the struggle ensuing in Central America is simply not understood in the Reagan administration and it is the key. It is the struggle for a new personality in Central and Latin America.

The brilliant Venezuelan writer Carlos Rangel, who is not a critic of the United States, has raved how the "noble savage" of Latin America (as the Europeans saw them) has now been transmuted into the "noble revolutionary." "The end of history must be a return to the golden age," he writes, and goes on to trace how the "noble savage is turned into the good revolutionary, the romantic adventurer, Red Robin Hood, the Don Quixote of Cuba, the New Garibaldi, the Marxist St. Juste, the Sid Campeador of the wretched of the earth, the secular Christ, the San Ernesto de la Higuera, . . . Che Guevara."

What we are seeing here is another cycle in the struggle between the pragmatic, empirical, practical Anglo-Saxon Protestant America of the North and the old, romantic, mystical, Catholic America of the South. Only this time, the struggle is transmuted into revolution, which makes it all much more difficult to contain or to answer. These personality types do not respond to electoral options. They are the quintessential old absolutists of Spanish history. In fact, there is much of the Spanish Civil War in Central America today.

Fuentes, rightly I believe, sees the struggle as Latin America's effort to enter the modern age. He recognizes "an intellectual inclination that sometimes drives us from one church to another in search of refuge and certitude" (i.e., from Catholicism to Marxism or, better, to both together). He sums up: "Today, we are on the verge of transcending this dilemma by recasting it as an opportunity, at last, to be ourselves—societies neither new nor old, but, simply, authentically Latin American as we sort out, in the excessive glare of instant communications or in the eternal dusk of our isolated villages, the benefits and the disadvantages of a tradition that now seems richer and more acceptable than it did one hundred years of solitude ago."

Any U.S. policy which does not understand this deep and authentic yearning—and speak intelligently and subtly to it—risks something even greater than what we have already seen; it risks a total cultural break between the two linked Americas.

Point No. 6: There has been too much casual talk about Central America being "another Vietnam". Charles Mohr, the fine New York Times correspondent recently was sent to Salvador to compare his long Vietnam experience with that situation. He saw "the analogy in the reluctance of U.S. officials, particularly those in Washington, to apply strong pressure on the host countries when they ignore U.S. advice or pursue what the Washington officials consider to be self-destructive policies." As to the certification every 180 days on human rights improvements, he noted "that as certification has routinely followed certification, it seems to have become apparent to Salvadorean officials that only cosmetic measures are required on their part." He further notes that even "the South Vietnamese authorities and security forces never showed the same callousness that prevails here."

What Mohr writes is not only true, it puts a very new and different light on the entire Central America saga. For it is not that the United States dominates a country like Salvador too much, it is that it does not dominate it enough—that it does not demand enough of its surrogates. There has never been such a situation in history: a great power puts its total prestige and power on the line, at the service of others (and often a murderous set) and does not even call the shots!

And it is here, ironically, that President Reagan may lose the whole business. For the missing element in the Central American equation—what will emerge as the fatally missing element—is American pressure to clean up the murderousness of the Salvadorean security forces. The United States should exact this, making clear the threat that otherwise we will withdraw our support. If we do not do this, not only will any U.S. policy fail, we will lose any remaining prestige we have in the area. It is not U.S. pressure that is hated (especially when it is for a decent cause), it is U.S. support of corrupt leaders or U.S. indifference, which brings ridicule for everything American.

If we look back into recent history as to where we succeeded, in every single case—from post-war Japan, to post-war Europe to Korea—these were situations in which we kept the ultimate power to ourselves and did not delegate it to corrupt surrogates. This is how we succeeded and how we lost in the twilight struggles.

Finally, the importance of Central America to this country cannot be overestimated. We are now involved in something totally new in American history. For the first time, we have lost our territorial isolation—our protection from the cycles of the world and from the wheel of fortune—and we are a country like other countries, open to invasion or, more crucial and more likely, to every type of ideological subversion. The world of the "irregulars"—the guerrillas, terrorists, non-governmental and non-institutional combatants of all sorts who control so much of the world today—is now upon us. This is the first war that Americans can walk to. We are about to lose our innocence.

The policy answers to such a prolonged twilight struggle on so many levels must, of necessity and of reality, be on many and the most sophisticated levels. Initiatives must be taken at once and policy must be implemented with the greatest sophistication and subtlety—two elements that have not characterized U.S. administration in recent years, but ones that we must develop in this new age, when we can no longer go off the rooftops and sail away, this time not from the Embassy roof in Saigon, but from the new Balkans on our doorstep.

A NEW CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT PROGRAM

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, one of the major issues to confront the 99th Congress will be the design of a new civil service retirement program. The Subcommittee on Civil Service, Post Office and General Services, which I chair, has been sponsoring pension policy forums and studies to help draft such a new plan. The subcommittee's special counsel, Jamie Cowen, has just completed a series of articles for the Federal Times which examines the issues to be considered in designing a new civil service pension plan. I ask unanimous consent that the series of articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESIGNING A NEW RETIREMENT SYSTEM

(By James S. Cowen)

With passage of the Social Security Amendments of 1983, all federal employees hired after December 1983 will be covered by both the social security system and the civil service retirement system.

Establishing a new civil service retirement plan is necessary to coordinate the two systems and reduce the excessive contributions and benefits they provide for.

Under special legislation introduced by Sen. Ted Stevens, R-Alaska, and passed in the waning days of the last session of Congress, employees hired after December 1983 will contribute to the civil service system at a reduced rate until December 1985 or the establishment of a new retirement program, whichever is earlier. Congress will be considering proposals to establish a new plan immediately after the 1984 elections.

Now is the time to influence the design of a new retirement plan coordinated with social security, and the federal community must get involved at the ground level in the design work. It must study the particulars of the pension field and then tell Congress what is desired.

This article and others to follow will try to give a basic framework for understanding pensions. We'll be looking at the importance of a new plan to the current work force, the objectives of a retirement plan, social security and how to coordinate it with a new plan, the major features and basic structure of retirement plans and, finally, the financing and costs associated with such plans.

Why is a new plan important to all federal workers?

The obvious answer to this question is: to preserve the continued solvency and benefit structure of the current plan. The advent of a new system, however, will have little or no impact on the solvency of the current system.

The current system's financial condition does not depend upon new entrants. Its soundness is secured solely by continued government appropriations into the retirement trust fund. Whether or not a new plan is linked to the current one has little to do with the sufficiency of the trust fund.

But the overall level of benefits provided in the new plan may affect the current plan's benefit structure. If the new plan is substantially less generous than the current one, pressure may mount to pare the benefit levels in the current plan.

The fear that a social security-based plan will be forced on current workers is probably unfounded. There appears to be little support in Congress for such a move. Typically, companies and state governments establishing new plans grandfather current workers into existing ones. Concern should focus on mounting pressures to reduce the benefits of the current program.

A second reason for interest is the impact a new plan will have on the makeup of the future federal work force.

Retirement plans drive the demographics of a work force. Generous benefits for primarily long-career employees will attract individuals who want to spend their working life in government. Benefits for short-term workers will appeal to those who want career flexibility.

Retirement ages affect upward mobility in the work force and retention of expertise. What's beneficial to a government executive may not be to a carpenter. Because the current work force understands the benefits and shortcomings of the current retirement program, it can assist in the development of a new plan and, hence, a future work force.

Finally, many in the work force may have concluded that the current retirement plan does not adequately serve their own career and retirement plans. The current system primarily benefits individuals who retire at earliest eligibility. For those who leave government before retirement, it fails miserably.

In such a situation one may withdraw contributions at little or no interest, or leave the money in the system and defer receiving an annuity until age 62. Since the annuity is not indexed for inflation until retirement, deferring it until age 62 often results in the real benefit being significantly diminished.

Employees who work well beyond retirement age fare better in many private sector plans. Social security serves as the basis for private plans. It provides a full benefit at age 65 and a reduced one at 62. Many who retire at social security eligibility in the private sector would find that the combined benefits of social security and their private pensions exceed that of a federal employee retiring at the same age.

These federal employees may find that a new plan serves them better. Thus, they should ensure an attractive option exists to transfer to the new plan.

Normally, such arrangements exist in two forms.

An employee's benefits accrued up to the point of transfer are frozen, with the understanding that service in the new plan be counted for purposes of eligibility for retirement in the old plan.

An employee's service is simply transferred to the new plan and the option is sweetened with an incentive such as a refund of old-plan contributions with interest.

The point is that current federal employees should take an active role in developing the new plan. They have a unique perspective and possibly have the most to gain from such involvement.

The primary purpose of a retirement plan is to provide employees with a comfortable transition from a working career to retirement.

This doesn't mean the retiree must receive a benefit equal to 100 percent of his preretirement salary. Many costs borne by the working population are not applicable to retirees. For them, mortgages are often fully repaid, children are gone, work-related expenses no longer exist and favorable tax treatment of the elderly applies.

Most experts agree that to maintain the standard of living for a low income worker, benefits equal to 70 to 80 percent of preretirement salary are necessary. For a high income employee, the amount suggested is 55 to 60 percent. This means that ideally the combined benefit of social security and the employer's pension for a career employee should equal those amounts.

From an employer's perspective, retirement should be encouraged at the point where the employer would benefit by replacing the older worker with a younger one. This point can vary greatly depending upon the type of job. For instance, employees in white collar jobs generally can work longer than those employed in blue collar positions. Thus an employer may vary retirement eligibility depending upon the type of work involved.

If an employer desires long-term employees with minimal turnover, the plan should provide for late vesting with generous benefits at a specified retirement age.

The plan's formula should be tilted to reward long-term employees as the civil service retirement system currently does. A compensation system tilted away from pay but toward rich retirement benefits will also encourage long-term employment.

If an employer prefers a certain amount of turnover, possibly an early withdrawal feature, common in thrift plans, could be made available to employees. If mid- or late-career recruitment is wanted, then a formula weighted toward early years of service and based on some final salary arrangement could be employed. Obviously, the richer or more costly the package the more successful the employer will be in recruiting and retraining desired personnel.

A retirement plan is only one part of an employer's compensation package, but it clearly will influence the work force's make up. Thus, before designing a new retirement plan for the government, decisions must be made as to the desired characteristics of a future federal work force.

COMBINING PENSION PLANS: WHAT'S BEST?

(By James S. Cowen)

The social security system and the civil service retirement system differ in the types of benefits provided, when they are provided and how they are provided. In fact, their goals also differ.

Social security is, in part, a social insurance program that redistributes wealth from high- to low-income workers. Civil service retirement, on the other hand, is a staff retirement plan which replaces a certain percentage of an employee's pre-retirement earnings at all income levels.

Social security attempts to provide a safety net for the elderly. Civil service retirement, in a sense, defers wages.

Coordination of the two programs, however, is readily feasible. Private firms, for example, often coordinate their pension programs with social security.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The basic benefit of social security is the old-age benefit. This is based on average career wages adjusted for inflation.

An eligible beneficiary can begin drawing a full old-age benefit at age 65 (this will increase gradually to ages 66 and 67 after the year 2000) and a reduced one at age 62. Workers become eligible for an old-age benefit if they work in covered employment the lesser of 10 years (40 quarters) or one quarter for every year after 1950 and before age 62.

A spouse of an eligible beneficiary is entitled to an additional 50 percent of the basic benefit upon reaching age 65. Survivor benefits are also available to spouses upon attaining age 60 or age 50 if disabled or any age if the spouse has dependent children.

The elderly spouse is entitled to 100 percent of the worker's basic benefit. The younger spouse and dependent children are entitled to 75 percent of the worker's benefit. Generally, survivors are eligible for benefits if the worker had 18 months (six quarters) of covered employment.

Finally, disability benefits are available to the covered worker and his family if the worker is ruled totally disabled and unfit for substantial gainful employment for one year or longer. Such workers are entitled to 100 percent of the basic benefit.

An elderly spouse or one with dependent children is eligible for an additional 50 percent for each person subject to a maximum

family benefit. To be eligible for a disability benefit, the worker must have had five years (20 quarters) of covered employment, less if the worker is younger than age 31.

Social security benefits are skewed to the low-income worker, while civil service benefits replace the same percentage of salary at all income levels.

Assume employees A, B, and C work for three years and retire at different salary levels. Table I is a rough example of the basic benefits provided under both programs and their replacement of final salary for the three employees.

TABLE 1 [1]

Employee	A	B	C
Final year's salary	$15,000	$30,000	$45,000
Social security benefit	$6,000	$8,200	$8,400
In percent	40	27	19
Civil service benefit	$8,000	$16,000	$24,300
In percent	54	54	54

[1] Ed Hustead, Hay Associates.

While under both programs the high-income worker receives a larger benefit than the low-income worker, the low-income worker receives proportionately a much greater percentage of final salary under social security.

The question becomes how to coordinate a new civil service plan with social security to achieve reasonable replacements of salary as well as normal employer goals such as desired work force characteristics, competitiveness with other employers, high or low employee turnover, and the rewarding of long-term employees.

A NEW PLAN

Retirement benefits are normally viewed as deferred compensation and, hence, bear a direct relationship to earnings. Social security's policy of redistributing wealth to low-income workers conflicts with the underlying policy of many pension programs.

There are ways for employers to deal with this problem. They can implicitly recognize the value of social security to the employee by granting a pension which when coupled with social security provides a reasonable retirement income.

Table II is such an example using the same assumptions as Table I.

TABLE II[1]

Employee	A	B	C
Final year's salary	$15,000	$30,000	$45,000
Social security benefit	$6,000	$8,200	$8,400
Pension benefit (1.5 percent times service)	$6,100	$12,200	$18,200
Total income	$12,100	$20,400	$26,600
In percent	80	68	55

[1] Ed Hustead, Hay Associates.

Note in this example that the pension benefit—1.5 percent times service—is less than the current program. Yet, in most cases, it provides greater income than the current civil service system when coupled with social security.

Also note that the large redistributive nature of the social security program is retained, thereby proportionately benefiting those with lower income.

The Internal Revenue Code permits an employer's pension formula to substantially reverse or explicitly recognize the tilt in social security in order to level the percentage of pre-retirement earnings, replaced in the overall retirement benefit.

In Table III, for example, the pension benefit is reduced by one-half of the amount of the social security benefit:

TABLE III [1]

Employee	A	B	C
Final year's salary	$15,000	$30,000	$45,000
Social security benefit	$6,000	$8,200	$8,400
Pension benefits gross benefits (2 percent times service)	$8,100	$16,200	$24,300
Half social security benefit	$3,000	$4,100	$4,200
Net benefit	$5,100	$12,100	$20,100
Total income (pension and social security)	$11,100	$20,300	$28,500
In percent	74	68	63

[1] Ed Hustead, Hay Associates.

Note that while Employee C is still receiving a lower percentage of his final salary than Employee A, the difference is not as great as the example shown in Table II. Employees, in effect, are being treated in a more consistent fashion at all income levels.

Many state governments use formulas similar to that shown in Table II. Most private employers, however, use some variation of the integrated method shown in Table III. This issue can be very significant.

Should the government adjust for the redistributive formula in social security, or should it keep that tilt in the new plan?

Additionally, depending upon the plan's structure, if the pension plan permits retirement before social security eligibility, pension benefits may be relatively small until receipt of social security benefits.

Some private plans offer what is termed a leveling option in which the employee receives a larger portion of his pension benefit in the years prior to social security eligibility. When social security payments begin, the pension is substantially reduced to maintain the same total income as prior to the commencement of social security.

Irrespective of how coordination with social security is accomplished, the result will significantly affect the total retirement package for the federal government. Thought must be given to how the new plan will meld with social security in providing basic benefits as well as survivor and disability benefits.

In many cases, social security survivor benefits exceed current civil service benefits. Should there be a dollar-for-dollar offset from the two plans?

Additionally, social security disability benefits are fairly generous but eligibility is very restrictive. So, many private firms provide a separate disability program with far less stringent eligibility requirements than social security.

Currently, disability retirements account for 15 to 20 percent of government retirements. Proper coordination with social security is vital to a complete retirement plan.

DIFFERENT PLANS PRESENT A CRUCIAL CHOICE

(By James S. Cowen)

Both the social security and civil service retirement systems are known as defined benefit plans. Both systems promise a certain benefit calculated as a percentage of salary and in some measure are dependent upon length of service.

There is another common type of retirement plan: the defined contribution plan. In this case, the employer, and occasionally the employee as well, contributes a specified percentage of salary to an employee trust fund account. The money is then invested in various types of interest-bearing instruments. The employee's retirement benefit consists of the contributions in his account plus their accumulated earnings.

In such a case, an arrangement is normally made with the retiring employee to transform his or her account into a lifetime annuity. The amount of the annuity is determined by the employee's projected mortality, the amount of money currently in the employee's account, and the returns the account is expected to earn while being disbursed.

Both types of plans, defined benefit and defined contribution, have their advantages and disadvantages. The decision as to which plan will serve as the new civil service pension is probably the most significant issue facing the federal work force.

Defined benefit plans are more prevalent in older, unionized industries. In recent years, however, defined contribution plans have been used more frequently. This can be attributed to difficult economic times and to the fewer legal requirements imposed on employers who use contribution plans.

The most consequential difference between a benefit and a contribution plan is the certainty of the benefit. A defined benefit plan promises a specific benefit regardless of the economic climate. Poor economic conditions do not affect that benefit, especially if it is adjusted for inflation, as in the civil service retirement system. In a sense, the government bears the risks and costs of an inflation-adjusted benefit plan.

An important caveat to this is the assumption that an employer will not reduce the level of benefits under a defined benefit plan during an economic slump. The Employee Retirement Income Security Act, which regulates private pensions, prohibits reductions in accrued benefits once employees are vested.

But ERISA does not cover the civil service retirement system, and thus changes are not prohibited. Congress has reduced benefit levels often in recent years. In fact, it is unlikely a government benefit plan can ever be fully insulated from subsequent acts of Congress.

In a contribution plan, the employee owns the account and thus bears the economic risk. If investments do well, the employee's account gains. The reverse is equally true.

Rather than providing for a certain benefit, a contribution plan assures a certain cost—an advantage for the employer. But a well invested contribution plan can provide employees with good benefits while not increasing employer costs.

The employee's certainty in a defined contribution plan is in owning the account. Normally, annual statements are provided to the employees showing their accumulations. These statements keep the employees involved in their own retirement planning and assist them in determining when to retire.

A more esoteric and yet perhaps more crucial point concerns congressional power over the plan. If federal employees owned their accounts, Congress could not reduce them. While Congress could change future contributions, it would be prohibited from tampering with the current accounts and funds. In such a case, a contribution plan would be more secure than a benefit plan.

In most situations, however, the defined benefit plan provides certainty for the employee while the defined contribution plan provides the same for the employer.

The greatest advantage of a contribution plan is its portability.

Because an employee owns his account, most plans permit the employee to take his

account with him if he leaves the organization. This allows the employee to roll over the accrued funds into an IRA or the subsequent employer's pension system, so the funds can continue to grow.

In other words, the employee loses nothing by changing jobs. This allows a great deal of flexibility in career planning.

Most benefit plans in effect penalize less than full-career employees. A departing employee rarely can take any benefits with him. Instead, if he is vested, he is entitled to receive the benefit at retirement age. In most cases, however, benefits are not adjusted for inflation after the employee leaves, at least not until he begins receiving them. Thus, the real level of the benefit will be greatly reduced.

Another important factor is the entry age of an employee into the plan.

A contribution plan is more advantageous for a worker starting a job while relatively young. This gives his account time to accumulate contributions and take advantage of compounding interest.

For example, an early participant in the Teacher's Insurance and Annuity Association and College Retirement Equities Fund, the nation's largest defined contribution plan, would have seen his 1952 stock unit valued at $10.50 increase to $140 today when the compounding effect is considered.

The defined benefit plan is better for a middle-aged worker taking a new job. As noted above, the employee will receive a specified benefit not dependent upon accumulated contributions.

Obviously, the contribution plan account of an older-entry employee will not have sufficient time to fully accumulate unless the employee is permitted to roll over a cashed-out account of another plan into his present one. Also, a benefit plan is far more adaptable to crediting past service than a contribution plan.

For employees who plan to work beyond retirement age, the contribution plan may be more attractive. While benefits increase under both types of plans as one works longer, the rate of increase under a contribution plan accelerates in later years due to compounding.

Finally, which plan better hedges against inflation after retirement will depend upon the extent of the cost-of-living adjustment available in a defined benefit plan. A contribution plan can protect against inflation after retirement. Even while being disbursed through an annuity, funds in a contribution plan are being reinvested. Thus, the money earned by the disbursing account can provide inflationary protection.

Very few defined benefit plans in the private sector incorporate automatic COLAs. Those that do cap the adjustments at 3 or 4 percent. Most companies will provide COLAs on an ad hoc basis depending on a company's ability to pay for them.

But the lack of any regular adjustment for employees in private plans must be seen in light of the fact that these same employees receive social security benefits, which are adjusted for inflation.

The defined benefit plan, if it includes a COLA comparable to that provided in the civil service retirement system, would clearly be preferable. But the cost of the full, automatic COLAs now applied to federal retirement programs is one of the budgetary items most under attack. It may be very difficult to establish a new pension system with that feature given the current economic climate.

Private industry often provides a combination of the two plans for its employees. Most firms offer a defined benefit plan as the basic pension. Yet many also offer a supplemental contribution plan such as a thrift, salary reduction, stock option or profit-sharing plan.

The two plans together meet the objectives of many employees by providing the security inherent in a defined benefit plan with the portability attached to a defined contribution plan. A refined mixture of the two plans can make for a very attractive retirement program.

How Retirement Eligibility Can Affect Work Force

(By James S. Cowen)

Employer objectives must be carefully considered before the actual design of a retirement program.

The earlier the retirement age, the greater the potential for young employees to move up as older employees retire. This has been true with the federal government.

Additionally, an employer's major concern is to encourage retirement at the point where the employer would benefit from retiring the older worker and replacing him with a younger one.

When this point is reached depends in large part upon the position involved. Jobs requiring physical stress or labor may require a fairly early retirement age. Later retirement ages should be considered for those in white collar jobs.

But if the employer wants long-term employees—including white collar ones—an early retirement age with a substantial service requirement should be provided.

An early retirement age, however, may cause a loss of expertise by spurring senior employees to retire early. A recent phenomenon in the civil service is a case in point. Retirees were getting full inflation-adjusted benefits while active employees saw their pay capped or restrained, thus creating an economic incentive for senior employees to leave at earliest eligibility.

Two major questions are involved in setting the retirement eligibility age. At what age may an employee retire with an immediate annuity? And when may he or she retire with an unreduced annuity?

Currently, the earliest age at which federal employees can retire with an immediate annuity is 55. Employees retiring at that age also receive an unreduced annuity. Age 55 is a common minimum retirement age elsewhere, but except in state and local governments, employers usually reduce annuities between 2 and 6 percent for every year under the more typical retirement age of 62.

An unreduced retirement benefit available at age 55 costs employers twice as much as full retirement at age 65. This is the main reason employers reduce the annuity for those who retire at an early age.

It should be noted that almost all private plans recognize social security as part of the total retirement package. Most employers try to structure a pension benefit which provides a reasonable retirement benefit when added to social security. But social security payments do not begin until age 62, so a pension benefit received at an earlier age often is not adequate for retirement.

Thus, providing a retirement benefit equivalent in value to the one currently available at age 55 may be difficult in the new federal plan.

One way to handle this potential problem is for the government to add a supplemental savings plan to the basic pension. The accumulated money in a savings plan could be used to subsidize early retirement.

Regardless of one's position, setting a new retirement age for a future federal work force will be a very sensitive issue. Concern must be shown for the needs of both the government as employer and of the employees themselves.

Vesting—when an employee becomes entitled to an eventual benefit under a pension plan—is another important issue. It is a particularly vital point to employees who want flexible careers, because a benefit vested after relatively short service is a portable benefit.

Under most defined benefit plans, employees are vested after 10 years on the job. Most defined contribution plans, on the other hand, vest either immediately or after only one year of service.

The early vesting in defined contribution plans contributes to the portable nature of such plans. Early vesting in a defined benefit plan can also help employers recruit late-career employees. If the rate of benefit accrual is constant with the new employer, an employee would not necessarily be penalized by leaving a former employer late in career.

But early vesting is often a trade-off for other benefits. Because early vesting costs the employer more as a result of vested employees terminating before retirement, benefits to long-term employees may be restrained to compensate.

Adoption of later vesting can foster increased benefits for long-career employees. In short, if long-career employment is desired, later vesting is preferable. If short-career employment is to be encouraged, earlier vesting is best.

Employee contributions to a pension plan are normally used to reduce employer costs, increase the eventual employee benefit and foster a sense of employee involvement in the plan.

Each percent of contribution means approximately a 3 percent addition to the employee's replacement rate of final salary. So employee contributions can significantly increase benefits. But employee contributions do not bolster an employee's legal right to a benefit. Therefore, a larger retirement benefit is the only employee gain from a mandatory contribution system.

The current federal system requires employees to contribute. However, employees in any new plan will have to pay 7 percent and more up to the maximum earnings base to social security.

The great majority of plans in the private sector are non-contributory. Most in state and local government are contributory. This is because most government plans existed before social security. Governments that have restructured their retirement programs in recent years have tended to convert to non-contributory plans.

If a contributory plan is desirable, adding a voluntary supplemental plan to the basic pension may be the best way to go. Offering an optional plan, particularly one where different contribution amounts are allowed, permits employees to individually build for their retirement.

The rate of accrual of benefits can also affect the work force. Accrual of benefits is how each particular year of service is credited for retirement purposes.

For example, the current civil service system credits 1.5 percent of an employees "high three" years of salary for each of the employees' first five years of service—1.75 percent for each of the next five years and 2 percent for every year thereafter. The retirement benefit cannot exceed 80 percent

of the "high three" average, which is reached at 42 years.

This type of benefit accrual is known as "back loading." The civil service retirement system was designed for long-career employees and the back-loaded formula reflects that. Early years of service receive far less benefit accrual than later years, thereby encouraging longer service.

Plans can also be either frontloaded or constant. Some employers may want a youthful work force. If so, the plan's formula would be weighted toward the early years of service. If an employer wants to employ mid- or late-career employees, a frontloaded retirement plan would be an attractive offer.

Finally, the formula can be designed to foster retirements. The Age Discrimination Act generally prohibits mandatory retirement ages, at least outside the government. But many employers circumvent the act by prohibiting further accrual of retirement benefits after age 65. The current system's benefit lid of 80 percent of final salary accomplishes a similar goal.

How Should New System Index Retirement Benefits?

(By James S. Cowen)

Indexation can affect a retirement plan at two different points. The first affects the amount of the initial benefit. The second maintains the real level of the benefit after retirement.

The goal of a good retirement plan is to maintain a career worker's standard of living into retirement. Normally, employees earn their highest incomes in the years just before retirement.

In order to maintain their standard of living, a retirement plan should base its benefits on an average of the salaries of those years.

The problem is cost and accounting. Basing a retirement benefit on a final salary formula is expensive. The fewer years used in the formula, the more expensive the plan.

In addition, private plans must prefund an employee's eventual retirement benefit. A final salary formula requires an employer to project employees' final salaries and to contribute to the pension fund accordingly.

The projections of final salary and other factors required by such a plan are quite variable.

Private industry normally uses the highest five years of salary as a formula to determine retirement benefits. A formula using the highest three years of salary costs more.

Indexation after retirement is used to maintain a retiree's real income over time. In industry, retirees are limited to social security increases and company pensions.

Without cost-of-living adjustments, and assuming inflation continues, the standards of living for a retiree will gradually decline.

Indexation of retirement benefits, however, is expensive. It accounts for more than 30 percent of the cost of the civil service benefit.

The current civil service program is one of the few that offers an automatic and fully adjusted COLA. Many employers will grant ad hoc increases when the company is able to provide them.

But employers realize that retirement benefit increases shift income from active workers to retired ones.

Another problem concerns the method of indexation. The few plans that do provide automatic indexing tie the increases to changes in the cost of living.

The most frequently used index is the Consumer Price Index. Many have criticized the CPI as not accurately reflecting the consumption patterns of the elderly. It is argued that the elderly face smaller cost of living increases than those indicated by changes in the CPI.

Full and automatic indexation of the new civil service pension plan will be heatedly debated. One important note is that the social security benefit is fully indexed, thus relieving some pressure on the new pension plan.

Social security provides a survivor benefit to an aged spouse or one with dependent children. The Employee Retirement Income Security Act additionally requires that a pension plan provide a post retirement survivor benefit equal to 50 percent of the worker's benefit.

But a worker may choose no survivor coverage. One who chooses the survivior benefit often finds his retirement benefit reduced by the total projected value of this benefit, which is usually significant.

Private pension plans are not required to provide a pre-retirement survivor benefit except to those workers who are eligible to retire. Thus, few do.

Most firms, however, provide substantial life insurance coverage, which when coupled with social security may be adequate survivor income.

The current civil service plan offers both a pre and post retirement benefit. With social security serving as the base of the new plan, the extent of additional survivor coverage needs to be considered.

Life insurance could act as an adequate supplement of social security, thereby diminishing the need for additional survivor protection, Also, the increasing number of two-worker families reduces the need for such coverage.

On the other hand, young spouses with no dependents are not eligible for social security benefits, possibly creating a need for some further protection.

Disability benefits are meant to provide a level of income to disabled employees. These benefits support employees during their disability but encourage them to attempt rehabiliation and return to work.

The actual amount to accomplish this is difficult to ascertain and varies among income groups. Social security provides fairly good disability benefits, particularly to those with a low income.

In fact, these often exceed current civil service disability benefits.

Rather than provide disability retirement, many employers offer a long term disability insurance program. If an employee becomes disabled, he is placed in such a program with benefits approximating 50 to 60 percent of his pay.

If his disability meets the social security definition, than the firm's benefits are offset by social security benefits to maintain the 50 to 60 percent of pay as total income.

If he fails to become eligible for social security and is not restored to employment, he can usually remain on the disability program for up to two years and is then cut off.

The current civil service plan maintains employees on the disability rolls as long as they continue to meet the civil service definitions. Those with less than 22 years of service, however, are limited to 40 percent of their "high three" years of salary.

The major issues involved in the design of the new civil service retirement are the definition of disability, the amount of the disability benefit, whether the plan's payments should be offset by social security, and whether those failing to meet social security's definition of disability should be cut off.

In addition to social security and a staff retirement plan, most major employers also offer a supplemental plan, such as a thrift plan, salary reduction, stock option or profit sharing. Two government agencies, the Federal Reserve Board and the Tennessee Valley Authority, now offer thrift plans. The Fed also has a salary reduction plan.

In a thrift plan, an employee's contributions to a savings account are matched by the employer. In a salary reduction plan, the employee sets aside a portion of his pay, deferring some tax liability.

Supplemental plans also are fully portable. Vesting is normally immediate and there are several tax advantages. In any case, supplemental plans can provide a great deal of flexibility to employers and employees in their retirement plans.

Funding Federal Retirement Without Hiding Costs

(By James S. Cowen)

Cost of a pension plan is derived from its benefits, the age of retirements, mortality, turnover, administrative expenses and investment income. A plan's actual cost is equal to benefits paid plus administrative expenses minus investment income.

There are many ways to estimate the cost of a pension plan. Estimates that account for present realities and future probabilities are the most reliable.

The most common method to estimate cost—and the one used by the Board of Actuaries of the civil service system—is termed entry age normal cost.

This method estimates the cost of retirement benefits for a group of newly hired employees, taking into account the plan's benefit formula, wage growth, investment income, price inflation, mortality, turnover, age of retirements and administrative expenses. It reflects a plan's cost as a percentage of current payroll.

For example, the Board of Actuaries has determined the normal cost of the civil service system to be 36 percent of payroll. After the employees' 7 percent contribution, the government must contribute 29 percent of pay to fully fund the total retirement benefits.

But the normal cost method assumes such major economic variables as future wage growth, price inflation and interest income.

If projections for wage growth or price inflation are too low, the system will cost more. If projections for interest are too low, the system will cost less. For instance, holding other things constant, a 1 percent change in the interest component can affect the normal cost by 25 percent.

The Board of Actuaries uses the following economic assumptions to determine normal cost: 6 percent annual interest, 4 percent annual price inflation.

The Social Security Administration uses other sets of economic assumptions for its programs. Its moderate set of assumptions, termed II-B, project 6.1 percent interest, 5.5 percent wage growth and 4 percent inflation.

When these assumptions are used to estimate the cost of the civil service system, the total normal cost is 31 percent rather than 36 percent. The government's cost is 24 percent versus 29 percent.

These estimates do not change the actual cost. They simply provide a measure by

which the employer can properly finance the system.

The primary purpose in calculating the cost of a pension system is to determine the funding levels necessary to fulfill the obligations.

Fully funding a system is usually unnecessary. This would entail an employer contributing the total amount required to fund employees' eventual benefits at the beginning of the plan.

Funding a plan as obligations arise, or a "pay as you go system," characterizes the military retirement system. The Internal Revenue Code, however, prohibits a qualified private retirement plan from doing this. Early private plans that did so eventually failed to meet obligations.

The Employee Retirement Income Security Act requires a level of contributions that would, in essence, fund a plan on a normal cost basis. This is one form of partial funding.

ERISA requires a plan to fully fund employees' accrued benefits to assure benefit obligations will be met if a plan is terminated. But because the law provides that other liabilities be amortized over time, accrued benefits usually are not fully funded.

Currently, the civil service system is a partially funded system. If covered by ERISA, however, the system would be deemed underfunded. To comply with ERISA, agencies would be required to fund the normal cost of employees—29 percent of payroll—plus the government would be required to amortize the civil service system's massive unfunded liability in 30 to 40 years.

One of the most serious issues in designing a new civil service plan will be adequacy of funding.

The civil service retirement fund is part of the unified federal budget. Thus, public monies contributed to the fund become government assets.

The government uses agency contributions and treasury appropriations to buy specially issued government bonds, which are placed in the fund. Becasue the transaction is from one account to another within the unified budget—treasury to retirement fund—tax or borrowing increases are not necessary to fund the payments. Such an arrangement is really an accounting transaction.

When benefit payments come due, the government redeems the bonds and pays the benefits. At this point, benefits are paid from tax revenues and funds borrowed from the market. Therefore, the first true budgetary effect of the civil service system occurs when retirees get benefits.

This is very different from what occurs in the private sector. ERISA prohibits a company retirement plan from holding more than a small portion of the company's own stocks or bonds. Therefore, the company must generate real money and contribute it to the funding instruments.

In a sense, the company's budget is affected at the point of contribution. The intent of the law is to secure the eventual benefit payments to retirees. If money is held internally by the company and the firm enters financially troubled times, the adequacy of the retirement fund could be jeopardized.

In the federal plan, the retirement fund is required to hold government securities. Since there is little chance of the federal government going bankrupt, financing the retirement plan from the outside is unnecessary for this purpose.

From a pure budgetary standpoint, there is no need to prefund a new government retirement plan, since the timing of the funding has no impact on the budget or the health of the system.

As long as a new government plan holds only government securities, the budgetary cost in the beginning will be minimal but will increase over time regardless of its funding adequacy. On the other hand, without adequate prefunding, the true cost of a new plan could be hidden until later years, causing backlash now experienced by the civil service system.

Therefore, a new plan should provide for funding methods that the federal government requires of private plans. If funds are to remain within the government, the budgetary impact will remain the same—at the point of benefit distribution.

But the true annual cost to the public will always be known. The recognition of the full cost of a new plan, accompanied by adequate funding, should go a long way to the plan's public acceptance.

HOW PRIVATE INVESTMENTS COULD CHANGE RETIREMENT

(By James S. Cowen)

What are the benefits and draw-backs—from the government's and employee's perspectives—of investing pension funds outside the federal government? And what are the economic implications of such a change?

Currently, funds of the civil service system are invested solely in government securities. Although the interest earnings have no budgetary effect, they do have a positive impact on the accounting solvency of the retirement fund.

If a portion of the new civil service retirement fund is held outside the government and earnings exceed current earnings, the cost of the new plan eventually could be substantially reduced without necessarily affecting benefit levels.

The determinant is called the real rate of return on investments. This is the interest earned over inflation.

The Board of Actuaries of the civil service system estimates the current fund in the long run will earn a 1 percent real rate of return. Long-term rates of return in the private sector, however, have traditionally exceeded this figure.

Thirty and 50 year historical averages show Treasury bill returns barely exceeding inflation, with more mixed investment portfolios of stocks and bonds earning 2 to 3 percent real rates of return.

This can have a dramatic impact on a pension fund. Costs can be reduced in a defined benefit plan or benefits will increase in a defined contribution plan.

Investing solely in government securities can be justified on two counts. One, the government as employer completely controls the money at no risk to itself or to the fund. Two, real money is not needed until benefit payments become due many years after the establishment of the plan.

It should be noted, however, that almost all other pension funds invest outside the employer's entity, including state and local governments to which such investments are optional. The two federal government thrift plans, at the Federal Reserve Board and the Tennessee Valley Authority, invest in a variety of instruments.

In other words, employers have found outside investments beneficial to their pension plans, regardless of the increased risk.

While internally held funds reduce costs in the earlier years, they make no difference in the eventual cost. The primary impact of private investment of a new pension plan would be a short-term federal budget phenomenon.

Real money contributions would be made which, when coupled with benefit payments from the current program, would increase government spending at least for the near term. But the question becomes: What real impact would be felt on financial markets?

Presumably, the Treasury would borrow additional monies from private markets to make the contributions.

Generally, government intrusion into the market increases interest rates because of increased demand on a constant supply of money. In this case, however, the money is returning to the market in the form of long-term investments. So in essence, the same money is borrowed and then recycled back into investments, not altering the total capital available in the markets.

In defined contribution plans or thrift plans, private investment can provide opportunities for employees to become more involved in their own retirement planning. Often these plans grant employees investment options in which they can designate a certain percentage of contributions to specific funds such as stocks, bonds or real estate.

It has been shown that investment needs vary not only among individual employees but also among different age groups. Thus these arrangements could enhance career and retirement flexibility.

Private investment of a government plan also raises the possibility of governmental interference in investment decisions. Stringent safeguards would have to be applied to assure that investments were made solely for the benefit of the participants. An independent board would have to oversee such an arrangement.

Again, though, most state and local government plans and the two federal thrift plans similarly invest in private concerns and are subject to the same potential conflicts a new civil service plan would experience. Adequate protection can be afforded, but it is impossible to absolutely prevent abuse. The risk would always exist.

Questions could be raised as to whether financial markets could absorb such a large infusion of new capital. This is not a serious problem.

The nation's largest 1000 pension funds currently hold more than $750 billion in assets. Total contributions to the new plan will be fairly low in the early years due to its coverage of a relatively few number of people. As the plan's coverage and contributions grow, other funds will similarly grow.

Besides, other large states and corporations have substantial pension funds which do not overwhelm the capital markets.

Finally, a private investment feature in a new plan has the potential of assisting in capital formation. Monies now used solely for benefit payments would be first invested in long-term securities providing additional capital to business.

Private investment of funds by a new civil service plan would be a major break from historical practice, but it should be considered. Such an initiative, however, should be approached carefully.

MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF, TRADE, AND CUSTOMS MATTERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will

now resume consideration of H.R. 2163, which will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2163) to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAWKINS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUDMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3028

(Purpose: To provide for a ten percent reduction in budget authority)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) proposes an amendment numbered 3028.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the amendment, insert the following:

TEN PERCENT REDUCTION IN SPENDING REQUIRED

SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 if such concurrent resolution does not comply with the provisions of this section.

(b)(1) A concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 shall set forth for each of the fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, a total amount of budget authority for discretionary Federal programs which does not exceed an amount equal to the product of the total amount of budget authority provided by law for such programs for fiscal year 1984 multiplied by 90 percent.

(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term "discretionary Federal program" means any Federal program other than—

(A) a program classified under the functional category of National Defense in the budget submitted by the President for the applicable fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code; and

(B) a program for which spending authority (as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) is provided by law.

(c)(1) A concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 shall set forth for each of the fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, a total amount of budget authority for the payment of obligations under spending authority (as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) provided by law which does not exceed an amount equal to the total amount of budget authority provided for such payments for fiscal year 1984 multiplied by 90 percent.

(2) The requirements of paragraph (1) shall not apply to budget authority provided for payments under spending authority provided by titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act.

(d) To carry out subsection (c), a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 shall contain provisions to require the committees described in clauses (1) through (10) of this subsection to submit, by June 1, 1984, recommendations to the Senate Committee on the Budget in accordance with such clauses. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill, or resolution, or both, carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(1) The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $7,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $8,900,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $10,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(2) The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $2,500,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $3,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $5,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(3) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $13,500,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $15,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $18,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(4) The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $1,900,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $2,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $2,500,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(5) The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $1,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $1,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $300,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(6) The Senate Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(7) The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $1,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $1,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $1,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(8) The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $400,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $400,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $500,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(9) The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $2,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $2,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $2,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(10) The Senate Committee on Indian Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, earlier this year, I indicated I would offer a budget amendment that would substantially reduce the Federal deficit. Along with my distinguished colleagues, Senator MCCLURE and Senator NICKLES, I proposed an amendment to reduce Federal spending by 10 percent in all areas of the budget except the social security function, including medicare, and national defense. I asked for this amendment to be held at the desk until a suitable time during the budget debate.

Mr. President, because of the unusual nature of the budget debate this year, as the first installment on a so-called deficit reduction plan, I feel now is an appropriate time to offer my proposal and to discuss it.

As we always say around this place, my amendment is very simple, Mr. President. It provides for a 10-percent across-the-board reduction in spending for all Federal programs except the ones I have mentioned—specifically, social security, including medicare, and national defense.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that my proposal, if adopted, would cut roughly $200 billion in Federal spending over the next 3 years. In arriving at that amount of savings, the CBO used economic assumptions which I feel may be overly pessimistic, but which, nevertheless, are consistent with those used by the Senate Budget Committee this year. In terms of defense spending, CBO used numbers suggested by the leadership on this side of the aisle which I understand are fully acceptable to President Reagan.

Mr. President, this amendment would achieve these spending cuts in two ways: First, the amendment provides instructions for the Senate committee having jurisdiction over entitlements to recommend ways of restructuring these programs to reduce the cost to the taxpayers by 10 percent. Again, I emphasize that it specifically exempts social security and medicare. I emphasize that my proposal does not—for the purpose of emphasis, let me reiterate—does not instruct the committees how to reduce the cost of entitlements by 10 percent. I prefer to give the committees a target amount of savings and to have them report ways of streamlining the programs to achieve it.

Second, the pending amendment provides for a 10-percent cut in budget authority relative to fiscal year 1984 levels for the so-called nondefense discretionary programs. In other words, I propose that the Senate cut spending authority for all programs Congress chooses to fund, except defense.

Mr. President, the Congressional Budget Office has prepared several tables which reflect my proposal, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—APR. 23, 1984, HELMS PLAN 3—PRELIMINARY ESTIMATES

[By fiscal year in billions of dollars]

	1984	1985	1986	1987	1985–87 total
SBC Baseline	189.4	197.3	216.9	245.2	
Deficit Reductions:					
Revenues (No change)					0
Spending					
Defense: Senate Republican defense targets		2.6		1.4	4.0
Entitlements: fiscal year 1985–87 outlays 10 percent below fiscal year 1984 exc. soc. sec. and medicare		−30.5	−35.1	−41.9	−107.5
Nondefense discretionary: Fiscal year 1985–87 budget authority 10 percent below fiscal year 1984 for other nondefense discretionary		−15.0	−24.8	−31.6	−71.4
Offsets[1]					0
Interest	0	−2.2	−7.8	−15.4	−25.5
Total deficit change	0	−45.1	−67.7	−87.5	−200.4
New deficit	189.4	152.2	149.2	157.7	

[1] Employer share, employee retirement.

TABLE 2.—HELMS REDUCTIONS IN NONDEFENSE DISCRETIONARY SPENDING

	1985		1986		1987		1988		1989	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
150	−3.216	−1.502	−3.768	−2.461	−4.957	−3.255	−5.772	−4.134	−6.502	−5.042
250	−1.760	−1.191	−2.206	−2.005	−2.664	−2.452	−3.173	−2.944	−3.705	−3.465
270	−1.224	−0.620	−1.568	−0.901	−1.932	−1.179	−2.345	−1.491	−2.706	−1.806
300	−2.538	−1.590	−3.065	−2.154	−3.602	−2.778	−4.178	−3.383	−4.777	−3.904
350	−0.628	−0.613	−0.718	−0.706	−0.815	−0.792	−0.905	−0.883	−1.001	−0.982
370	−1.108	−0.462	−1.272	−0.742	−1.440	−1.069	−1.651	−1.417	−1.853	−1.645
400	−2.207	−1.505	−2.590	−2.034	−3.010	−2.747	−3.462	−3.809	−3.942	−4.881
450	−1.083	−0.443	−1.164	−0.645	−1.437	−0.871	−1.720	−1.025	−2.011	−1.277
500	−4.411	−1.102	−5.657	−4.498	−6.939	−5.900	−8.264	−7.174	−9.612	−8.491
550	−1.873	−1.003	−2.366	−2.086	−2.882	−2.584	−3.456	−3.128	−4.059	−3.713
570	−0.000	−0.219	−0.000	−0.287	−0.000	−0.305	−0.000	−0.321	−0.000	−0.337
600	−3.231	−0.863	−3.989	−1.406	−4.805	−2.001	−5.695	−2.550	−6.598	−3.137
650	−0.000	−0.593	−0.000	−0.694	−0.000	−0.755	−0.000	−0.918	−0.000	−0.984
700	−1.827	−1.366	−2.095	−1.835	−2.378	−2.258	−2.673	−2.544	−2.992	−2.854
750	−1.060	−0.867	−1.192	−1.068	−1.328	−1.276	−1.476	−1.440	−1.627	−1.590
800	−1.067	−0.919	−1.194	−1.139	−1.324	−1.296	−1.468	−1.438	−1.618	−1.587
850	−0.100	−0.100	−0.108	−0.108	−0.116	−0.116	−0.124	−0.124	−0.132	−0.132
Total	−27.333	−14.957	−32.952	−24.771	−39.629	−31.634	−46.362	−38.724	−53.135	−45.827

TABLE 3.—HELMS BUDGET PLAN VS. SBC BASELINE ENTITLEMENTS

	1984	1985	1986	1987
Committee:				
Agriculture	0.0	−7.0	−8.9	−10.8
Armed Services	0.0	−2.5	−3.8	−5.0
Banking	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Commerce	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Environment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Finance	0.0	−13.5	−15.1	−18.7
Foreign Affairs	0.0	−1.9	−2.2	−2.5
Government Affairs	0.0	−1.7	−1.0	−0.3
Judiciary	0.0	−0.1	−0.1	−0.1
Human Resources	0.0	−1.3	−1.3	−1.3
Rules	0.0	−0.4	−0.4	−0.5
Veterans	0.0	−2.1	−2.4	−2.6
Indian Affairs	0.0	−0.1	−0.1	−0.1
Total	0.0	−30.5	−35.1	−41.9 −107.5

TABLE 4.—HELMS, FUNCTION 050

[In billions of dollars]

	1984	1985	1986	1987
SBC baseline:				
Budget authority	264.1	297.3	329	367.2
Outlays	234.4	263.4	294.6	329
Helms:				
Budget authority	264.1	299	333.7	372
Outlays	234.4	266	294.6	330.4
Difference:				
Budget authority	0	+1.7	+4.7	+4.8

TABLE 4.—HELMS, FUNCTION 050—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	1984	1985	1986	1987
Outlays	0	+2.6	0	+1.4

TABLE 5.—HELMS PAY PLAN (MAR. 13, 1984) SAVINGS RELATIVE TO THE SBC BASELINE

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	1985	1986	1987
Function 920:			
Budget authority	−1,008	−2,753	−4,683
Outlays	−1,041	2,885	−4,951

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

By way of a brief explanation, table No. 1 shows the savings my amendment would achieve over the next 3 years. Using the Senate Budget Committee baseline and the defense spending targets in the underlying amendment, it reflects a savings of $107.5 billion in entitlements and $71.4 billion in nondefense discretionary programs. These cuts alone would save the Federal Government, that is to say, the taxpayers, $25.5 billion in interest payments. All told, my amendment would cut the deficit and save the taxpayers $200.4 billion in 3 years.

Table No. 2 sets forth the necessary spending reduction targets for the nondefense discretionary programs as they appear in the budget resolution. And table No. 3 illustrates the necessary savings by committee for the entitlement programs.

The two remaining tables simply provide the Budget Committee with technical information necessary for consideration and implementation of my proposal as indicated in the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I, of course, fully realize that cutting entitlements is sensitive business, but in light of the enormous growth of these programs in recent years, as well as projected increases for future years, I am convinced that cuts can—and indeed must—be made.

As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, I have been personally involved in efforts to streamline entitlement programs under the jurisdiction of that

committee. I know firsthand that their costs can be reduced without compromising the overall effectiveness of these programs.

For instance, since 1981 the committee has made significant changes in the food stamp and child nutrition programs. When President Reagan signed the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, $5 billion was trimmed from food stamps and $4 billion from nutrition, and without sacrificing the worthwhile objectives of these programs.

Farmers in North Carolina and, I believe, elsewhere have been more than willing to do their share in reducing the cost of government. Last year, the Agriculture Committee put together the Dairy and Tobacco Adjustment Act, which substantially reduced the costs of dairy price support programs. That legislation will save the taxpayers anywhere from $1 billion to $2 billion over a 4-year period and will save consumers from between $4 billion and $11 billion at the grocery store.

In addition, the President has just signed legislation saving the taxpayers $3 billion over the next 4 years by freezing target prices for many farm commodities.

So you see, Mr. President, I am not asking other Senators or other committees to do something that I have not been willing to do myself or that I have not been willing to have my own committee do. Oh, I admit that cutting entitlements is a tough call politically, but if we are genuine, if we are sincere in our political speeches when we go back home and talk about cutting Federal spending, balancing the budget, and reducing deficits, here is an opportunity to do it.

I do not want to be too blunt about it, but I think it is about time that we put up or shut up on this question.

We can have a marked effect on the economy. We can have a marked effect on interest rates if we but have the courage to do what needs to be done.

So, Mr. President, if our goals are really to reduce Federal spending, eliminate the deficit, bring down the interest rates, and encourage the private enterprise system to function effectively, than I think we owe it to the people we represent to make a commitment and to cast a tough vote, and I know that the news media will do as they always do, be exceedingly critical and make all of the usual charges about hardheartedness, and that sort of thing, but the arithmetic of Federal spending is such that the criticism will not hold water in terms of the drain on the taxpayers of this country.

Congress cannot be content, in my judgment, merely to nibble away at the deficit through one combination or another of tax increases and spending cuts.

So, Mr. President, without a doubt, our Nation is enjoying a rather salutary economic recovery. It could and should be better. We could and should be doing more in terms of creating jobs. But we cannot do it piecemeal. We cannot do it by illusory mirror games. Our job in Congress is to adopt fiscal policies that are consistent with a healthy sustainable level of economic growth that is in tune with the principles of the free enterprise system that we all boast about.

In the process, we should be careful not to overstate the correlation between Federal deficits and interest rates. I realize that some crowding our occurs when the Government competes in private capital markets in order to finance the Federal debt. This tends to put upward pressure on interest rates, but it seems to me that the spending practices of Congress, not the size of the deficit itself, is the real drain on the economy. As I see it, the deficit is symptomatic of the problem. The problem, I believe, is the fiscal irresponsibility of Congress over a long period of time.

I do not make any partisan charges in that regard. It has been a bipartisan folly of 30 years or more.

But I think now is the time to act and I say again that this is an opportunity I think to put up or shut up. It gives us the opportunity to treat the cause of the deficit problem rather than to examine the symptoms.

I hope Senators will look favorably upon my suggestion that we reduce Federal spending by some $200 billion over the next 3 years.

The President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a suffficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPECTER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise to speak for just a few moments with reference to the amendment that the distinguished Senator, Senator HELMS, has placed before the Senate.

First, I would say that the distinguished Senator he is indeed courageous. There is no doubt in my mind that, as I look at his amendment and listen to his words of support, he clearly understands the major problems that this country has; that is, the size of the deficit. In proceeding with an approach to dramatically reduce the deficit, a couple of things are noteworthy in his approach—certainly with reference to the committee that he has jurisdiction over as chairman and that he works so hard for, the Agriculture Committee. He does not spare his own committee from the across-the-board requirement that their programs be reduced.

Likewise, it seems that the distinguished Senator is aware of the fact that social security has just been reformed, and that medicare is a most difficult and complicated problem for the senior population of this country, and thus he has exempted those two from reductions.

So in one sense, while he is courageous, he also has exhibited a significant sense of concern, compassion, and a very significant degree of fairness. However, I would call one matter to the attention of the Senate that I believe in a real way makes the Senator's amendment an exceptionally difficult one. The Senator does not address defense with the same kind of reduction that he addresses the other part of the budget. Obviously, the Senator has his reasons for that. I think the Senate ought to clearly know that is the case.

Likewise, when you exempt social security, medicare, and defense, clearly you have exempted a rather dramatic part of the budget both in terms of issues, but also in terms of dollars.

You have taken a very, very big window and exempted it from the reductions that are mandated through the committees in the rest of the proposal.

I want to close by saying in addition to courage, as I indicated heretofore, this proposal is very innovative and different with reference to how it would reduce other domestic discretionary and entitlement programs. The distinguished Senator is fully aware of the fact, as I understand it, that you just cannot take entitlement programs and say I am reducing them 10 percent. He is suggesting, if I read it correctly, Senator, that the committee would be ordered to do that, and they would have the jurisdiction to determine how they would restructure—"reform" might be a better word—those particular entitlements so that the reduction causes the remaining program to be as consistent as possible with its original goals and objectives.

That is ultimately one way that the Congress might use to address the very serious issue of deficits. We may indeed have to have some hybrid approach where you do not actually pass the law of the floor which does it the first time around, but, rather, something in the nature of a more precise and specific reconciliation, for lack of a better word. I use that word "reconciliation" not in its typical sense, but in its statutory sense as it is found in

the Budget Act, and applied in the past few years.

Having said that, in addition to the remarks that I have made with reference to the proposal and the distinguished Senator who has offered it, I do think the Senator is to be praised for coming here today and offering this so we can get started.

Frankly, I do not think this whole approach here to budget and deficit reduction, which started with the tax package 2½ or 3 weeks ago, has that many issues. I hope Senators will decide to come and propose their packages or their amendments so we can get on with it.

On the other hand, I understand there may be reasons for delay.

I do thank the Senator from my standpoint as one who has to see to it that we get this done; at least we are getting started.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank my able and distinguished friend. He is a close friend in the Senate.

This gives me an opportunity to pay tribute to him, one of the hardest working Members of the Senate, with perhaps the most difficult job in the Senate. I have thought many times that no matter how difficult I think the Agriculture chairmanship may be, the Budget Committee is four times as consuming, involving more study and consideration. I want to pay my respects to Senator DOMENICI, a great American and a great Senator.

I know that this will be a difficult proposal for Senators, but I think the time has come for us to put up or maybe shut up about fiscal responsibility. If no one has further comment on the amendment, I am ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. CHILES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, it is always good to hear from anyone who wants to reduce the deficit. From that standpoint, I like the bottom line numbers in the plan of the Senator from North Carolina. It gets the deficits down to $159 billion by 1987. That looks good.

Yet I have always had problems with these across-the-board solutions ever since I was in the Florida State Legislature. It seems to me "across-the-board" is one way of saying we will not look at individual programs and weigh the good along with the bad. Under this proposal we would just apply a 10-percent solution across the board.

You might argue we are doing it fairly and for everyone. But that is not what this amendment would do. This amendment exempts defense from the 10-percent reduction. It exempts social security. But then it imposes a 10-percent reduction on everyone and everything else.

A 10-percent across-the-board reduction in law enforcement programs would mean a combined overall reduction of $257 million below the 1984 appropriations level. That means that personnel-intensive agencies which serve to combat illegal drug trafficking—like the FBI and the Drug Enforcement Agency—would be cut even below last year's actual level at a time when drug trafficking is one of the Nation's few growth businesses.

The FBI would lose $108 million. That would be $80 million less than the 1984 actual levels.

The Drug Enforcement Administration would lose $29 million, $22 million less than the 1984 actual level.

And while we would be cutting $100 million for the FBI and $29 million for drug enforcement, the drug trafficking industry grossed over $100 billion last year—$100 billion.

Does it make good government sense to tell the people that, while we are reducing the money for the FBI and the drug enforcement agencies below the 1984 levels, we have drug trafficking running rampant throughout the United States? That, to me, is neither sound budgeting nor sound fiscal policy.

A 10-percent cut in the foreign aid program would scuttle the President's Central America initiative. If that is what the Senate and the Congress wants to do, I think we ought to vote up or down on the Central America initiative itself. Part of that money is for military and arms as well as economic aid. Yet this aid package would fall by the wayside under a 10-percent, across-the-board plan.

In function 600 we find the supplemental security income program for the elderly and the disabled. These are people who are at and below the poverty line. What we would be saying is that we are either going to cut benefits 10 percent or else 10 percent of the recipients are going to be thrown off the rolls. It would have to be one or the other.

As I look at the plan of the Senator from North Carolina, I notice he does not provide any new revenue. None. So all the dabate we have had on the finance bill would be for naught, because we are not going to have any new revenue. No, we are not going to say to any of the people who have received the tax cut of 25 percent, reducing the rate from 70 to 50 percent, that we are going to change the benefits. But if you are one of those people getting SSI, if you are disabled, if you are aged in this country, we are going to cut you 10 percent or we are going to cut 10 percent off the rolls. That is what we would be saying with this across-the-board plan.

I just wonder if the Senate or the Congress is prepared to do that.

A 10-percent cut from the 1984 appropriations level in compensatory education for disadvantaged children would cut approximately 700,000 children off the rolls. Does that make sense? Is that good, sound economic sense? Do we tell them we just do not have the money? Do we just say, We have to do something about these deficits, and everybody has to take a cut?

You really do not achieve anything when you cut compensatory education, and when you cut disadvantaged children. Eventually we pick them up in the prison system. Eventually we pick them up in the welfare system. Entitlement programs will soon pick them up. If you are in prison, somebody has to pay for you. The Federal courts will say you get a certain amount of exercise room, you get a certain amount of space, you cannot put but so many in a prison. They, in effect, tell the States, "If you do not comply with this, we will let people go. We will put them out on the street."

So we have to put them in the prisons and we have to take care of them. But we are going to cut children off the rolls from compensatory education, approximately 700,000, because we are going to save money. The savings we achieve now, will only mean a higher human and financial cost later.

I think these examples, Mr. President, illustrate why we should not try to enact an across-the-board plan. If we want to look at individual programs and cut them, let us do it. But exempt defense? By exempting defense, we find in addition to its growth of 7 percent it would also grow by inflation. So it gets about a 13-percent increase. But, at the same time, we would turn around and cut SSI 10 percent. So there would be a 23-percent spread between what we are doing for military spending and what we would be doing in the domestic area.

I think defense is tremendously important in this country, Mr. President. I think we have to increase funds for defense. The Senator from Florida has been voting to do that and, has a plan to be debated later that will add to the money we appropriated last year in defense. But to turn around now and say we are going to cut 10 percent off of last year's payment to the people in this country who cannot do for themselves is hard to justify.

Sure, we have some shirkers out there. If we can devise legislation to take them off the rolls, let us do it. But we also have some elderly in this country who cannot do for themselves any more. They have done a lot for the country. They have helped build the Nation's economic base. Some of them cannot take care of themselves now. But we are going to say to them, 10 percent of you off the rolls, or we reduce all of you by 10 percent.

We would be cutting the Coast Guard, an area where the Senator from Florida has a lot of concern, be-

cause right now, the Coast Guard is interdicting drugs and refugees pouring into my State. The Federal Government does not want to pay for those refugees. That burden falls on State and local governments. They fill up our hospitals, they fill up our prisons. They are the ones who are seeking help and support.

But we would say we are going to cut the Coast Guard so they are not going to run the cutters and aircraft out there to try to stop some of these refugees and to interdict the drugs that have been coming into my State.

The Coast Guard, under this would lose about $67 million from their procurement account. That buys about 11 patrol boats, it could buy 3 C-130's, or a new major cutter. They would lose $165 million from their operations account. That is 30,000 cutter operating hours that would be reduced. That is an example of the amount it would cut from the Coast Guard.

Mr. President, I could go on with more example, but I think these are sufficient to make the point that I wish to make. A 10-percent cut sounds good when you look at the bottom line and the amount of money saved. But when we start looking at the programs we would indiscriminately cut while accelerating the pace of military spending, I do not think that is very sound. I hope the Senate will not adopt this amendment.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am not certain which amendment the Senator from Florida is opposing in his remarks. He certainly echoed precisely what was said last year by the distinguished Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART), when he stated his opposition to doing something about the deficit. I have been waiting around this place for 12 years, Mr. President, and for much longer than that when I was a private citizen back in North Carolina, for Congress to do something. It is a pretty clear matter of record that some of the people who complain the loudest and the longest about deficits are the very ones who, in past years, have voted for the excessive appropriations.

Mr. President, if we are just going to say we cannot do anything and bring forth the litany of purported examples of what will happen, then we will not do anything; the Senator from Florida is exactly right. But I do not think he is aware that this amendment bestows upon the committees of the Senate the duty to find ways to reduce Federal spending without doing undue harm to the most worthy aspects of Federal programs.

The litany that the able Senator from Florida listed is almost the same as what Senator HART did last year. This is what we shall hear every time somebody proposes to do something realistic about reducing Federal spending. I am aware of that. It is a game we play around here, to try to nail a Senator, to identify him as hard-hearted and all that sort of thing. But the most hard-hearted attitude Congress can take toward the American people is not to reduce Federal spending, not reduce the Federal deficit, not bring down the interest rates.

I submit that this amendment is fair, it does place a resonsibility on committee chairmen, it does place a responsibility on the Appropriations Committee in particular. But that is what we are paid for, Mr. President. We are paid to do this sort of thing and to take on the difficult responsibilities.

If we want to, we can sit back and say, well, we cannot do this, because we might get some bad publicity back home because some Senator got up and said oh, that thing cannot pass. But if we are really dedicated to the proposition that we are going to move toward a balanced budget, we are going to reduce the Federal deficit, we are going to bring down interest rates, we are going to reduce the public sector of Government, this is a good beginning. I hope the Senate will consider it.

If we do not want to vote for it, that is fine, but I hope we shall not try to obfuscate the meaning of the amendment, the intent of the amendment, by dragging out a litany of things which will not happen if the committees of the Senate will do their duty, which I am sure the committees will.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from North Carolina if he is ready to vote.

Mr. HELMS. Yes, Mr. President, I am.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am just going to make an observation, Mr. President. This amendment has caused me to develop a quick table. I do not know that it offers anybody a reason for voting for or against it, but for those who want to know something about the Federal Government's budget and what it is really made up of, this amendment has caused the Senator from New Mexico to take the 1984 outlays of the Federal Government and put them up alongside the 1985 outlays as contemplated by the budget resolution reported out before the holiday recess and then break them down into the categories he addresses and adding in net interest, Mr. President. The Senator obviously does not want us to cut interest by 10 percent, but save whatever interest we can by reducing the deficit. The table is very interesting, I am going to just quickly read it.

The outlays for 1984 would be $855 billion, for 1985 would be $924 billion. If you take those items that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina wants to send to committees and let them reduce it by 10 percent at their discretion, taking into account the goals, programs, and objectives and trying to meet them as best possible, interestingly enough, the 1984 outlays for all those programs is only $269 billion.

They would have grown under the budget resolution to only $276 billion. The three items: defense, medicare, and social security, are as follows: $237 billion in 1984 and $266 billion in 1985 for defense; medicare, $60 billion in 1984 and $67 billion in 1985; social security, $179 billion in 1984 and $190 billion in 1985; and then net interest, $110 billion in 1984 and $125 billion in 1985.

I merely state that because out of $855 billion and $924 billion budgets, respectively, for each of the 2 years, only $269 billion and $276 billion are not part of defense, medicare, social security, and net interest.

I send the table which summarizes this to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of the RECORD following my remarks and as explanation of my brief statement.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal years—	
	1984	1985
Total outlays in budget resolution reported by Senate Budget Committee	855	924
Deduct budget elements not subject to Helms amendment 10 percent cut:		
Defense	−237	−266
Medicare	−60	−67
Social Security	−179	−190
Net interest	−110	−125
Outlays subject to Helms amendment 10 percent cut	269	276

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Maine (Mr. COHEN) and the Senator from Nortn Carolina (Mr. EAST) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) is absent because of a death in the family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who wish to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 68, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 78 Leg.]

YEAS—27

Andrews	D'Amato	Exon
Boren	Denton	Garn

Goldwater	Laxalt	Rudman
Hatch	Long	Symms
Hecht	Mattingly	Thurmond
Heflin	McClure	Trible
Helms	Murkowski	Warner
Humphrey	Nickles	Wilson
Kasten	Nunn	Zorinsky

NAYS—68

Abdnor	Eagleton	Moynihan
Armstrong	Evans	Packwood
Baker	Ford	Pell
Baucus	Glenn	Percy
Bentsen	Gorton	Pressler
Biden	Grassley	Proxmire
Bingaman	Hatfield	Pryor
Boschwitz	Hawkins	Quayle
Bradley	Heinz	Randolph
Bumpers	Hollings	Riegle
Burdick	Inouye	Roth
Byrd	Jepsen	Sarbanes
Chafee	Johnston	Sasser
Chiles	Kassebaum	Simpson
Cochran	Lautenberg	Specter
Cranston	Leahy	Stafford
Danforth	Levin	Stennis
DeConcini	Lugar	Stevens
Dixon	Mathias	Tower
Dodd	Matsunaga	Tsongas
Dole	Melcher	Wallop
Domenici	Metzenbaum	Weicker
Durenberger	Mitchell	

NOT VOTING—5

Cohen	Hart	Kennedy
East	Huddleston	

So Mr. HELMS' amendment (No. 3028) was rejected.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ON THE DEATH OF DAVID KENNEDY

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, the loss of any young life is always tragic. It is doubly so in the case of David Kennedy because he was a young man of such great potential. Annie and I knew David—and we were fortunate enough to know his father as a friend. And in times of great sorrow, Robert Kennedy often quoted Greek poet Aeschylus who wrote:

> God, whose law it is that he who learns must suffer. And even in our sleep, pain that cannot forget falls drop by drop upon the heart, and in our own despair, against our will, comes wisdom to us by the awful grace of God.

Let us pray that in this tragedy, too, the Lord will grant us wisdom. Our prayers and deepest sympathy go out to Ethel, David's brothers and sisters, our colleague, TED, and the entire Kennedy family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ARMSTRONG). The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Ohio in speaking, I am sure, for every Member on this side of the aisle in extending our sympathy to the family of David Kennedy, especially to his mother, Ethel, and his brothers and sisters at this time of sorrow.

I knew David's father well. I served with him in this body. Perhaps I knew David as a young man, as a child.

I wish to express my profound sorrow to our colleague and friend, TED KENNEDY, on this loss of a member of a distinguished American family.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I seek the floor at this time in order to ask the distinguished majority leader what the program is for the rest of the day and the rest of the week.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the minority leader.

Mr. President, I would like to see us go to the normal time this afternoon, or until about 6 p.m. I have consulted with the chairman of the Budget Committee, however, and he indicates that as far as he can ascertain at this time no other amendments are ready to be presented.

I see that the Senator from Kansas may have an amendment, or a statement.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, if the leader will yield, what we would like to do, if there are no other amendments on this bill, is to proceed with the child support enforcement bill with a time agreement of 10 minutes on each side. We think we have cleared the child support bill on both sides of the aisle. Senator BRADLEY is here. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana, Senator LONG, is also here. The distinguished Presiding Officer (Mr. ARMSTRONG) will manage that bill. We would like to take that bill up, if there are no other amendments pending.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the minority leader yield?

Mr. BAKER. If the Senator would withhold for a moment, I thank the Senator from Kansas. I have consulted with the Senator and his staff, and agreed that we would try to take this bill up as soon as possible. I think it would be an excellent time to do that. Let me explore that possibility in a moment, and perhaps we can do it this afternoon.

May I inquire of the Senator? Do you think a rollcall vote would be required?

Mr. DOLE. I do not think a rollcall vote will be required. We have agreed to 10 minutes on each side. We do not think it will take that long.

Senator BRADLEY and I have a colloquy. I have another colloquy with Senator JEPSEN. There are no amendments.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if the majority leader would yield, I do not have an amendment. I do have a speech that I would like to make on the economic consequences of the budget reconciliation bill which we are considering. But I would be happy to defer that speech until the Senator from Kansas takes up his bill, if the majority leader wishes to do it that way.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, what I propose to do now, if the minority leader can agree, is take us off this bill temporarily, and ask that we go to the child support enforcement bill on a time limitation.

While I explore that possibility with the minority leader, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the manner of clearing the Child Support Enforcement Act for action at this time will take a little longer. In the meantime, if the Senator from Wisconsin is prepared to do so, I am prepared to put us in morning business, and if the Senate will agree. He can make his speech at that time. Or we could stay on this bill and do it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my speech relates directly to the bill.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I yield the floor. The Senator may seek recognition for that purpose.

At the conclusion of his speech, may I say to the Members that we will go to the Child Support Enforcement Act, if cleared, or otherwise to a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business. However, I do not expect further action on this bill, or on the pending measure today, with the exception of the statements as in the case of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, may I yield the floor briefly to the Senator from Florida without losing my right to the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I thank him for initiating the economic assumptions. The Budget Act provides that, first, 4 hours of debate on the budget resolution shall be about economics. Since our main consideration, deficits, is going to be on this bill, I think we ought to start our debate

talking about the impact of the deficit reduction plans on the economy.

I will have some comments to make about economic assumptions, but I certainly am delighted that the Senator from Wisconsin—in the role that he has played in regard to the Joint Economic Committee, and his concern about the economy—is here to initiate the remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COCHRAN). The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida.

WHY FISCAL POLICY FOR THE NEXT SEVERAL YEARS SHOULD BE A TRAIL OF THORNS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is the first time, to my knowledge, that that provision of law to which the Senator from Florida has referred has been honored in the Senate. It has been honored every year in the House of Representatives where they have had debate on the economic consequences of our action. Of course, the law conceives that this is one that we should certainly discuss and consider, and in some detail. We have not done it. We talk about how we cut the budget, how much we cut the budget, but not what this would do to unemployment, what it would do to interest rates, what it would do to inflation, nor what effect it would have on the lives of American citizens.

So I would like to speak on that briefly. I am delighted to hear that the Senator from Florida may also have some comments on it.

Mr. President, this Senator believes that the mammoth Federal Government deficits that confront this country constitutes far and away our most serious economic problem. Indeed, the deficits with their mamoth size and the likelihood that they will be with us for years to come constitute, in the words of the eminent international economist who heads the International Monetary Fund, the single most serious obstacle to worldwide economic stability and growth. There is absolutely no way that Federal deficits, ranging from $150 billion a year to $300 billion a year can serve any constructive purpose. The damage from these deficits come from the colossal drain on savings represented by Treasury borrowing forced by these deficits. Indeed, some experts estimate the deficits will absorb more than two-thirds of all the savings of the American people over the next 5 years.

So what? So the diminished pool of capital must finance homebuilding, the purchase of automobiles, farm equipment, capital expenditures by American business, and borrowing by State and local municipalities. The deficits will smash into this non-Federal borrowing like a 10-ton truck collision. It will have two perverse effects on the economy.

First, it will drive interest rates up, up, up—real interest rates; that is, interest minus inflation—which are already far above record levels of the past. Those interest rates are rising. As the recovery continues, they can only go one way—up.

The second perverse effect of these deficits will slam thousands of employers and millions of workers flat on their back. Rising interest rates will elbow home buyers and auto buyers out of the market. No industry is nearly as interest rate sensitive as housing. The overwhelming majority of home buyers finance their purchase by borrowing on a mortgage. Whether they buy a new home or not depends on whether their income enables them to meet their monthly payments. When interest rates rise about 15 percent on a long-term mortgage, interest constitutes 75 percent of the entire monthly payments. So rising interest rates mean rising monthly payments and diminishing housing sales. In the last big rise in interest rates during the 1981–82 period, housing starts dropped by an astounding 1 million starts. That drop in housing starts cost about 2 million jobs. Every housing start means approximately 2 man-years of work.

The auto industry is nearly as sensitive to interest rate fluctuations as the housing industry. Seventy-five percent of auto buyers finance their purchases on time. When interest rates go too high, monthly auto payments march right up with them step by step. And the number of auto buyers falls directly and inevitably as interest rates and monthly payments on auto purchases rise. With one out of six jobs in the country dependent on the automobile industry, rising interest rates could cut new auto buying in half and cost millions of jobs.

But the most damaging effect of these king-size Federal deficits comes in the area of foreign trade. The deficits flood the world as well as the domestic American market with Treasury securities. Those U.S. Treasury securities attract Japanese and German and United Kingdom and Mexican investment. And why not? They are risk free and the interest rate is high. So the Japanese sell their yen and buy the dollar to invest in these high flying U.S. securities.

What is the result? The dollar rises in value, the yen falls. Between 1980 and 1982 the dollar rose 21 percent compared to the yen and 30 percent compared to the average value of European currencies. What did that mean? That meant that we could buy Japanese cars at a 21-percent cheaper price—just as if they had a price cut, the same price cut would follow for Japanese TV's, and radios, and computers. But the Japanese had to pay 21 percent more for American goods. So what happened? Our trade balance with the Japanese worsened by 70 percent in those 2 years. With the Europeans it was worse. The dollar rose by a fat 30 percent compared to European currencies. We suffered a 30-percent disadvantage in selling to the Europeans. And of course they greatly increased their exports to us.

The overall result of all this was a disastrous trade year for this country in 1983. Our adverse trade balance went through the stratosphere to $61 billion. And next year? The Secretary of Commerce tells us to grit our teeth and get ready for an incredible $100 billion adverse balance of trade. A few years ago American trade was in balance. The Secretary of Commerce tells us that every billion dollars of adverse trade costs this country 25,000 jobs. So high Federal deficits—by driving interest rates through the roof—will cost this country a $100 billion adverse trade balance which in turn will cost us 2½ million American jobs.

Mr. President, you add up the cost to this country of the jobs the deficit will cost this country in new home construction, in automobile production, and in its impact on our foreign trade and you have the difference between a booming, healthy economy and a first-class depression.

Now unfortunately, Mr. President, what I have said so far tells only a part of the story. The tough problem we face is how we reduce the deficit without paralyzing our economy in the process.

I wrote Senator CHILES and asked for this opportunity to discuss the economic effects of this budget reconciliation policy, because unfortunately we do not face a simple problem of just cutting the deficit. Certainly we have to do that. But we should do it with our eyes wide open to the consequences of the kind of man-sized cuts these deficit reductions must make in American jobs, on the survival of thousands of businesses, and on American economic growth.

Now obviously, Mr. President, one big reason, in fact the major reason, why this country has enjoyed the remarkable recovery we have enjoyed in the past year-and-a-half has been because the Federal Government ran back-to-back deficits of grossly irresponsible size in 1982 and 1983. Consider: in 1981 the Federal Government ran a fat $56 billion deficit. Then the Federal deficits really took off. Mind you, the previous record for deficits had been a monster of $66 billion in 1976. But in 1982, the deficit leaped to an astonishing $109 billion super record level. And then last year—1983—the deficit shot to the amazing level of $195 billion. For the next several years, unless the Congress adopts extraordinary, and I mean extraordinary, measures to hold down spending and increase revenues the Federal def-

icit will stay at or above the $150 billion level. Interest rates will stay high and interest-sensitive industries—homebuilding, auto production and trade effected industries—will suffer drastically.

Will these high deficits guarantee us continued economic recovery? No. They will have virtually no stimulus because it is the increase, I repeat the increase in the deficit that lifts and pushes the economy. I repeat, the increase—the increase is critical. The economy moved out of the recent recession because the deficit leaped from $56 billion to $109 billion and then to $195 billion. If the deficit floats along at the present level it will not bring any new stimulus to growth or jobs.

What will be the job and growth consequences if we cut the Federal Government deficits as some Senators have proposed by enough to bring the deficit back promptly to the historic levels in relation to the gross national product that we had in the sixties and seventies? The answer, unfortunately, is that we would increase unemployment by millions and very probably push the country back into a serious recession. In fact, it may very well be literally impossible to reduce the deficit over the next 5 years to less than $100 billion because any massive spending cut or tax increase would take so much out of the economy that the unavoidable increased unemployment and welfare costs and the sharply diminished tax revenues would deepen the deficit—at least temporarily. It is very possible that we have irresponsibly plunged this country into an economic dead end.

Even the modest proposals by the administration and the distinguished Senator from Florida on behalf of Senate Democrats on the Budget Committee would, for a time, increase unemployment and reduce the rate of economic growth in the country, according to some respected forecasters.

None of the major forecasters has yet published analyses of the deficit reduction plans, but we have found two recent studies—one on the Senate Republican's $150 billion plan and one on Senator CHILES' $200 billion reduction proposal—both of which show that budget tightening, has a restraining effect on the economy and inflation from what otherwise would have been the case and similarly lowers interest rates. A third budget reduction plan of $185 billion in the House's first concurrent resolution has not yet been formally analyzed, but its effect should be similar to the other two plans.

Allen Sinai, chief economist for Lehman Bros. Kuhn Loeb, used the DRI model on the Republican plan and came up with the following economic results: By 1987, real GNP would be 1.6 percent lower than with no deficit reduction, inflation would be 0.7 percentage points lower, the unemployment rate would be 1.4 percentage points higher, and interest rates would be 1.05 to 1.26 percentage points lower.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator answer a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will be delighted to.

Mr. DOMENICI. The statement made just before the comment on Senator CHILES, was that compared with doing nothing that that would occur?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That compared with no change in the deficit over the levels that are projected at the present time, if we do not change policy now.

Mr. DOMENICI. So that is if we do nothing, with current policy, a deficit reduction package of the size we offer will harm rather than help? Is that what the Senator is saying?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; and I am for deeper reductions, as I will come to in a minute, because I think we have to bite the bullet. What it would do is to increase unemployment, but it will also decrease inflation, also decrease interest rates. But the overall effect, according to the studies by these economists, is that it would have some adverse effect on unemployment. The 1.4 percentage points higher is a big increase, well over 1 million jobs. Whether that is worth the price or not is something else. I think it is well worth the price. We ought to go farther. I am trying to spell out the fact that we should have our eyes open.

Mr. DOMENICI. I just wanted to say that I have a thought. There is a statement around that to err is human but to get paid for it is divine.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree with the Senator's implications of his remarks. Economists are often wrong. But at the same time I think we ought to be aware of the fact that there is no easy fix here. No matter what we do, we are going to cause some pain. We cannot do this painlessly. I think we ought to be able to recognize that.

A study of the Chiles plan being prepared for Senator BENTSEN by George Tyler of the JEC staff, which also uses the DRI model, seems to be coming up with results very similar to Sinai's—lower growth and inflation, higher unemployment, and lower interest rates.

While these proposals would yield lower deficits than under current policies, they will not actually reduce the deficit below current levels. CBO estimates that the House plan will result in a deficit of $189 billion in fiscal 1984 and $182 billion in fiscal 1987. According to Sinai, the deficit under the Republican plan will grow from $190 billion in 1985 to $198 billion in 1987.

Even more damaging to all these plans is the fact that they all continue to yield very high structural deficits and thus generate significant stimulus even as the economy approaches full capacity and full employment. This amount of stimulus will result in higher inflation and higher interest rates and, in fact, this may already be starting. Since all three plans provide very little deficit reduction in 1985, excessive stimulus will continue to provide strong growth during the rest of this year and the problems of rising inflation and interest rates may occur much sooner than any of the major models currently predict.

Frankly, this Senator would opt for a much stronger deficit reduction program—recognizing the full consequences of this policy to jobs and economic growth during the next 2 or 3 years. I believe that deficit reduction is so critical to the long-term economic health of this country that I favor a program that would cut spending by more than $100 billion per year by 1988 and increase revenues by nearly $100 billion in that year. That program would, by my calculations, give the country a balanced budget if we could bring unemployment down to 7 percent or below, which would be very difficult, obviously.

Between now and 1988, however, the economy would have to suffer through a very painful readjustment, as the Allen Sinai and George Tyler studies show.

But, Mr. President, the principal purpose of my speech this afternoon is to emphasize the critical importance of debating these changes in our fiscal policies—in taxing and spending—with our eyes wide open. We must acknowledge that we are at a stage of Federal budgetmaking in which we cannot bring the kind of drastic changes to our fiscal policy we urgently need without enduring more than the very real pain of reducing popular and desirable spending programs and increasing taxes.

That is tough enough. In addition, we must also honestly face up to the prospect that we shall be putting this Nation through the agonizing ordeal of recession that will, in all probability, last several years.

Mr. President, I wish there were some way we could escape this. Heaven knows, no one wants to advocate a program that is going to mean higher unemployment. But I think we should be honest and recognize we are going to have to go through it. I think we would come out in the long run with a better product.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1984

TIME LIMITATION AGREEMENT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am advised by the minority leader now that a time agreement with respect to H.R. 4325, which is the Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1984, has been approved on his side. May I now

put the time request for the consideration of all Members?

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate turns to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 761, H.R. 4325, the child support enforcement program bill, it be considered under the following time agreement: 20 minutes on the bill to be equally divided between the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ARMSTRONG) and the ranking minority member of the Finance Committee or their designees; that no amendments be in order with the exception of an amendment reported by the committee in the nature of a substitute; 2 minutes on any debatable motion, appeal, or point of order if such is submitted to the Senate; and that the agreement be in the usual form.

That is the request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, with that agreement in hand, I ask unanimous consent that the pending unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 4325, Calendar Order No. 761, and that after disposition of that measure, the Senate resume consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask the majority leader whether or not it is anticipated there will be a rollcall vote on this measure.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee if he anticipates a rollcall on this bill or any amendments thereto?

Mr. DOLE. No, Mr. President.

Mr. BAKER. I gather they do not, Mr. President.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask the majority leader if he will put in a very brief quorum call. Mr. LONG is on his way. I ask that that not be charged against him.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for me to suggest the absence of a quorum without the time consumed thereby to be charged against the time allocated for the consideration of the bill and the amendments thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Without objection, the bill will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4325) to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to assure, through mandatory income withholding, incentive payments to States, and other improvements in the child support enforcement program, that all children in the United States who are in need of assistance in securing financial support from their parents will receive such assistance regardless of their circumstances, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1984".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Statement of purpose.
Sec. 3. Federal matching of administrative costs.
Sec. 4. Federal incentive payments.
Sec. 5. 90-percent matching for automated management systems used in income withholding and other required procedures.
Sec. 6. Required State procedures.
Sec. 7. Periodic review of effectiveness of State programs; modification of penalty.
Sec. 8. Special project grants for interstate enforcement.
Sec. 9. Extension of section 1115 demonstration authority to child support enforcement program.
Sec. 10. Modifications in content of annual report of the Secretary.
Sec. 11. Child support enforcement for certain children in foster care.
Sec. 12. Continuation of support enforcement for AFDC recipients whose benefits are being terminated.
Sec. 13. Increased availability of Federal parent locator service to State agencies.
Sec. 14. Availability of social security numbers for child support enforcement purposes.
Sec. 15. Limitation on discharge in bankruptcy of child support obligations.
Sec. 16. Collection of past-due support from Federal tax refunds.
Sec. 17. State guidelines for child support awards.
Sec. 18. Wisconsin child support initiative.
Sec. 19. Sense of the Congress that State and local governments should focus on the problems of child custody, child support, and related domestic issues.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. Section 451 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "and obtaining child and spousal support," and inserting in lieu thereof "obtaining child and spousal support, and assuring that assistance in obtaining support will be available under this part to all children (whether or not eligible for aid under part A) for whom such assistance is requested,".

FEDERAL MATCHING OF ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 455(a) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(a)";

(2) by striking out ", beginning with the quarter commencing July 1, 1975,";

(3) by striking out paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraphs (1) and (3) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(4) by amending paragraph (1)(A) as so redesignated to read as follows:

"(A) equal to the percent specified in paragraph (2) of the total amounts expended by such State during such quarter for the operation of the plan approved under section 454, and";

(5) in paragraph (1)(B) as so redesignated, by striking out "specified in clause (1) or (2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "specified in subparagraph (A)"; and

(6) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) The percent applicable to quarters in a fiscal year for purposes of paragraph (1)(A) is—

"(A) 70 percent for fiscal years 1984, 1985, and 1986,

"(B) 69 percent for fiscal year 1987,

"(C) 68 percent for fiscal year 1988,

"(D) 67 percent for fiscal year 1989,

"(E) 66 percent for fiscal year 1990, and

"(F) 65 percent for fiscal year 1991 and each fiscal year thereafter.".

(b) Subsections (d)(1)(B), (d)(2)(A), (d)(2)(B), and (e) of section 452 of such Act are each amended by striking out "455(a)(3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "455(a)(1)(B)".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply to fiscal years after fiscal year 1983.

FEDERAL INCENTIVE PAYMENTS

SEC. 4. (a) Section 458 of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"INCENTIVE PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 458. (a) In order to encourage and reward State child support programs which perform in a cost-effective and efficient manner to secure support for all children who have sought assistance in securing support, whether such children reside within the State or elsewhere and whether or not they are eligible for aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under part A of this title, and regardless of the economic circumstances of their parents, the Secretary shall, from support collected which would otherwise represent the Federal share of assistance to families of absent parents, pay to each State for each fiscal year, on a quarterly basis (as described in subsection (e)) beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1985, an incentive payment in an amount determined under subsection (b).

"(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), the incentive payment shall be equal to—

"(A) 6 percent of the total amount of support collected under the plan during the fiscal year in cases in which the support obligation involved is assigned to the State pursuant to section 402(a)(26) or section 471(a)(17) (with such total amount for any fiscal year being hereafter referred to in this section as the State's 'AFDC collections' for that year), plus

"(B) 6 percent of the total amount of support collected during the fiscal year in all other cases under this part (with such total amount for any fiscal year being hereafter referred to in this section as the State's 'non-AFDC collections' for that year).

"(2) If subsection (c) applies with respect to a State's AFDC collections or non-AFDC collections for any fiscal year, the percent specified in paragraph (1)(A) or (B) (with

respect to such collections) shall be increased to the higher percent determined under such subsection (with respect to such collections) in determining the State's incentive payment under this subsection for that year.

"(3) The dollar amount of the portion of the State's incentive payment for any fiscal year which is determined on the basis of its non-AFDC collections under paragraph (1)(B) (after adjustment under subsection (c) if applicable) shall in no case exceed the dollar amount of the portion of such payment which is determined on the basis of its AFDC collections under paragraph (1)(A) (after adjustment under subsection (c) if applicable).

"(4) The Secretary shall make such additional payments to the State under this part, for fiscal year 1986 or 1987, as may be necessary to assure that the total amount of payments under this section and section 455(a)(1)(A) for such fiscal year is no less than 80 percent of the amount that would have been payable to that State and its political subdivisions for such fiscal year under this section and section 455(a)(1) if those sections had remained in effect as they were in effect for fiscal year 1984 prior to the amendments made by the Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1984.

"(c) If the total amount of a State's AFDC collections or non-AFDC collections for any fiscal year bears a ratio to the total amount expended by the State in that year for the operation of its plan approved under section 454 for which payment may be made under section 455 (with the total amount so expended in any fiscal year being hereafter referred to in this section as the State's 'combined AFDC/non-AFDC administrative costs' for that year) which is equal to or greater than 1.4, the relevant percent specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b)(1) (with respect to such collections) shall be increased to—

"(1) 6.5 percent, plus

"(2) one-half of 1 percent for each full two-tenths by which such ratio exceeds 1.4;

except that the percent so specified shall in no event be increased (for either AFDC collections or non-AFDC collections) to more than 10 percent. For purposes of the preceding sentence, laboratory costs incurred in determining paternity in any fiscal year may at the option of the State be excluded from the State's combined AFDC/non-AFDC administrative costs for that year.

"(d) In computing incentive payments under this section, support which is collected by one State on behalf of individuals residing in another State shall be treated as having been collected in full by each such State.

"(e) The amounts of the incentive payments to be made to the various States under this section for any fiscal year shall be estimated by the Secretary at or before the beginning of such year on the basis of the best information available. The Secretary shall make such payments for such year, on a quarterly basis (with each quarterly payment being made no later than the beginning of the quarter involved), in the amounts so estimated, reduced or increased to the extent of any overpayments or underpayments which the Secretary determines were made under this section to the States involved for prior periods and with respect to which adjustment has not already been made under this subsection. Upon the making of any estimate by the Secretary under the preceding sentence, any appropriations available for payments under this section shall be deemed obligated.".

(b) Section 454 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (18);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (19) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(20) in order for the State to be eligible to receive any incentive payments under section 458, provide that, if one or more political subdivisions of the State participate in the costs of carrying out activities under the State plan during any period, each such subdivision shall be entitled to receive an appropriate share (as determined by the State) of any such incentive payments made to the State for such period, taking into account the efficiency and effectiveness of the activities carried out under the State plan by such political subdivision.".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall become effective on October 1, 1985.

90-PERCENT MATCHING FOR AUTOMATED MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS USED IN INCOME WITHHOLDING AND OTHER REQUIRED PROCEDURES

SEC. 5. (a) Section 454(16) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "and (D)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(D) to facilitate the development and improvement of the income withholding and other procedures required under section 466(a) through the monitoring of child support payments, the maintenance of accurate records regarding the payment of child support, and the prompt provision of notice to appropriate officials with respect to any arrearages in child support payments which may occur, and (E)".

(b) Section 455(a)(1)(B) of such Act (as redesignated by section 3 of this Act) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "automatic data processing and information retrieval system" the following: "(including in such sums the full cost of the hardware components of such system)"; and

(2) by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", or meets such requirements without regard to clause (D) thereof".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to quarters beginning on or after October 1, 1984.

REQUIRED STATE PROCEDURES

SEC. 6. (a) Section 454 of the Social Security Act (as amended by section 4(b) of this Act) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (19);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (20) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(21) provide that (subject to section 466(c)) the State (A) shall have in effect all of the laws required by section 466, and (B) shall implement the procedures (designed to improve child support enforcement effectiveness) which are prescribed in or pursuant to such laws.".

(b) Part D of title IV of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"*REQUIREMENT OF STATUTORILY PRESCRIBED PROCEDURES TO IMPROVE EFFECTIVENESS OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT*

"SEC. 466. (a) Each State must enact laws requiring the use of the following procedures, consistent with regulations of the Secretary, to increase the effectiveness of the program which the State administers under this part:

"(1) Procedures described in subsection (b) for the withholding from income of amounts payable as support being collected under the plan.

"(2) Procedures under which liens are imposed against real and personal property for amounts of overdue support (as defined in subsection (d)) owed by an absent parent who resides or owns property in the State, in those cases in which the State determines that the imposition of liens is appropriate.

"(3) Procedures under which the State child support enforcement agency shall request, and the State shall provide, that for the purpose of enforcing a support order being enforced under any State plan approved under this part—

"(A) any refund of State income tax which would otherwise be payable to an absent parent will be reduced, after notice has been sent to that absent parent of the proposed reduction and the procedures to be followed to contest it (and after full compliance with all procedural due process requirements of the State), by the amount of any overdue support (as defined in subsection (d)) owed by such absent parent;

"(B) the amount by which such refund is reduced shall be distributed in accordance with section 457(b)(3) or (d)(3) in the case of overdue support assigned to a State pursuant to section 402(a)(26) or 471(a)(17), or, in the case of overdue support which a State has agreed to collect under section 454(6), shall be distributed, after deduction of any fees imposed by the State to cover the costs of collection, to the child or parent to whom such support is owed; and

"(C) notice of the absent parent's social security account number (or numbers, if he has more than one such number) and home address shall be furnished to the State agency requesting the refund offset, and to the State agency enforcing the order.

The Secretary may prescribe regulations specifying the minimum amount of a refund, and the minimum amount of overdue support, to which the procedures required by this paragraph may apply.

"(4) Procedures by which information regarding the amount of overdue support (as defined in subsection (d)) owed by an absent parent residing in the State will be made available to any consumer reporting agency (as defined in section 603(f) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(f))) upon the request of such agency; except that (A) if the amount of the overdue support involved in any case is less than $1,000, information regarding such amount shall be made available only at the option of the State, (B) any information with respect to an absent parent shall be made available under such procedures only after notice has been sent to such absent parent of the proposed action, and such absent parent has been given a reasonable opportunity to contest the accuracy of such information (and after full compliance with all procedural due process requirements of the State), and (C) a fee for furnishing such information, in an amount not exceeding the actual cost thereof, may be imposed on the requesting agency by the State.

"(5) Procedures which require in appropriate cases that an absent parent give security, post a bond, or give some other guarantee to secure payment of overdue support (as defined in subsection (d)), after notice has been sent to such absent parent of the proposed action and of the procedures to be fol-

lowed to contest it, and after full compliance with all procedural due process requirements of the State.

"(6) Procedures under which expedited processes are in effect under the State judicial system for establishing paternity and obtaining and enforcing child support orders. All decisions or recommendations resulting from such expedited procedures must be reviewed by a judge of the appropriate court for purposes of ratification or modification or remand, and any appellate procedures applicable under State law shall apply. The Secretary may waive the provisions of this paragraph with respect to one or more political subdivisions within the State on the basis of the effectiveness and timeliness of support order issuance and enforcement within the political subdivision (in accordance with the general rule for waivers under subsection (c)). Political subdivisions using administrative processes shall qualify for such waiver treatment on the same basis as subdivisions using judicial processes.

"(b) The procedures referred to in subsection (a)(1) (relating to the withholding from income of amounts payable as support) must provide for the following:

"(1) In the case of each absent parent against whom a support order is or has been issued or modified in the State, and is being enforced under the State plan, so much of his or her wages must be withheld, in accordance with the succeeding provisions of this subsection, as is necessary to comply with the order and provide for the payment of any fee to the employer which may be required under paragraph (6)(A), up to the maximum amount permitted under section 303(b) of the Consumer Credit Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1673(b)). If there are arrearages to be collected, amounts withheld to satisfy such arrearages, when added to the amounts withheld to pay current support and provide for the fee, may not exceed the limit permitted under such section 303(b), but the State need not withhold up to the maximum amount permitted under such section in order to satisfy arrearages.

"(2) Such withholding must be provided without the necessity of any application therefor in the case of a child (whether or not eligible for aid under part A) with respect to whom services are already being provided under the State plan, and must be provided in accordance with this subsection on the basis of an application for services under the State plan in the case of any other child in whose behalf a support order has been issued or modified in the State. In either case such withholding must occur without the need for any amendment to the support order involved or for any further action (other than those actions required under this part) by the court or other entity which issued it.

"(3) An absent parent shall become subject to such withholding, and the advance notice required under paragraph (4) shall be given, on the earliest of—

"(A) the date on which the payments which the absent parent has failed to make under such order are at least equal to the support payable for one month,

"(B) the date as of which the absent parent requests that such withholding begin, or

"(C) such earlier date as the State may select.

"(4) Such withholding must be carried out in full compliance with all procedural due process requirements of the State, and the State must send advance notice to each absent parent to whom paragraph (1) applies regarding the proposed withholding and the procedures such absent parent should follow if he or she desires to contest such withholding on the grounds that withholding (including the amount to be withheld) is not proper in the case involved because of mistakes of fact. If the absent parent contests such withholding on such grounds, the State shall determine whether such withholding will actually occur, and (if so) shall, within no more than 30 days after the provision of such advance notice, send notice to such parent of the date on which such withholding is to begin.

"(5) Such withholding must be administered by a public agency designated by the State, and the amounts withheld must be expeditiously distributed by the State or such agency in accordance with section 457 under procedures (specified by the State) which provide for the keeping of adequate records to document payments of support and permit the tracking and monitoring of such payments, except that the State may establish or permit the establishment of alternative procedures for the collection and distribution of such amounts (under the supervision of such public agency) otherwise than through such public agency so long as the entity making such collection and distribution is publicly accountable for its actions taken in carrying out such procedures, and so long as such procedures will assure prompt distribution, provide for the keeping of adequate records to document payments of support, and permit the tracking and monitoring of such payments.

"(6)(A)(i) The employer of any absent parent to whom paragraph (1) applies, upon being given notice as described in clause (ii), must be required to withhold from such absent parent's wages the amount specified by such notice (which may include a fee, established by the State, to be paid to the employer unless waived by him or her) and pay such amount (after deducting and retaining any portion thereof which represents the fee so established) to the appropriate agency (or other entity authorized to collect the amounts withheld under the alternative procedures described in paragraph (4)) for distribution in accordance with section 457.

"(ii) The notice given to the employer shall contain only such information as may be necessary for the employer to comply with the withholding order.

"(B) Methods must be established by the State to simplify the withholding process for employers to the greatest extent possible, including permitting any employer to combine all withheld amounts into a single payment to the appropriate agency or agencies (with the portion thereof which is attributable to each individual employee being separately designated).

"(C) The employer must be held liable to the State for any amount which such employer fails to withhold from wages due an employee when such amount is required under this subsection to be so withheld following receipt by such employer of proper notice under subparagraph (A), but such employer shall not be required to vary the normal pay and disbursement cycles in order to comply with this paragraph.

"(D) Provision must be made for the imposition of a fine against any employer who discharges from employment, refuses to employ, or takes disciplinary action against any absent parent subject to wage withholding required by this subsection because of the existence of such withholding and the obligations or additional obligations which it imposes upon the employer.

"(7) Provision must be made under State law for the priority of support collection under this subsection over any other legal process under State law against the same wages.

"(8) The State may take such actions as may be necessary to extend its system of withholding under this subsection so that such system will include withholding from forms of income other than wages, or will include the imposition of bonding or other requirements in cases involving absent parents with income from sources other than wages, in order to assure that child support owed by absent parents in the State will be collected without regard to the types of such absent parents' income or the nature of their income-producing activities.

"(9) The State must extend its withholding system under this subsection so that such system will include withholding from income derived within such State in cases where the applicable support orders were issued in other States, in order to assure that child support owed by absent parents in such State or any other State will be collected without regard to the residence of the child for whom the support is payable or of such child's custodial parent.

"(10) Provision must be made for terminating withholding.

"(c) If a State demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary, through the presentation to the Secretary of such data pertaining to caseloads, processing times, administrative costs, and average support collections, and such other actual data or estimates as the Secretary may specify, that the enactment of any law or the use of any procedure or procedures required by or pursuant to this section will not increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the State child support enforcement program, the Secretary may exempt the State, subject to the Secretary's continuing review and to termination of the exemption should circumstances change, from the requirement to enact the law or use the procedure or procedures involved.

"(d) For purposes of this section, the term 'overdue support' means the amount of a delinquency (which has continued for such minimum period of time as established by the Secretary) pursuant to an obligation determined under a court order, or an order of an administrative process established under State law, for support and maintenance of a minor child, which is owed to or on behalf of a minor child. At the option of the State, overdue support may include spousal support in the same manner as spousal support may be included for purposes of paragraphs (4) and (6) of section 454. At the option of the State, overdue support may include amounts which otherwise meet the definition in the first sentence of this subsection but which are owed to or on behalf of a child who is not a minor child. The option to include spousal support, and the option to include support owed to children who are not minors, shall each apply independently to each procedure required under this section.".

(c) Section 454(6)(B) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(B) an application fee for furnishing such services shall be imposed, which shall be paid by the individual applying for such services, or recovered from the absent parent, or paid by the State out of its own funds (the payment of which from State funds shall not be considered as an administrative cost of the State for the operation of the plan, and shall not be considered revenue to the program), the amount of

which (i) will not exceed $25 (or such higher or lower amount (which shall be uniform for all States) as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate for fiscal years after fiscal year 1985 to reflect increases or decreases in administrative costs), and (ii) may vary among such individuals on the basis of ability to pay (as determined by the State), and".

(d)(1) Section 454 of such Act (as amended by sections 5(b) and 6(a) of this Act) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (20);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (21) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(22)(A) impose a late payment fee on all overdue support (as defined in section 466(d)) under any obligation being enforced by the State agency, in an amount equal to a uniform percentage determined by the State (which may not be less than 3 percent nor more than 10 percent) of the overdue support, which shall be payable by the absent parent owing the overdue support; and

"(B) assure that the fee will be collected in addition to, and only after full payment of, the overdue support, and that the imposition of the late payment fee shall not directly or indirectly result in a decrease in the amount of the overdue support which is paid to the child to whom, or on whose behalf, it is owed.".

(e) Section 454(5) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after "directly to the family" the following: ", and the individual will be notified at least annually of the amount of the support payments collected,".

(f)(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the amendments made by this section shall become effective on October 1, 1984.

(2) Section 454(22) of the Social Security Act shall become effective with respect to support owed for any month beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) In the case of a State with respect to which the Secretary of Health and Human Services has determined that State legislation is required in order to conform the State plan approved under part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to the requirements imposed by any amendment made by this section, the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such part solely by reason of its failure to meet the requirements imposed by such amendment prior to the beginning of the fourth month beginning after the end of the first session of the State legislature which ends on or after October 1, 1984. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term "session" means a regular, special, budget, or other session of a State legislature.

PERIODIC REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS OF STATE PROGRAMS; MODIFICATION OF PENALTY

SEC. 7. (a)(1) Section 452(a)(4) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "not less often than annually" and inserting in lieu thereof "not less often than once every three years (or not less often than annually in the case of any State to which a reduction is being applied under section 403(h)(1), or which is operating under a corrective action plan in accordance with section 403(h)(2))".

(2) Section 402(a)(27) of such Act is amended by striking out "operate a child support program in conformity with such plan" and inserting in lieu thereof "operate a child support program in substantial compliance with such plan".

(b) Section 403(h) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(h)(1) If a State's program operated under part D is found as a result of a review conducted under section 452(a)(4) not to comply substantially with the requirements of such part, the amount otherwise payable to such State under this part for any quarter beginning after September 30, 1983, shall be reduced by—

"(A) not less than one nor more than two percent, or

"(B) not less than two nor more than three percent, if the finding is the second consecutive such finding made as a result of such a review, or

"(C) not less than three nor more than five percent, if the finding is the third or a subsequent consecutive such finding made as a result of such a review.

"(2)(A) The reductions required under paragraph (1) shall be suspended for any quarter if—

"(i) the State submits a corrective action plan, within a period prescribed by the Secretary following notice of the finding under paragraph (1), which contains steps necessary to achieve substantial compliance within a time period which the Secretary finds to be appropriate;

"(ii) the Secretary does not disapprove such corrective action plan as being insufficient to achieve substantial compliance; and

"(iii) the Secretary finds that the corrective action plan (or any amendment thereto not disapproved by the Secretary under clause (ii)), is being fully implemented by the State and that the State is progressing in accordance with the timetable contained in the plan to achieve substantial compliance with such requirements.

"(B) A suspension of the penalty under subparagraph (A) shall continue until such time as the Secretary determines that—

"(i) the State has achieved substantial compliance, or

"(ii) the State is failing to implement its corrective action plan or has failed to achieve substantial compliance within the appropriate time period (as specified in subparagraph (A)(i)).

"(C) In the case of a State whose penalty suspension ends pursuant to subparagraph (B)(i), the penalty shall not be applied to any quarter during the suspension period. In the case of a State whose penalty suspension ends pursuant to subparagraph (B)(ii), the penalty shall then be applied to all quarters during the suspension period, and in determining the percentage reduction, all reviews carried out during the suspension period shall be considered to be consecutive findings.

"(3) Any reduction under this subsection, whether taken following a finding by the Secretary that the State's plan does not meet the requirements of this part, or that the State is failing to implement its corrective action plan, shall continue until the first quarter throughout which the State is found to be in substantial compliance with all such requirements or throughout which the reduction has been suspended by reason of paragraph (2).

"(4) For purposes of this subsection, section 402(a)(27), and section 452(a)(4), a State which is not in full compliance with the requirements of this part shall be determined to be in substantial compliance with such requirements only if the Secretary determines that any noncompliance with such requirements is of a technical nature which does not adversely affect the performance of the child support enforcement program.".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall become effective on October 1, 1983.

SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS FOR INTERSTATE ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 8. Section 455 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e)(1) In order to encourage and promote the development and use of more effective methods of enforcing support obligations under this part in cases where either the children on whose behalf the support is sought or their absent parents do not reside in the State where such cases are filed, the Secretary is authorized to make grants, in such amounts and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, to States which propose to undertake new or innovative methods of support collection in such cases and which will use the proceeds of such grants to carry out special projects designed to demonstrate and test such methods.

"(2) A grant under this subsection shall be made only upon a finding by the Secretary that the project involved is likely to be of significant assistance in carrying out the purpose of this subsection. The Secretary may waive any of the requirements of this part which would otherwise be applicable, to such extent and for such period as the Secretary determines is necessary or desirable in order to enable the State to carry out such project.

"(3) At the time of its application for a grant under this subsection the State shall submit to the Secretary a statement describing in reasonable detail the project for which the proceeds of the grant are to be used, and the State shall from time to time thereafter submit to the Secretary such reports with respect to the project as the Secretary may specify.

"(4) Amounts expended by a State in carrying out a special project assisted under this subsection shall be considered, for purposes of section 458(b), to have been expended for the operation of the State's plan approved under section 454.

"(5) There are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1986, and $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1987 and each fiscal year thereafter, to be used by the Secretary in making grants under this subsection.".

EXTENSION OF SECTION 1115 DEMONSTRATION AUTHORITY TO CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 9. (a) Section 1115(a) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "part A" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "part A or D";

(2) by striking out "402," in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "402, 454,"; and

(3) by striking out "403," in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "403, 455,".

(b) Section 1115 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) In the case of any experimental, pilot, or demonstration project undertaken under subsection (a) to assist in promoting the objectives of part D of title IV, the project—

"(1) must be designed to improve the financial well-being of children or otherwise improve the operation of the child support program;

"(2) may not permit modifications in the child support program which would have the effect of disadvantaging children in need of support; and

"(3) must not result in increased cost to the Federal Government under the program of aid to families with dependent children.".

MODIFICATIONS IN CONTENT OF ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

SEC. 10. (a) Section 452(a)(10)(C) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(C) the following data, with the data required under each clause being separately stated for cases where the child is receiving aid to families with dependent children (or foster care maintenance payments under part E), cases where the child was formerly receiving such aid or payments and the State is continuing to collect support assigned to it under section 402(a)(26) or 471(a)(17), and all other cases:

"(i) the total number of cases in which a support obligation has been established in the fiscal year for which the report is submitted, and the total amount of such obligations;

"(ii) the total number of cases in which a support obligation has been established, and the total amount of such obligations;

"(iii) the number of cases described in clause (i) in which support was collected during such fiscal year, and the total amount of such collections;

"(iv) the number of cases described in clause (ii) in which support was collected during such fiscal year, and the total amount of such collections; and

"(v) the number of child support cases filed in each State, and the amount of the collections made in each State, on behalf of children residing in another State or against parents residing in another State;".

(b) Section 452(a) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (G);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (H) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (H) the following new subparagraph:

"(I) the amount of administrative costs which are expended in each functional category of expenditures, including establishment of paternity.".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be effective for reports for fiscal year 1986 and each fiscal year thereafter.

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT FOR CERTAIN CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE

SEC. 11. (a)(1) Section 457 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, amounts collected by a State as child support for months in any period on behalf of a child for whom a public agency is making foster care maintenance payments under part E—

"(1) shall be retained by the State to the extent necessary to reimburse it for the foster care maintenance payments made with respect to the child during such period (with appropriate reimbursement of the Federal Government to the extent of its participation in the financing);

"(2) shall be paid to the public agency responsible for supervising the placement of the child to the extent that the amounts collected exceed the foster care maintenance payments made with respect to the child during such period but not the amounts required by a court or administrative order to be paid on behalf of the child during such period; and the responsible agency may use the payments in the manner it determines will serve the best interests of the child, including setting such payments aside for the child's future needs or making all or a part thereof available to the person responsible for meeting the child's day-to-day needs; and

"(3) shall be retained by the State, if any portion of the amounts collected remains after making the payments required under paragraphs (1) and (2), to the extent that such portion is necessary to reimburse the State (with appropriate reimbursement to the Federal Government to the extent of its participation in the financing) for any past foster care maintenance payments (or payments of aid to families with dependent children) which were made with respect to the child (and with respect to which past collections have not previously been retained);

and any balance shall be paid to the State agency responsible for supervising the child care placement, for use by such agency in accordance with paragraph (2).".

(2) Section 457(b) of such Act is amended by inserting "(subject to subsection (d))" after "shall" in the matter preceding paragraph (1).

(b) Part D of title IV of such Act is further amended—

(1) in section 454(4)(B), by inserting "including an assignment with respect to a child on whose behalf a State agency is making foster care maintenance payments under part E," immediately after "such assignment is effective,", and by inserting "or E" immediately after "part A"; and

(2) in section 456(a), by inserting "or secured on behalf of a child receiving foster care maintenance payments" immediately after "section 402(a)(26)".

(c) Section 471(a) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (15);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (16) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(17) provides that, where appropriate, all steps will be taken, including cooperative efforts with the State agencies administering the plans approved under parts A and D, to secure an assignment to the State of any rights to support on behalf of each child receiving foster care maintenance payments under this part.".

(d) Section 464(a) of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "or section 471(a)(17)" after "402(a)(26)"; and

(2) by inserting "or (d)(3)" after "457(b)(3)".

(e) The amendments made by this section shall become effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to collections made on or after that date.

CONTINUATION OF SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT FOR AFDC RECIPIENTS WHOSE BENEFITS ARE BEING TERMINATED

SEC. 12. (a) Section 457(c) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "may" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "shall"; and

(2) by striking out "the net amount of" in paragraph (2), and by striking out "to the family" and all that follows in such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "to the family (without any application) on the same basis as in the case of other individuals who are not receiving assistance under part A of this title,".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall become effective on October 1, 1984.

INCREASED AVAILABILITY OF FEDERAL PARENT LOCATOR SERVICE TO STATE AGENCIES

SEC. 13. (a) Section 453(f) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out ", after determining that the absent parent cannot be located through the procedures under the control of such State agencies,".

(b) The amendment made by this section shall become effective on the date of the enactment of this Act.

AVAILABILITY OF SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS FOR CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PURPOSES

SEC. 14. (a) Section 453(b) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "the social security account number (or numbers, if he has more than one such number) and" before "the most recent address".

(b)(1) Section 6103(l)(6)(A)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by inserting "social security account number (or numbers, if he has more than one such number)," before "address".

(2) Section 6103(l)(8)(A) of such Code is amended by inserting "the social security account number (or numbers, if he has more than one such number)," before "net earnings".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall become effective on the date of the enactment of this Act.

LIMITATION ON DISCHARGE IN BANKRUPTCY OF CHILD SUPPORT OBLIGATIONS

SEC. 15. (a) Section 523(a)(5) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after "property settlement agreement," the following: "or any other order, resulting from a judicial or administrative proceeding, requiring the payment of such alimony, maintenance, or support,"; and

(2) by striking out "pursuant to section 402(a)(26)" and inserting in lieu thereof "to the State for collection under the State plan approved under part D of title IV".

(b) Section 456(b) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "under section 402(a)(26)" and inserting in lieu thereof "for collection under the State plan approved under this part".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall become effective on the date of the enactment of this Act.

COLLECTION OF PAST-DUE SUPPORT FROM FEDERAL TAX REFUNDS

SEC. 16. (a) Section 464(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "(1)" after "SEC. 464. (a)" and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) Upon receiving notice from a State agency administering a plan approved under this part that a named individual owes past-due support (as that term is defined for purposes of this paragraph under subsection (c)) which such State has agreed to collect under section 454(6), and that the State agency has sent notice to such individual in accordance with paragraph (3), the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine whether any amounts, as refunds of Federal taxes paid, are payable to such individual (regardless of whether such individual filed a tax return as a married or unmarried individual). If the Secretary of the Treasury finds that any such amount is payable, he shall withhold from such refunds an amount equal to such past-due support, and shall concurrently send notice to such individual

that the withholding has been made and send notice to any other person who may have filed a joint return with such individual of the steps which such other person may take in order to secure his or her proper share of the refund. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the amount withheld to the State agency, and the State shall pay to the Secretary of the Treasury any fee imposed by the Secretary of the Treasury to cover the costs of the withholding and any required notification. The State agency shall, subject to paragraph (4), distribute such amount to or on behalf of the child to whom the support was owed.

"(3) Prior to notifying the Secretary of the Treasury under paragraph (2) that an individual owes past-due support, the State shall send notice to such individual that a withholding will be made from any refund otherwise payable to such individual. The notice shall also instruct the individual owing the past-due support of the steps which may be taken to contest the State's determination that past-due support is owed or the amount of the past-due support. The notice shall also provide information, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services by regulation, with respect to procedures to be followed, in the case of a joint return, to protect the share of the refund which may be payable to another person.

"(4) If the Secretary of the Treasury determines that an amount should be withheld under paragraph (2), and that the refund from which it should be withheld is based upon a joint return, the Secretary of the Treasury shall notify the State that the withholding is being made from a refund based upon a joint return, and shall furnish to the State the names and addresses of each taxpayer filing such joint return. The State may delay distribution of the amount withheld in the case of such a withholding until the State has been notified by the Secretary of the Treasury that the other person filing the joint return has received his or her proper share of the refund, but such delay may not exceed six months.

"(5) If the other person filing the joint return with the named individual owing the past-due support takes appropriate action to secure his or her proper share of a refund from which a withholding was made under paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay such share to such other person. The Secretary of the Treasury shall deduct the amount of such payment from amounts subsequently payable to the State agency to which the amount originally withheld from such refund was paid.

"(6) In any case in which an amount was withheld under paragraph (2) and paid to a State, and the State subsequently determines that the amount certified as past-due support was in excess of the amount actually owed at the time the amount withheld is to be distributed to or on behalf of the child, the State shall pay the excess amount withheld to the named individual thought to have owed the past-due support (or, in the case of amounts withheld on the basis of a joint return, jointly to the parties filing such return).".

(b) Section 464(b) of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(b)";

(2) by adding at the end of paragraph (1) as so redesignated the following: "Any fee paid to the Secretary pursuant to this subsection may be used to reimburse appropriations which bore all or part of the cost of applying such procedure."; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) In the case of withholdings made under subsection (a)(2), the regulations promulgated pursuant to this subsection shall include the following requirements:

"(A) The withholding shall apply only in the case where the State determines that the amount of the past-due support which will be owed at the time the withholding is to be made, based upon the pattern of payment of support and other enforcement actions being pursued to collect the past-due support, is equal to or greater than $500. The State may limit the $500 threshhold amount to amounts of past-due support accrued since the time that the State first began to enforce the child support order involved under the State plan, and may limit the application of the withholding to past-due support accrued since such time.

"(B) The fee which the Secretary of the Treasury may impose to cover the costs of the withholding and notification may not exceed $25 per case submitted.".

(c) Section 464(c) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "(c) As used in this part" and inserting in lieu thereof "(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), as used in this part"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) For purposes of subsection (a)(2), the term 'past-due support' means only past-due support owed to or on behalf of a minor child.".

(d) Section 454(6) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating clause (C) as clause (D);

(2) by striking out "fee so imposed" in clause (D) as so redesignated and inserting in lieu thereof "fees so imposed"; and

(3) by striking out ", and" at the end of clause (B) and inserting in lieu thereof ", (C) a fee of not more than $25 may be imposed in any case where the State requests the Secretary of the Treasury to withhold past-due support owed to or on behalf of such individual from a tax refund pursuant to section 464(a)(2), and".

(e)(1) Section 6402(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended—

(A) by striking out "to which such support has been assigned" and inserting in lieu thereof "collecting such support"; and

(B) by inserting before the last sentence thereof the following: "A reduction under this subsection shall be applied first to satisfy any past-due support which has been assigned to the State under section 402(a)(26) or 471(a)(17) of the Social Security Act, and shall be applied to satisfy any other past-due support after any other reductions allowed by law (but before a credit against future liability for an internal revenue tax) have been made.".

(2) Section 6402 of such Code is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS TO STATES.—The Secretary may provide that, for purposes of determining interest, the payment of any amount withheld under subsection (c) to a State shall be treated as a payment to the person or persons making the overpayment.".

(f)(1) Section 6103(l) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(9) DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN INFORMATION TO AGENCIES REQUESTING A REDUCTION UNDER SECTION 6402(c).—

"(A) RETURN INFORMATION FROM INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.—The Secretary shall, upon receiving a written request, disclose to officers and employees of a State agency seeking a reduction under section 6402(c)—

"(i) the fact that a reduction has been made or has not been made under such subsection with respect to any taxpayer;

"(ii) the amount of such reduction;

"(iii) whether such taxpayer filed a joint return;

"(iv) Taxpayer Identity information with respect to the taxpayer against whom a reduction was made or not made and of any other person filing a joint return with such taxpayer; and

"(v) the fact that a payment was made (and the amount of the payment) on the basis of a joint return in accordance with section 464(a)(5) of the Social Security Act.

"(B) RESTRICTION ON USE OF DISCLOSED INFORMATION.—Any officers and employees of an agency receiving return information under subparagraph (A) shall use such information only for the purposes of, and to the extent necessary in, establishing appropriate agency records or in the defense of any litigation or administrative procedure ensuing from a reduction made under section 6402(c).".

(2) Section 6103(p)(3)(A) of such Code is amended by striking out "(l)(1), (4)(B), (5), (7), or (8)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(l)(1), (4)(B), (5), (7), (8), or (9)".

(3) Section 6103(p)(4) of such Code is amended by striking out "(l)(1), (2), or (5)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(l)(1), (2), (5), or (9)".

(4) Section 6103(p)(4)(F)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking out "(l)(1), (2), (3), or (5)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(l)(1), (2), (3), (5), or (9)".

(5) Section 7213(a)(2) of such Code is amended by striking out "(l) (6), (7), or (8)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(l) (6), (7), (8), or (9)".

(g) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to refunds payable under section 6402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 after December 31, 1985.

STATE GUIDELINES FOR CHILD SUPPORT AWARDS

SEC. 17. (a) Part D of title IV of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"STATE GUIDELINES FOR CHILD SUPPORT AWARDS

"SEC. 467. (a) Each State, as a condition for having its State plan approved under this part, must establish guidelines for child support award amounts within the State. The guidelines may be established by law or by judicial or administrative action.

"(b) The guidelines established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be made available to all judges and other officials who have the power to determine child support awards within such State, but need not be binding upon such judges or other officials.

"(c) The Secretary shall furnish technical assistance to the States for establishing the guidelines, and each State shall furnish the Secretary with copies of its guidelines.".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall become effective on October 1, 1986.

WISCONSIN CHILD SUPPORT INITIATIVES

SEC. 18. (a)(1) If the State of Wisconsin requests the Secretary of Health and Human Services to waive the requirements of parts A and D of title IV of the Social Security Act, or to waive the requirements of part D and only those requirements of part A of such Act as relate to the provision of aid to dependent children as defined in section 406(a) of the Social Security Act (hereafter referred to in this section as "dependent children in single-parent families"), in order

to permit the State to make an adequate test in any county or counties, or throughout the State, of its Child Support Initiative, the Secretary shall waive such requirements if—

(A) the State provides a complete description, in accordance with paragraph (2), of the program, known as the Initiative, which it will operate in place of the programs under such parts A and D, and makes the description readily available to the public throughout the State;

(B) the Governor provides assurances that, under the Initiative, assistance will be provided to all children in need of financial support, and the State will continue to operate an effective child support enforcement program;

(C) the State agrees that, during the conduct of such test, it will continue to determine eligibility for medical assistance under the State plan approved under title XIX of the Social Security Act, applying the criteria (insofar as may be applicable to members of families with dependent children affected by the Initiative) in effect under its State plan approved under part A of title IV for the month preceding the month in which the Initiative (approved under this section) becomes effective, except that such criteria shall be deemed to have been changed to the extent necessary to comply with generally applicable changes in Federal law or regulations occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act;

(D) the State specifies measurable performance objectives, submits an evaluation plan (including criteria for evaluating the Initiative), and agrees to submit interim and final evaluations and reports, at such time or times and containing such information, as the Secretary may require; and

(E) the State agrees to obtain, at least once every two years, a financial and compliance audit of the funds received under this section and to obtain, after the close of the operation of the Initiative under this section, such an audit and make it public within the State on a timely basis and provide a copy to the Secretary within 30 days after its completion.

(2) The program description provided under paragraph (1)(A) shall describe in detail how the proposed Initiative will affect children and families, with specific reference to the principles for calculating benefits and establishing and enforcing child support obligations. The description shall also include estimates of cost and program effects and provide other relevant information necessary for the Secretary to determine whether the financial well-being of children and their families will be adversely affected by the operation of the Initiative.

(b) The Child Support Initiative proposed by the State of Wisconsin as detailed in the program description submitted to the Secretary, and the related requested waivers, shall become effective within 120 days after its submission unless the Secretary determines that the financial well-being of children in the State will be adversely affected by the Initiative. The Secretary shall notify the State in writing that, effective with the beginning of the following quarter (or of such later quarter as the State may select), the State may operate its Child Support Initiative instead of its programs of aid to families with dependent children (or, if the State had so requested, instead of its program of aid to dependent children in single-parent families) and child support enforcement in such county or counties, or on a statewide basis, as the State has indicated in its request.

(c)(1) For each quarter during which such program is in effect throughout the State, the Secretary will pay to the State with respect to any quarter the sum of its proportionate share (as defined in paragraph (4)(A)) of each of the following:

(A) the amount advanced by the Secretary to all the other States (as defined in section 1101(a) of the Social Security Act) for such quarter with respect to section 403(a)(1) and (2) of such Act;

(B) the amount so advanced by the Secretary with respect to section 403(a)(3) of such Act;

(C) the amount so advanced by the Secretary with respect to section 455(a) of such Act; and

(D) the amount so advanced by the Secretary with respect to section 458(a) of such Act;

reduced by so much of its proportionate share of support collections on behalf of individuals receiving aid to families with dependent children (as defined in paragraph (4)(B)) as would have been credited to the Federal Government under section 457(b) of such Act had such collections been made in the last quarter of fiscal year 1986.

(2) If in any quarter the Initiative approved under this section is in operation in fewer than all the counties in the State, the amount paid to the State with respect to the counties to which the waiver under subsection (a) applies shall equal (in lieu of the amount specified in paragraph (1)), the proportionate share with respect to the counties in which the Initiative is operated (as defined in paragraph (5)(A)) of the amount advanced to the State under the four authorities specified in paragraph (1) with respect to all the other counties for such quarter, reduced by so much of the proportionate share of support collections (as defined in paragraph (5)(B)) with respect to the counties in which the Initiative is operated, as would have been credited to the Federal Government under section 457(b) of such Act had such collections been made in the last quarter of fiscal year 1986.

(3) Payment under this subsection shall be estimated by the Secretary before the beginning of each quarter during which the Initiative is in effect on the basis of the advances made under parts A and D of title IV of the Social Security Act for such quarter, and the Secretary shall make payments for such quarter on a monthly basis (with each payment made no later than the beginning of the month involved), in the amounts so estimated, and adjusted as necessary to reflect the amount of any previously made overpayment or underpayment under this section. Payment of any amount determined with respect to paragraphs (1)(A) and (1)(B) shall be made from amounts appropriated to carry out part A of title IV of the Social Security Act for the appropriate fiscal year; payment of any amount determined with respect to paragraphs (1)(C) and (1)(D) shall be made from amounts appropriated to carry out part D of title IV of the Social Security Act.

(4)(A) The State's proportionate share of each amount enumerated in paragraph (1) shall be the portion of such amount that bears the same ratio to such amount as the corresponding portion advanced to the State for quarters in fiscal years 1984 through 1986 bears to the total corresponding amount advanced to all the other States for such quarters.

(B) The State's proportionate share of support collections means the amount that bears the same ratio to such collections on behalf of individuals receiving aid to families with dependent children by all the other States for the quarter involved as such collections by the State for quarters in fiscal years 1984 through 1986 bear to the total of such collections by all the other States for such quarters.

(5)(A) The proportionate share with respect to the counties in which the Initiative is operated, in the case of—

(i) the amount advanced to the State under section 403(a)(1) of the Social Security Act;

(ii) the amount advanced to the State under section 403(a)(3) of such Act;

(iii) the amount advanced to the State under section 455(a) of such Act; and

(iv) the amount advanced to the State with respect to section 458(a) of such Act;

is the sum of such amounts, each having been multiplied by the ratio of (I) the corresponding amount advanced with respect to such counties for all quarters in fiscal years 1984 through 1986 to (II) the corresponding amount advanced with respect to all the other counties in the State for all such quarters.

(B) The proportionate share of support collections for any quarter, with respect to the counties in which the Initiative is operated, means the amount that bears the same ratio to such collections on behalf of individuals receiving aid to families with dependent children with respect to all the other counties in the State for such quarter as such collections by such counties for quarters in fiscal years 1984 through 1986 bear to the total of such collections by all the other counties in the State for such quarters.

(6) If the State requests, under subsection (a), waiver of only those requirements under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act as relate to the provision of aid to dependent children in single-parent families, and continues to operate its program of aid to families with dependent children deprived by reason of the unemployment of a parent—

(A) the State's proportionate share of the amount specified in paragraph (1)(A) (and only that amount) shall be computed under paragraph (4) by application of the ratio of (i) the amount advanced to the State, under section 403(a)(1) of the Social Security Act for quarters in fiscal years 1984 through 1986 with respect to expenditures in the form of aid to dependent children in single-parent families, to (ii) the amount advanced to all the other States, under section 403(a)(1) and (2) of such Act with respect to such expenditures, rather than by application of the ratio specified in paragraph (4); and

(B) part A of title IV of such Act shall continue to apply to the State's program of aid to families with dependent children deprived by reason of the unemployment of a parent; except that section 403(a)(3) shall not apply during the period, and in the part or parts of the State, that the Initiative is in effect.

(d)(1) The State may cease to conduct the Initiative under this section and (if it so chooses) return to the administration of its plans approved under part A and part D of title IV of the Social Security Act upon the provision to the Secretary of at least 3 months notice (or such greater advance notice as may be necessary so that administration of such plans will resume at the beginning of a quarter in the fiscal year).

(2) The Secretary may terminate approval of the Initiative upon the giving of 3 months

advance notice (or such greater amount as specified in paragraph (1)) to the State if it is determined that the financial well-being of children in the State (or county or counties involved) would be better achieved by the operation of programs under part A and part D of title IV of the Social Security Act.

(e) This section shall be in effect for quarters beginning after September 30, 1986, and ending before October 1, 1994.

SENSE OF THE CONGRESS THAT STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS SHOULD FOCUS ON THE PROBLEMS OF CHILD CUSTODY, CHILD SUPPORT, AND RELATED DOMESTIC ISSUES

SEC. 19. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the divorce rate in the United States has reached alarming proportions and the number of children being raised in single parent families has grown accordingly;

(2) there is a critical lack of child support enforcement, which Congress has undertaken to address through the child support enforcement program;

(3) Congress is strengthening that program to recognize the needs of all children;

(4) related domestic issues, such as visitation rights and child custody, are often intricately intertwined with the child support problem and have received inadequate consideration; and

(5) these related issues remain within the jurisdiction of State and local governments, but have a critical impact on the health and welfare of the children of the Nation.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) State and local governments must focus on the vital issues of child support, child custody, visitation rights, and other related domestic issues that are properly within the jurisdictions of such governments;

(2) all individuals involved in the domestic relations process should recognize the seriousness of these matters to the health and welfare of our Nation's children and assign them the highest priority; and

(3) a mutual recognition of the needs of all parties involved in divorce actions will greatly enhance the health and welfare of America's children and families.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Finance Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4325, the Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1984. The House of Representatives passed H.R. 4325 on November 16, 1983, by a vote of 422 yeas to 0 nays. The substitute was unanimously approved by the committee on March 23, 1984. The administration strongly supports the Finance Committee amendments to H.R. 4325, many of which were contained in the administrations' own child support enforcement reform legislation, S. 1691, introduced on July 27, 1983, and cosponsored by every majority member of the Finance Committee. I urge my colleagues to support the Finance Committee substitute and vote to send the bill to conference without delay.

The chairman of the subcommittee on Social Security and Income Maintenance programs (Mr. ARMSTRONG) will assume the duties of floor manager for this important bill and will describe the major provisions of the substitute. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ARMSTRONG) for the effective leadership he has demonstrated in helping to move this legislation through the committee. Senator ARMSTRONG is the chief sponsor of S. 1691 and chaired hearings on the reform proposal in his subcommittee and in the full committee. Senators PACKWOOD, DURENBERGER, and GRASSLEY were especially active in the development of the proposals we are considering today. On the minority side, Senator BRADLEY supplied important input. In addition to these committee members, Senators KASSEBAUM, HAWKINS, HATCH, and TRIBLE provided valuable support during the legislation's development. For several months, these members and their staffs worked with representatives of the administration and members of the Finance Committee staff to develop a consensus package for consideration by the committee. The committee needed only 1 day for markup of the package and the substitute was unanimously approved by the committee on Friday, March 23.

Mr. President, I would like to acknowledge and commend the longstanding interest in this program demonstrated by the ranking minority member of the Finance Committee, the senior Senator from Louisiana. Senator LONG is rightly known as the "father" of the child support enforcement program and his advice and counsel was valuable in the development of the committee substitute. I want to assure the Senator from Louisiana that this Senator feels the same dedication to the success of this program that he has indicated over the years. Our interest in child support enforcement will not end with the enactment of these amendments.

Finally, I would like to recognize the efforts of the President and those of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Margaret Heckler, in guiding this legislation through the House and the Finance Committee. Mrs. Heckler has made the child support program one of her highest priorities. Beyond the passage of this legislation and its effective implementation, Mrs. Heckler plans a child support symposium here in Washington during the month of August. It is my understanding that she intends to bring together Governors, State legislators, State administrators, judicial officials, and parents to discuss the problems of child support enforcement, child custody and visitation issues. The President, as Senator LONG pointed out during our hearings, has been a supporter of a strong child support program since his days as Governor of California. The program can look forward to his continued interest and enthusiasm.

THE CHILD SUPPORT PROBLEM

Many of us are familiar with the grim statistics surrounding the payment—or nonpayment—of child support. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, more than 8.4 million women in 1981 were raising children whose fathers were absent; 30 percent of these women and children were living in poverty. Although most of the women should receive child support payments, obligations have been established on behalf of only 4 million of them.

More than one-half of those 4 million received only partial payment of child support or received no payment at all. The Census Bureau estimates that these defaults are depriving children of nearly $4 billion in properly due child support each year. Clearly, this lack of support is a significant factor in the increase in the number of women and children in poverty.

Even more alarming than the fact that regular child support payments are made in such a small percentage of cases is the fact that there has been a steady decline in the amount of support being received. The Census Bureau study indicated that there has been a steady decline in the amount of support being received. The Census Bureau study indicated that for those who did receive child support, payments after adjustment for inflation averaged about 16 percent lower in 1981 than in 1978. Payments were also being received in fewer cases in 1981 than in 1978.

The problem will not get any smaller. Every year the parents of 1.2 million children are divorced and another 700,000 children are born out of wedlock. Incredibly, half of the children born this year are expected to live in single parent families before age 18. This disturbing trend has led to a rapid increase in the number of child support and paternity cases which are brought to the State Child Support Enforcement Office. Annually an estimated 2 million children with potential child support problems are added to the existing backlog of cases. One large city in California reports that its child support office takes on 1,000 new cases every week, more 50,000 families a year.

THE CHILD SUPPORT PROGRAM

The growing problem of child support was recognized by the Finance Committee as early as 1967. Finally, in 1975, the Federal-State child support enforcement program was established. The program provides services to locate absent parents, establish paternity, and assist in the establishment and collection of child support. The program covers both welfare and nonwelfare families.

Currently, there are wide variations in the effectiveness of the State programs. For example, if we look at families receiving welfare payments—families that make up one-third of all families owed support—six States account for 88 percent of all support collected,

but spend only 32 percent of the total administrative funds. The remaining States spend 68 percent of the administrative funds, but collect only 12 percent of the support for welfare families.

Clearly, the State programs must be reformed—to do a better job of collecting the support that is owed to children and to reduce their administrative overhead. The administration and many of us here in Congress believe that the program can and should do a better job. That is why the House unanimously passed H.R. 4325 and the Finance Committee added several important amendments. H.R. 4325, as amended, contains legislative measures which will provide greater incentive to States to run effective, cost-efficient programs.

The legislation provides the tools for the States to increase collections—such as mandatory withholding from wages for overdue support, the interception of State and Federal income tax refunds which are then offset for amounts of past-due support, and the placement of liens against property when support is delinquent.

Under H.R. 4325, as amended, the States will be encouraged to strengthen the welfare portion of the child-support program and to place new and strong emphasis on the nonwelfare caseload. It has been well documented that for many women, one or two late or never received support checks means the difference between remaining independent of the welfare system or being forced to accept public support.

The administration and the Finance Committee place a high priority on the improvement of State performance in making collections for welfare and nonwelfare cases. The lack of incentive payments for the nonwelfare caseload under current law was frequently mentioned by witnesses at the Finance Committee hearings as the main cause of the dismal State performance in this area. The new incentive payment of at least 6 percent and up to 10 percent of nonwelfare collections should encourage States with poor records to improve substantially.

Introducing the cost-effectiveness factor should also cause the States to place greater emphasis on streamlining procedures and reducing unnecessary and wasteful spending. All States should, at a minimum, be expected to improve the cost-effectiveness ratio of their programs to at least the current national average of $1.33 in collections to $1 in costs. In fact, the administration estimates that after implementation of the mandatory enforcement practices contained in the Finance Committee substitute, all States should be able to achieve substantial improvement, to the point that in fiscal year 1986, the national average should be approximately $1.40 in collections for every $1 in costs.

The Finance Committee substitute places a cap on the nonwelfare incentive payments at an amount equal to 100 percent of the welfare incentive payments. It is my view that this cap will encourage the States to provide a balance in their programs, so that both welfare and nonwelfare families may anticipate a fair share of program resources and staff attention.

It is also my view that a cap on the nonwelfare incentive payments is necessary so that States will not be encouraged simply to transfer to the federally funded child support program those activities which are currently financed out of State and local funds, with not increase in the level or efficiency of child support services. All States will benefit from the new nonwelfare incentive payment because, as my colleagues know, currently no incentives at all are being paid for collections made on behalf of this group.

The 100-percent cap is necessary to insure that States operate balanced child support programs. A higher cap, or removing the cap entirely, could lead to many States concentrating almost exclusively on the nonwelfare caseload where collections are likely to be higher due to higher incomes and support awards. A certain amount of creaming is sure to occur, that is, State offices working cases that are easy and neglecting paternity and other difficult and time-consuming cases.

Finally, the potential for nonwelfare collections is enormous. Since these incentives are totally financed by the Federal Treasury, if incentives are paid on a larger percentage of the collections, the Federal deficit in the program is sure to increase. For fiscal year 1985, for example, the current law incentive program is projected to cause a $140 million deficit in the program—all charged to the Federal taxpayer.

Some of you may have heard from your Governors or State program administrators protesting the committee's adoption of a slight, gradual decrease in the Federal matching percentage for administrative costs associated with running the child support program. As you know, the Federal Government currently pays 70 percent of the administrative costs of the program. This was reduced from 75 percent by a House-passed provision of the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982. Fiscal year 1983 administrative expenditures totaled $691 million—the Federal share was $483.7 million.

The Finance Committee substitute introduces a 1-percent reduction in the Federal match for administrative costs each year, beginning in fiscal year 1987 and ending in fiscal year 1991 when the match would reach 65 percent. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that this small change would save $70 million for fiscal years 1987 through 1989. Additionally, the substitute contains a hold harmless provision which would be in effect for fiscal years 1986 and 1987. Under this provision, a State would be guaranteed the higher of 80 percent of what they would receive under current law, or the amount they would receive under the new incentive and match provisions.

In my opinion, this is a reasonable provision. When the child support program began, the exceedingly high 75-percent match was necessary to encourage the States to participate in the new program. Now that the program has proved its value, as testimony before our committee on behalf of the National Governors Association demonstrated, it is time to move toward a more equal sharing of costs. An increased stake in the program by the States and local jurisdictions will have the effect of causing closer scrutiny of expenditures of scarce dollars.

Historically, the States have benefited greatly from the child support program. State savings for fiscal year 1976 through fiscal year 1983 equal $1.8 billion. During the same period, the program had a net cost to the Federal Government of $648 million. Even the 19 States which spend more than they collect currently benefit from the program.

While the States complain about the need for more money in order to improve program performance, it is clear that the $1.8 million in State savings from the program has not all been invested in program expansion or improvement. In fact, many State program directors believe that much of the State profit has been used for nonrelated programs.

As mentioned earlier, the Federal match was reduced in 1982 from 75 percent to 70 percent. State administrators predicted serious cutbacks—if not shutdowns—in some State and local programs. In fact, no reduction in State and local child support enforcement staff has become evident. According to State reports, program staffing on a national basis has remained constant at the equivalent of about 23,000 full-time employees. Meanwhile, State administrative expenditures increased by nearly 17 percent between fiscal years 1982 and 1983.

Given the already mentioned staffing levels, some of this increase must represent administrative costs, formerly financed entirely with State and local funds and newly claimed for Federal matching, without any addition to child support enforcement services actually rendered. This cost shifting is unfortunately the normal State response when what the States should

really be seeking is a reduction in costs through more efficient management.

I would remind my colleagues that even 70 percent is an unusually rich Federal match. As you know, the national average Federal match for the aid to families with dependent children program is about 54 percent. Also, It should be remembered that the child support program provides a 90-percent match for acquisition and installation of computer systems.

Finally, to show the extent to which some jurisdictions will go to have the Federal Government pick up the tab for State costs—the Office of Child Support Enforcement is currently involved in a couple of interesting disputes. One State is attempting to claim matching funds for the costs of jailing individuals found in contempt of court for nonpayment of child support. A second State is seeking Federal matching funds for the purpose of securing legal counsel for indigent child support obligors. These are certainly not the kinds of expenditures that I have in mind as proper for the Federal Government to match at 70 percent.

As I mentioned earlier, the Finance Committee included several mandatory enforcement procedures which have proven effective in collecting support in a number of States. The committee substitute requires States to have these procedures in place and operating as a part of the State child support program. However, the committee substitute also allows the States sufficient flexibility to use the procedures in those cases in which they will be most effective.

Finally, I would stress for my colleagues that this legislation represents the continuing commitment of the Federal Government to the child support enforcement program. The addition of incentive payments for nonwelfare collections, even when coupled with the slight reduction in the Federal match, will still produce increased State savings for all but the worst performing States. If all States improve their collections, as they should through the use of the mandatory procedures, no State will suffer a loss of Federal funding.

It is important to remember that the Federal-State child support enforcement program is designed not to produce revenue for the States and local jurisdictions—or for the Federal Government. The goal of this program is to collect child support for children at a reasonable cost. I believe that the Finance Committee amendment to H.R. 4325 will help the States to do a better job in reaching that goal, as well as slowly equalize the State and Federal financial involvement in the program.

We must all—Federal, State, and local governments—work harder to insure that all American children receive the financial support to which they are entitled. The partnership which has developed over the years in the child support enforcement program can and must be strengthened. This bill, with the amendments adopted by the Finance Committee, will help to strengthen that partnership for the good of all children.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4325, as amended.

Mr. JEPSEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the excellent work of my colleagues on the Finance Committee in promptly addressing the serious problem of child support enforcement. Only in the last several years has the extent of this problem been brought to light.

Mr. President, I would like to ask my distinguished colleague from Kansas and chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator DOLE, several questions about an aspect of the legislation that concerns many noncustodial parents: visitation enforcement.

This issue is briefly addressed in Senate Concurrent Resolution 84 which I understand is a provision of the bill before us today. I wholeheartedly support that resolution and encourage State and local governments to take its message to heart. The last paragraph reads: "A mutual recognition of the needs of all parties involved in divorce actions will greatly enhance the health and welfare of America's children and families."

Let me premise my questions to Senator DOLE by saying that although in many cases both child support payments and visitation are ordered by a court in a divorce settlement, refusal to make timely support payments is not an appropriate response to a denial of visitation rights.

Senator DOLE, let me thank you again for the timely legislation you have before us today on this sensitive issue. I appreciate your cooperation in clarifying the following points:

Is there anything in this bill that would prevent States from enforcing visitation with as much diligence as they enforce child support payments?

Mr. DOLE. I thank my colleague from Iowa for raising this important issue. It is one which concerned me and members of the Finance Committee during the hearings on the child support amendments and during the committee deliberations. Let me assure my colleague that there is nothing in H.R. 4325, as amended by the Finance Committee, which would hamper or prevent the States, or other political jurisdictions, from enforcing visitation rights with as much vigor as child support orders. Many States already actively enforce visitation rights and it is my hope that the language included by the committee will encourage other States to do the same. I encourage the interested noncustodial parents to work at the State and local level for the type of changes which will lead to greater visitation enforcement.

Mr. JEPSEN. Is there anything in this bill that would prevent States from moving further in the direction of joint custody/shared parental responsibility which 31 States already have as either an option or preference?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, again I would assure my colleague from Iowa that there is nothing in the Finance Committee amendments which would prevent States from moving in the direction of joint custody or shared parental duties. The Finance Committee believes that these are areas of domestic law which are properly in the jurisdiction of the States. Nothing in the bill or in the committee amendments should be construed as altering that fact. I would note that a number of studies have recently been done which indicate that joint custody arrangements lead to more involvement for both parents. Also demonstrated is the fact that child support obligations are met on a regular basis in most cases of joint custody or shared parental responsibility. I thank my colleague for raising these important issues.

Mr. JEPSEN. I thank my friend and colleague. Mr. President, it is important that we take it clear that in most cases, it is in the best interest of children to have both parents involved in their lives. Both financial support and visitation are essential aspects of that involvement.

I recommend a column to my colleagues by James J. Kilpatrick on the balance needed in this delicate issue. I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FATHERS MUST BE HEARD, TOO

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Those of us in the news business are expected to heed a maxim of Roman law: Audi alteram partem. Hear the other side. I bypassed that sound admonition the other day in a column on a child support bill that is currently pending in the Senate. Let me make amends.

The bill would require the states, as a condition of receiving federal funds for welfare, to enact a series of tough laws in the field of child support. A parent who failed to make court-ordered payments would become subject to attack from half a dozen quarters. His wages could be withheld, his income tax refunds intercepted, his salary garnisheed.

In the vast majority of cases in which support payments are ordered, it is the father who pays. The trouble is that many fathers don't pay. The National Law Journal reports that non-compliance now amounts to an estimated $4 billion a year. Census Bureau figures show that fewer than half of the custodial parents actually get what a court has awarded them. My recent column accordingly gave a hiding to "deadbeat daddies."

The alliteration was OK, but the emphasis was unfair. There are malicious mothers

also. My mail brings pathetic and resentful letters from fathers whose ex-wives have behaved inexcusably. One father whose gross income was $2,000 a month sent $500 a month for the support of his two children. His ex-wife, he says, spent most of the money "on clothes for herself and presents for the man she was sleeping with."

She effectively prevented him from seeing his daughters. When her lover moved to a remote part of the state, she packed up and moved with the children to be near him. When the father briefly stopped his $500 checks, she sued for collection and got a judgment against him. When he finally managed to see his girls, "both of them were in shabby, dirty jeans, and one of them was wearing sneakers so badly worn that her big toe was sticking out."

Much of the problem lies in the area of visitation rights. Most divorced fathers, I am told, want to maintain bonds with their children. The usual custom is for a divorce decree to guarantee such rights. In practice, it appears, such decrees are often unenforceable. If an embittered ex-wife wishes to prevent her ex-husband from seeing his children, she can find ways of achieving that purpose.

The resentful fathers are seeking amendments to the pending bill that would balance the equities. They want the same kind of swift and effective mechanisms for enforcing visitation rights that the law would provide for enforcing child support payments. They want a rebuttable presumption that the mother is to be regarded automatically as the first choice for custody. They argue convincingly that in many cases a judge will award hefty child support as a kind of alimony, and this they resent.

Whatever these problems may be, as the Law Journal observes, they are certain to get worse. One-third of all children born in the 1980s, before they turn 18, will see their parents divorced.

The typical American family, beloved of government statisticians, supposedly is composed of a resident mother and father and two children. Such families are going the way of the orc and the dodo. Between illegitimacy and divorce, the trend points increasingly to single-parent households most often headed by a woman.

The bill now awaiting action in the Senate Finance Committee sailed through the House last November on a vote of 422-0. Senate hearings were held in January. With powerful bipartisan sponsorship, the bill is expected to pop out of committee this month. Prospects for lopsided approval are excellent.

Much as I resent federal laws that say a state "must" enact prescribed legislation, the bill still impresses me as a desirable measure. It is the innocent child who suffers when his father fails to pay support. All the same, the responsible ex-husbands who have written me make a convincing case. There are indeed two sides to this issue. The fathers deserve to be heard.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleagues from Kansas and Iowa, Senators DOLE and JEPSEN, for raising the issue of visitation rights, and I am pleased to learn that nothing in this legislation would interfere with State enforcement of court ordered visitation.

The entire issue of child support enforcement revolves around what is best for the child. I support this legislation's efforts to insure that the absent parent is indeed paying court-ordered child support. Further, this legislation does not prevent States from moving further in the direction of joint custody/shared parental responsibility, which 31 States already have as either an option or preference.

In our national community, the tragedy of a broken or separated family is a problem which cannot be placed on hold, or left for another Congress to ponder or try to solve. We can, however, reaffirm a parent's responsibility for a child, who is otherwise all too vulnerable to the ill wind of desertion, separation, or divorce. In looking after the needs of our children, two important steps are to insure that parents comply with court orders to pay child support and court orders determining visitation rights.

We all owe thanks to Senator DOLE for his dedicated leadership in assuring passage of this legislation. His legislative craftsmanship is admirable, especially in this bill which demonstrates our commitment to States that we welcome their efforts to diligently develop workable programs within their own communities. I strongly support this legislation, and support its quick enactment.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to bring before the Senate this much needed child suppport enforcement legislation. I would first like to thank Senator DOLE, Senator LONG, Senator GRASSLEY, and Senator DURENBERGER for their contributions in putting together this legislation. This legislation unanimously passed the Senate Finance Committee and is endorsed by the Reagan administration. I feel confident that its passage will help correct a serious and expensive problem for many of our country's women and children—this problem is the failure of absent parents to fulfill child support obligations.

Four million children of divorced, separated, or unmarried parents are not receiving either full or timely child support payments. In 1981, according to the Census Bureau, more than 8 million women were raising children alone. Most of these women were eligible for child support, but obligations has been established for only 4 million children. The total unmet obligation amounts to almost $4 billion a year—an unbelievable amount considering the young lives being affected. Specifically: First, 40 percent of single parents lack a child support order because the father is not known, or the mother chooses not to seek one. Second, of the 60 percent of single parents with court ordered child support, 28 percent get no support assistance at all, a quarter receive some assistance while only 47 percent receive full amount due in a particular. In my own State, Colorado, more than 130,000 child support cases are now processed a year.

This legislation before us today amends the Social Security Act to improve the ability of States to collect support for non-AFDC and AFDC families. It is expected to increase child support collections by at least $600 million over the next 4 years. In brief, the bill includes the following provisions:

It provides financial incentives for States that develop effective child support enforcement programs. These incentives would gradually increase a State's cost-effectiveness ratio up to a maximum of an additional 10 percent.

It requires States to impose mandatory wage withholding on absent fathers who are more than 30 days behind in child support.

It requires States to intercept State tax refunds from absent fathers behind in child support.

It prevents an absent parent from discharging child support obligations in bankruptcy proceedings.

Finally, it requires States to develop procedures that would expedite judicial proceedings on child support cases in civil courts.

These provisions have already been enacted by many States, and provide only the minimum requirements that States may enact to increase collections. In addition the Federal match would remain 70 percent until fiscal year 1987. This match would then be gradually reduced by 1 percent each year until 65 percent was reached in 1991. This would allow States time to implement these new collection mechanisms and to benefit from increased collections reducing the burden of State administration costs.

American children are being cheated out of several billions of dollars of court ordered child support. Each year the problem becomes increasingly worse as an additional 2 million children are being raised in single parent families. In addition, the nonpayment of child support has pushed more and more families onto the welfare rolls resulting in taxpayers actually subsidizing child support cheaters. Some 87 percent of those receiving Federal welfare payments through the aid to families with dependent children are eligible because child support is not being paid. Annual AFDC costs now exceed $13 billion.

Yet loss of Federal money by nonpayment of support is not the only tragedy. Each day many custodial parents face the anguish and frustration of trying to support children alone complicated by financial difficulties and perhaps the frustration of waiting months for court redress. It is crucial that we enact this legislation quickly to prevent further suffering of these individuals and the 2 million children who may be added to this list each

year. I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the Senate Finance Committee substitute be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT AMENDMENTS

I. SUMMARY

The bill (H.R. 4325), as amended by the Committee, strengthens the child support enforcement and paternity establishment program authorized by title IV-D of the Social Security Act by requiring the States to implement effective enforcement procedures, by providing incentives to the States to make available services to both Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and non-AFDC families and to increase the effectiveness of their programs, and by otherwise improving Federal and State administration of the program.

Purpose of the program.—Language is added to the statement of purpose assuring that services will be made available to non-AFDC families as well as AFDC families.

Federal matching of administrative costs.—The Federal matching share is gradually reduced from 70 percent as follows: 69 percent in fiscal year 1987, 68 percent in fiscal year 1988, 67 percent in fiscal year 1989, 66 percent in fiscal year 1990, and 65 percent in fiscal year 1991 and years thereafter.

Federal incentive payments.—The current incentive formula which gives States 12 percent of their AFDC collections (paid for out of the Federal share of the collections) is replaced with a new formula that is designed to encourage States to develop programs that emphasize collections on behalf of both AFDC and non-AFDC families, and to improve program cost effectiveness. The basic incentive payment will be equal to 6 percent of the State's AFDC collections, and 6 percent of its non-AFDC collections. States may qualify for higher incentive payments, up to a maximum of 10 percent of collections, if their AFDC or non-AFDC collections exceed combined administrative costs for both AFDC and non-AFDC components of the program. The total dollar amount of incentives paid for non-AFDC families may not exceed the amount of the State's incentive payment for AFDC collections. States may exclude the laboratory costs of determining paternity from combined administrative costs for purposes of computing incentive payments. States are required to pass through to local jurisdictions that participate in the cost of the program an appropriate share of the incentive payments, as determined by the State, taking into account program effectiveness and efficiency. Amounts collected in interstate cases will be credited, for purposes of computing the incentive payments, to both the initiating and responding States.

As part of the new funding formula, the Committee has included "hold harmless" protection for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 which assures the States that for those years they will receive the higher of the amoun' due them under the new incentive and Federal match provisions, or 80 percent of what they would have received under prior law.

The provision is effective beginning with fiscal year 1986.

Matching for automated management systems used in income withholding and other procedures.—The amendment specifies that the 90 percent Federal matching rate that is available to States that elect to establish an automatic data processing and information retrieval system may be used, at the option of the State, for the development and improvement of the income withholding and other procedures required in the bill through the monitoring of child support payments, the maintenance of accurate records regarding the payment of child support, and the provision of prompt notice to appropriate officials with respect to any arrearages that occur.

The amendment also specifies that the 90 percent matching is available to pay for the acquisition of computer hardware.

The provision is effective October 1, 1984.

Improved child support enforcement through required State laws end procedures.—States are required to enact laws establishing the following procedures with respect to their IV-D cases:

1. Mandatory wage withholding for all IV-D families (ADFC and non-AFDC) if support payments are delinquent in an amount equal to 1 month's support. States must also allow absent parents to request withholding at an earlier date.

2. Imposing liens against real and personal property for amounts of overdue support.

3. Withholding of State tax refunds payable to a parent of a child receiving IV-D services, if the parent is delinquent in support payments.

4. Making available information regarding the amount of overdue support owed by an absent parent, to any consumer credit bureau, upon request of such organization.

5. Requiring individuals who have demonstrated a pattern of delinquent payments to post a bond, or give some other guarantee to secure payment of overdue support.

6. Establishing expedited processes within the State judicial system for determining paternity and obtaining and enforcing child support orders. Decisions or recommendations resulting from the expedited process must be reviewed (i.e., ratified, modified, or remanded) by judges of the courts. Appellate review would be conducted by the regular court system at the request of either party.

7. Notifying each AFDC recipient at least once each year of the amount of child support collected on behalf of that recipient.

The Secretary may grant an exemption to a State or political subdivision from the required procedures, subject to later review, if the State can demonstrate that such procedures will not improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the State IV-D program.

The provision is effective October 1, 1984. However, if a State agency administering a plan approved under part D of title IV of the Social Security Act demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, that it cannot, by reason of State law, comply with requirements of a provision mentioned above, the Secretary may prescribe that the provision will become effective beginning with the fourth month beginning after the close of the first session of such State's legislature ending on or after October 1, 1984.

Fees for services to non-AFDC families.—States will be required to charge an application fee for non-AFDC cases not to exceed $25. The amount of the maximum allowable fee may be adjusted periodically by the Secretary to reflect changes in administrative costs. The State may charge the fee against the custodial parent, or pay the fee out of State funds, or it may recover the fee from the absent parent.

In addition, a late payment fee must be charged to the noncustodial parents of AFDC and non-AFDC families on support that is overdue. The State may not take any action which would have the effect of reducing the amount of support paid to the child and will collect the fee only after the full amount of the overdue support has been paid to the child. The late payment fee provision is effective upon enactment.

Periodic review of State programs; modification of penalty.—The Director of the Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement is required to establish standards of performance and to conduct audits at least every three years to determine whether the standards and other requirements have been met. A more flexible penalty provision is provided, equal to at least 1 but no more than 2 percent for the first failure to comply substantially with the standards and requirements, at least 2 but no more than 3 percent for the second failure, and at least 3 but no more than 5 percent of the third and any subsequent consecutive failures. Annual audits would be required unless a State is in substantial compliance. If a State is not in substantial compliance, the penalty may be suspended only if the State is actively pursuing a corrective action plan which can be expected to bring the State into substantial compliance on a specific and reasonable timetable. A State which is not in full compliance would be determined to be in substantial compliance only if the Secretary determines that any noncompliance is of a technical nature which does not adversely affect the performance of the child support enforcement program.

The provision is effective beginning in fiscal year 1984.

Special project grants to promote improvement in interstate enforcement.—The Secretary is authorized to make demonstration grants to States which propose to undertake new or innovative methods of support collection in interstate cases. The authorization is $5 million in 1985, $10 million in 1986, and $15 million in 1987 and years thereafter.

Extension of sec. 1115 demonstration authority to the child support program.—The sec. 1115 demonstration authority is expanded to include the child support enforcement program under specified conditions.

The provision is effective upon enactment.

Modification in content of annual report by the Secretary.—The present annual report information requirements are expanded to include data needed to evaluate State programs.

The provision is effective for reports issued for fiscal year 1986 and years thereafter.

Child support enforcement for certain children in foster care.—State child support agencies are required to undertake child support collections on behalf of children receiving foster care maintenance payments under title IV-E, if an assignment of rights to support to the State has been secured by the foster care agency. In addition, foster care agencies are required to take steps, where appropriate, to secure an assignment to the State of any rights to support on behalf of a child receiving foster care maintenance payments under the title IV-E foster care program.

The provision is effective upon enactment.

Continuation of support enforcement for AFDC recipients whose benefits are being terminated.—States must provide that families whose eligibility for AFDC is terminated due to the receipt of (or an increase in) child support payments will be automatically transferred from AFDC to non-AFDC

status under the IV-D program, without requiring application for IV-D services.

The provision is effective October 1, 1984.

Increased availability of Federal parent locator services to State agencies.—The present law requirement that the States exhaust all State child support locator resources before they request the assistance of the Federal Parent Locator Service is repealed.

The provision is effective upon enactment.

Availability of social security numbers for purposes of child support enforcement.—The absent parent's social security number may be disclosed to child support agencies both through the Federal Parent Locator Service and by the IRS.

The provision is effective upon enactment.

Limitation on discharge in bankruptcy of child support obligations.—The Bankruptcy Act is amended to provide that obligations that have been assigned to the State on behalf of a non-AFDC child as part of the IV-D enforcement process may not be discharged in bankruptcy. (Current law prohibits discharge in bankruptcy for obligations assigned to the State on behalf of an AFDC child.)

The provision is effective upon enactment.

Collection of overdue support from Federal tax refunds.—Current law requires the Secretary of the Treasury, upon receiving notice from a State child support agency that an individual owes past due support which has been assigned to the State as a condition of AFDC eligibility, to withhold from any tax refunds due that individual an amount equal to any past due support. The Committee amendment extends this requirement to provide for withholding of refunds on behalf of non-AFDC families, under specified conditions.

The provision is effective for refunds payable after the year ending December 31, 1984.

Guidelines for determining support obligations.—Each state must develop guidelines to be considered in determining support obligations.

The provision is effective October 1, 1986.

Wisconsin child support initiative.—The Secretary of HHS is required to grant waivers to the State of Wisconsin to allow it to implement its proposed child support initiative in all or parts of the State as a replacement for the AFDC and child support programs. The State must meet specified conditions and give specific guarantees with respect to the financial well-being of the children involved.

Sense of the Congress that State and local governments should focus on the problems of child custody, child support, and related domestic issues.—The Committee amendment incorporates the language of S. Con. Res. 84 urging State and local governments to focus on the vital issues of child support, child custody, visitation rights, and other related domestic issues that are within the jurisdictions of such governments.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that in addition to the members of the Finance Committee, the following Senators be listed as cosponsors of the committee substitute to H.R. 4325: Senators DOMENICI, WARNER, MATTINGLY, JEPSEN, HAWKINS, HATCH, TRIBLE, COCHRAN, KASSEBAUM, CHILES, MATSUNAGA, NUNN, and WARNER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we have toiled long and hard to finally reach the point where the full Senate is able to consider this measure. The Committee on Finance held extensive hearings on the various proposals regarding reform of the child support enforcement program, and we have reported out a bill worthy of every Senator's support.

I am very gratified to see such a large portion of my bill, S. 1708, incorporated into the committee package. I am particularly pleased that the committee accepted an amendment I offered along with Senators PACKWOOD and DURENBERGER which would extend the current system of offsetting Federal income tax refunds to collect past-due child support to non-AFDC children. This provision will help us make good on our pledge to assist all children in obtaining their court-ordered child support payments. We should not wait until families are forced on AFDC as a result of delinquent child support before we offer them assistance.

The compliance rate of child support payments is abysmally low. Changing domestic circumstances have made the need for a strong child support enforcement program even more necessary. Increases in the divorce rate and the number of single parent families have heightened that need. The traditional two-parent family with two children is not necessarily the norm in America. We need to recognize that fact.

H.R. 4325 does just that. By focusing on methods to insure appropriate child support payments, we are helping address the problems which often ensue after the breakup of a family. It is a disgrace that only 47 percent of the individuals due child support payments in 1981 received the full amount due. The primary responsibility of any parent is the well-being of their children.

Since the inception of the child support enforcement or IV-D program in 1975, great strides have been made to assist children in receiving their support payments. Proven enforcement techniques have been developed, and although individual track records vary, the States and localities have worked hard to provide good services to children having difficulty receiving their support payments.

By scrutinizing the experiences of the various States and their individual programs, certain enforcement techniques have been shown to be the most effective in dealing with nonpayment. The Senate Finance Committee has compiled a package of reforms in the current IV-D program which calls on all States to utilize these proven enforcement methods. The measures included in the package will greatly unify the operation of the program, aiding the often exasperating process of interstate collections.

We have also made some much needed changes in the financing of the program in order to better reflect the performances of the States in pursuing delinquent payors. These changes have been made with great consideration, and I might add, after much compromising. It seems the committee had as many options for the financing portion of the packages, as there are committee members. I feel confident the final version will provide for incentives to the States to do a good job in securing support for both AFDC and non-AFDC families.

Payments of support is an obligation no parents should take lightly. Similarly, visitation is a right which must be observed and honored. It is our intention that both court ordered payments, and court-ordered visitation rights be followed. The financial and emotional well-being of the child can only be enhanced if both parents live up to their end of the custody agreement. The child should not be used in an undeclared war between divorced individuals. I sincerely hope States take seriously their responsibility and fulfill the goal the committee amendment makes concerning an examination of visitation rights, custody and child support levels. Senator LONG made an important contribution to this package through his successful inclusion of an amendment requiring the States to develop a set of guidelines to be considered by judges in determining support orders.

The passage of this legislation will signal our commitment to insuring all children who need assistance in obtaining their support payments will be aided. H.R. 4325 deserves the unanimous support of this body. I hope all of my colleagues will join me in voicing their stong approval of the child support enforcement amendments.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, although more and more Federal dollars are spent every year on social programs to benefit children, there can be no question that parents bear the ultimate responsibility for the support and well-being of their children. We as a Nation believe in this fundamental duty. It cannot be neglected.

In 1975 Congress passed legislation to enforce this responsibility. This legislation established the child support enforcement program.

The purpose of this program is to enforce the support obligations owed by absent parents to both their children and spouses. Through a long judicial, administrative, and at times, clinical process, the program attempts to locate these parents, to establish paternity, and to obtain a court order for support.

This is a formidable task. The Census Bureau reports that 8.4 million

women are raising children whose fathers are absent. Over the last 12 years the number of families with a female head of household increased 71 percent. Such a trend adversely affects our Nation's children.

The child support enforement program has been successful since its beginning in fiscal year 1976. Between fiscal year 1976 and fiscal year 1982 more than $8.8 billion in payments have been collected, $3.8 billion on behalf of families receiving AFDC and $5 billion on behalf of non-AFDC families. In fiscal year 1981 over 782,000 parents were located, a fourfold incease over parents located in fiscal year 1976. Over 174,000 paternities were established in fiscal year 1982, up from 15,000 in fiscal year 1976. The number of support orders established increased from 24,000 to 468,000 during this period. In addition, more than 32,000 cases were removed from the AFDC rolls due to child support collections.

Despite the program's initial success, more must be done. It is estimated that overdue payments for AFDC-related child support total $9 billion and are growing at a rate of $1.5 billion each year. A preliminary report from the General Accounting Office, prepared at my request, indicates that only one-third of the support due AFDC families is being paid. For both AFDC and non-AFDC cases, State child support agencies do not act on delinquent cases until the payment is 3 months late. Improvements can and should be made.

Mr. President, that is why I rise to support H.R. 4325, the Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1983, as reported by the Finance Committee. This legislation would broaden the program to provide assistance in obtaining support for all children and spouses deprived of financial support. It would require the implementation of effective collection techniques, and would provide a financial incentive system to reward States for administering efficient programs.

The alarming growth of families with a female head of household but without financial support requires passage of this legislation. The child support enforcement program is intended to require payment of this support. It is unfortunate that such a program is necessary, but parent's financial support for their children is an unconditional responsibility.

Congress must not and cannot ignore the millions of children living without the proper financial, social, and moral support of their parents. The thought of these children growing up in an increasingly complex world without this support is frightening. Congress has responded to this crisis with assistance through such programs as aid to families with dependent children, food stamps, and other programs that assist low-income families. But direct Federal support is only a financial band-aid. The real solution is adequate parental support for their children.

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. President, I rise today as a cosponsor of the child support enforcement measure developed by my friend and colleague from Colorado, Mr. ARMSTRONG, the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, Mr. DOLE, and others.

Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Colorado has pointed out, 8 million of the children in our Nation are being raised by one parent, and more than half of these children are not receiving child support or are receiving it more than 2 months late. These children, and the single parents who are struggling to raise them alone, are being victimized. Many of these single parent families are being forced to seek Federal welfare assistance.

Mr. President, the vast majority of these custodial parents are women, many of them are struggling to make ends meet. They and their children are suffering due to the inability under the present system, of the States and Federal Government to enforce adequately court-ordered child support payments. This measure will serve to assist these single parent families while each year saving taxpayers approximately $120 million in welfare payments.

I wish to commend and congratulate my colleague from Colorado for taking the lead in formulating this vital legislation.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today to support this legislation, and focus attention on one of the most deplorable situations affecting the Nation's social welfare—the nonpayment of child support. The current record of child support collections is intolerable: Almost 55 percent of the more than 4 million women legally entitled to child support payments are not receiving the full amount; 28 percent of these women receive nothing at all. Nonpayment for child support increases the likelihood that a child will fall into poverty and remain so, prolonging reliance on public assistance.

Congress created the Office of Child Support Enforcement in 1975 to establish and enforce child support obligations, to establish paternity, and to assist in the enforcement of interstate support cases. This is a Federal and State effort, and its 9-year history is one of significant success. More than $8.8 billion has been collected in child support, over 2.2 million support orders have been established, and the paternity of more than 8,000 children have been determined. But this is not enough. The record of compliance on child support orders remains disgraceful.

The measure under consideration today will provide the stronger tools needed to enforce child support obligations and relieve the difficult economic circumstances facing a growing number of American families. It provides assistance for children who need such to secure the financial support due them from their absent parents. This measure imposes vigorous enforcement mechanisms including mandatory wage withholding of child support when a support payment is 1 month late, mandatory interception of State and Federal income tax refunds for back child support, and imposition of liens on real and personal property to secure payments. These reforms in the administration of the child support system are essential, and I am pleased to support them.

I am also a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 84, expressing the sense of Congress that State and local governments focus energy and efforts on the problems of child support, custody, visitation rights, and other domestic matters. The issue of child support goes far beyond the matter of collecting support payments. Congress has taken an important step to assure such prompt collections, but it is the responsibility of the States and localities to address the related issues of visitation and custody. These are complex and sensitive matters, best addressed at the State and local level.

There are strong links between female-headed households, poverty, welfare dependency, and delinquent child support. According to the Census Bureau, 19 percent of all families with children are headed by women—and 12.5 million children under age 18 live in female-headed households; 59 percent of the poor black Americans lived in female-headed families in 1980. Between 1970 and 1981, the number of these households increased more than 100 percent. Poverty rates among women who head their households are much higher than for male heads of households and husband-wife couples. Fifty-two percent of all in female-headed families with children had incomes below the poverty line, compared with 11 percent married couple families with children. Lack of child support from an absent parent, which happens in more than 50 percent of all cases where child support is due, is a compelling explanation for the preponderance of poverty among single-parent female-headed households, and for the substantial numbers of such families who become part of the welfare system.

A few years ago, in a paper I published in the Journal of Socioeconomic Studies, I examined increases in the proportion of children who need and receive public assistance. The projections, though necessarily tentative so far as the future is concerned, are

striking. One child in three born in 1980 will receive public assistance (AFDC) before he or she is 18. That is more than four times the ratio for children born in 1940.

Certain profound changes in the composition of those Americans who need and receive welfare are also quite pertinent to our discussion today. The welfare population is associated to an increasing degree, not with widowhood, but with abandoned female-headed families.

Let us consider but one more illustration of the pervasiveness and complexity of this matter, regarding enforcement of child support obligations. For all American women with incomes below the poverty line, only 60 percent received any child support payments, and the average such annual payment was just $1,440. In other words, custodial parents received merely $120 a month, on average, from absent parents to support their children. If every AFDC family with no father present had received just that $1,440 average annual payment in 1982, the savings in welfare payments would have been nearly $5 billion, rather than $800 million. This is money that could have been used to enhance services for our Nation's AFDC children for child nutrition programs, for the school lunch program, or other social welfare programs that have suffered severe funding cuts in recent years.

Adoption of this legislation will not remedy all the problems associated with the child support system, but this measure most certainly will improve collection of both AFDC and non-AFDC support obligations.

This measure is a most responsive one to the well-documented problem of child support enforcement. I am pleased to support it, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in enacting it.

Mr. MATTINGLY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is today considering legislation to strengthen our Nation's child support system. As my colleagues are aware, the House of Representatives earlier this year passed its version of the child support enforcement amendments without a dissenting vote. As a cosponsor of the measure in the Senate, I hope that we in this body will also demonstrate its commitment to this Nation's children by passing this bill.

According to the Census Bureau, in 1981 only 47 percent, less than one-half, of the 4 million women in this country who were due child support received the full amount due them. A quarter of them received no payment at all. While the Census Bureau talks in terms of women who are due payments, the fact, Mr. President, is that the children are due support. It is the children who suffer when parents refuse to pay court-ordered child support. In 1981 alone, children were cheated out of $4 billion in support. This is a tragic situation, and I think it is incumbent upon us to do what we can to remedy the situation and to return to the children the support they are due.

Current law has provided Federal incentives to States to make strong efforts to collect support payments from parents in arrears when the support payments would go to families who receive AFDC payments. No such incentives were in place for non-AFDC families, and the sad result has been that many families not currently receiving AFDC gradually lapse into poverty. This bill would reverse that trend by providing incentives to States to collect support as vigorously for nonwelfare families as they do for their welfare counterparts. In addition, the measure would require the mandatory withholding of wages from the paychecks of parents who are in arrears with child support payments. Federal income tax refunds would also be withheld.

When the citizens of this Nation decide not to obey the law, they should not be allowed to continue. Child support orders should be enforced. The children in this Nation should be cared for, by those who ultimately bear the responsibility for doing so—their parents.

I urge my colleagues to join me in casting a vote in favor of this important legislation.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, millions of children in this country are not receiving court-ordered support from their parents.

As a cosponsor of S. 1691, the Senate version of H.R. 4325 now before the Senate, I want to add my support to the amendments being offered by the Finance Committee.

At present, 8 million children are being raised by only one parent. Of these 8 million, more than half are not receiving any child support. These children and the parents with whom they live are being cheated out of $4 billion a year.

These amendments will provide a means to insure that these children receive the assistance to which they are entitled.

Parents have a responsibility to help raise their children. Many of these children are living in poverty; this must not continue.

The action we are taking today is long overdue. We may find that in the future additional amendments will be needed, but this legislation starts this Nation on the right path.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 4325, the Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1983. This important legislation will amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to assure that all children in America in need of assistance in securing financial support from their parents will receive such assistance, regardless of their circumstances. This bill will insure this assistance through mandatory income withholding, incentive payments to States, and other improvements in the child support enforcement program.

The intent of H.R. 4325 is to encourage States to make child support enforcement services available to all families, particularly those not dependent on the welfare system. Our current child support enforcement program began in 1975 as a cooperative effort among all levels of government. Its two aims were the fostering of family stability and a reduction in the cost of welfare to the taxpayer. Neither aim has been accomplished.

In New York, the child support enforcement program has progressed steadily since its inception in 1975, as evidenced by the increase in aid to families with dependent children collections from $31 million in fiscal year 1976 to $65 million in fiscal year 1983. Moreover, New York State has already instituted a number of enforcement practices, such as including automatic wage withholding and unemployment benefit withholding, and a State tax refund offset system.

There is a clear need to improve our child support enforcement programs. Of the more than 4 million American women legally owed child support, more than half receive only partial payment and nearly one-third receive no payments at all. American children are being cheated out of nearly $4 billion a year.

This loss of child support results in heavy financial burdens on State and Federal welfare programs, whose rolls are swelled by those deprived of the support they are owed by absent parents. Almost 90 percent of all child welfare recipients owe their welfare eligibility to the failure of parents to pay child support.

Part of the reason can be directly traced to the way the system operates. A General Accounting Office report, released in March 1983 concluded that the States now have little incentive to improve their programs performance. The flow of Federal dollars to States is based on what the States spend, not on the collection results they achieve.

Mr. President, I strongly urge my colleagues to pass this legislation today. I believe it will bring relief to many children across the United States who have been denied their entitled child support.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, I now yield to my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER), who has been especially interested and active on this issue.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Colorado. I, too, am extremely pleased that we are finally considering the legislation before us today which will strengthen our child support enforcement system. In particular, I commend the chairman of the Finance Committee for his efforts in reporting this bill and add my own comments relative to the ranking minority member of that committee (Mr. LONG), who has not only spent more time on this issue over the years but during the course of the debate on the child support amendments that we have before us today probably spent as much time in hearings with a variety of witnesses from all over the United States of America than all the other members of the committee put together.

I also recognize Senator GRASSLEY, Senator PACKWOOD, and Senator ARMSTRONG for their tremendous work on this legislation.

Failure to pay child support in this country has reached epidemic proportions. In fact, this situation has become so serious that everyone knows someone who is not receiving child support.

Translated into dollars and cents and national statistics, this problem is even more horrifying. Between a quarter and a third of fathers never make a single court-ordered payment. Absent parents fail to pay approximately $3 billion each year, and this trend is growing.

In addition, the number of single-parent families has mushroomed. In 1980, there were 8.5 million single-parent families, an increase of over 100 percent from 1970. The Census Bureau predicts that only half of all children born this year will spend their entire childhood living with both natural parents. Women head 90 percent of the rapidly growing number of single-parent familes.

What happens to a woman when confronted with a marriage that has been irreconcilably broken by financial problems, communication breakdowns, and changing values? At age 40, she may find herself raising her children alone, with no or limited means of support and terribly frightened.

Her efforts to achieve self-sufficiency and regain her self-esteem are frustrated by forces beyond her control. She quickly learns that the chances of employment are few without job skills and experience. She is confronted by the fact that the same society that encouraged her to raise and care for her family, now refuses to attach a value to the work she has performed.

If she is fortunate enough to obtain an order for child support from her former spouse, there is no guarantee that the support will ever be paid. While her standard of living quickly declines, she sees her former husband's increasing.

In many cases, she will be forced to turn to public assistance just to make ends meet. Only then can she find help collecting past-due support. Once the support starts arriving her financial situation improves—she now has enough income to obtain adequate dependent care, pay her medical bills, and provide for transportation expenses.

Unfortunately, once she becomes self-sufficient she no longer finds child support collection officials anxious to pursue her child support claims. In time, the support stops and she is forced to return to public assistance. This catch-22 may continue throughout her children's lives.

The breakdown of the American family is shocking in a society that has placed that institution at the apex of its social structure. Family dissolution is a problem that we, as national leaders, must address in the coming years. If we are going to maintain the backbone of our society, we must begin to search for ways in which we can keep the family together.

All too often we have ignored this need and sacrificed family unity and self-reliance for well-intentioned economic considerations. In doing so, we have damaged the health of America's children.

A child confronted by dissolution is frequently caught in an unwinnable and unhealthy situation. Far too often, children are used as puppets by parents who are acting out their own frustrations.

Not only do these children suffer during the course of the legal proceedings, but their anguish may continue for many years to come. In many cases, visitation and support issues rapidly interwine to catch the children in their parents' game of cat and mouse. For example, any one of the following are typical scenarios—first, the absent parent fails to pay support, and the custodial parent terminates visitation, second, the custodial parent refuses visitation, and the absent parent stops paying support, third, the absent parent purchases gifts for the children in lieu of support, or fourth, either or both parents move to a new locality.

These are just a few of the tragic situations that follow divorce, but they all lead to one inevitable conclusion—the innocent children are the ultimate victims.

Although these serious family law issues are primarily within the jurisdiction of the State and local governments, Congress does have an obligation to protect these children's financial well-being by tackling the child support enforcement problem.

I am pleased that the Senate is finally considering a strong child support bill. I have been extremely concerned about this problem and made child support enforcement a signficant part of both the Economic Equity Act of 1981 and the Economic Equity Act of 1983. I strongly support passage of this forceful legislation. The time has come for action.

The bill which we are considering today is a strong piece of legislation and incorporates many of the provisions of title V of the Economic Equity Act. It includes:

Mandatory wage withholding after arrearages equal 1 month.

Mandatory quasi-judicial procedures.

Mandatory Federal and State income tax offsets for both AFDC and non-AFDC families.

Mandatory liens against real and personal property.

Mandatory security and bonding procedures.

Support for State and local government initiatives with respect to visitation, child custody, and related domestic issues.

Mandatory development of objective standards for support.

This legislation also establishes a new incentive formula for both AFDC and non-AFDC collections. Hopefully, this change will encourage States to become more cost-effective and respnsive to all families—not just those receiving AFDC.

There is a gradual reduction in the Federal matching formula incuded in the bill. Although I, personally, would have preferred maintaining the Federal match at 70 percent, the new rate represents a compromise that recognizes the enormous Federal deficit and the needs of the States. When coupled with new incentive payments and greater State efficiency, this change will be negligible.

Passage of this legislation by the Senate will send a signal to American women that we intend to remove economic discrimination now. But, this does not complete our task. We must take action to insure passage of all the other provisions of the Economic Equity Act. We must increase the availability of the dependent care tax credit. We must remove all insurance discrimination that currently exists. We must reform public pensions for civil service spouses. Finally, we must set an example by removing impediments established in our regulatory Tax Codes.

Mr. President, the challenge that awaits us is great, but enactment of strong child support enforcement legislation is an important beginning. As we move ahead to our next goal, I believe it is vital that we keep in mind the importance of removing economic barriers which confront women. Hubert Humphrey articulated this well, in 1966, when he stated:

Despite the fact that we are doing better in this respect than most other countries, it

still remains true that the richest under-realized resource in America is the talent of its women.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I would be remiss if I did not point out to Senators that the first legislation on this subject of child support which has emerged as a major national problem was in fact presented by the Senator from Minnesota, and I compliment him for bringing this to the attention of the Finance Committee and taking the lead on it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the manager yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes. Of course, in fact, I think the Senator from Louisiana has time, and I will be happy to yield the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in order to put all Senators on record, I ask for the yeas and nays on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, first let me thank the distinguished chairman of the committee (Mr. DOLE) for the part he has played in bringing this legislation before the Senate, and Mr. ARMSTRONG, the manager of the bill, and Mr. DURENBERGER for the fine work they have done in connection with this matter.

I also congratulate my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. BRADLEY) for the fine contribution he has made in shaping this legislation and bringing it before the Senate.

Mr. President, 10 years ago the Finance Committee recommended legislation based on the proposition that children have a right to be supported by their parents. This legislation was enacted into law as the child-support enforcement program.

The existence of that program has greatly improved the extent to which the child's right to support has become a reality. In its brief history this program has collected nearly $5 billion for welfare families and over $6 billion for families not on welfare. This is a program which directly benefits children and which also saves the taxpayer money.

The child-support program has been successful. But there are still too many cases where children receive little or no support from absent parents who could and should be providing that support. The bill before the Senate would, in most respects, strengthen the program. States would be required to establish systems of wage withholding. They would have to use other enforcement techniques against parents who became delinquent in meeting this support obligation. Federal assistance for State enforcement efforts will be expanded by providing easier access to information in Federal files; this will help locate absent parents. In addition, the highly successful procedure of withholding past-due support from tax-refund checks will be made available to nonwelfare as well as welfare families.

The original child-support bill called upon States to help all children—not just those on welfare—to obtain the support due them. Some States have vigorously carried out this mandate; others have not. The pending bill reemphasizes this responsibility. It restructures the incentive payments to provide a financial bonus for State performance in this area.

This bill can do a great deal to strengthen the enforcement of child-support orders. But an effective enforcement mechanism will have little impact if the support orders themselves are not carefully and reasonably established. Too often, support orders are set at levels well below the level which represents reasonable support in the light of the child's needs and the parents' resources. The bill requires each State to devote attention to this problem and to develop a set of guidelines for judges to consider in establishing support orders.

To meet our goals, the bill includes a number of new requirements and procedures. But it must be recognized that the success of the child-support program will continue to depend on the seriousness with which it is pursued by those who administer the program at the Federal, State, and local levels.

The bill reemphasizes the responsibilities of the Director of the Office of Child Support Enforcement. He must set standards of effectiveness and conduct audits to assure that States achieve an effective level of operation in all areas of responsibility. This includes establishing paternity, locating absent parents, establishing support orders, collecting support orders, and providing adequately for interstate enforcement.

The one area in which I find the committee bill somewhat disappointing is in its financial provisions. Fortunately, the committee did agree to retain the incentive financing at approximately its current level. The bill does this by providing a 6-percent incentive rate for welfare and nonwelfare collections. However, the incentive provisions are structured in a way which could discourage efforts to determine paternity. In addition, the committee provides for a further reduction, from 70 to 65 percent, in the general Federal matching rate for this program. Although this reduction is phased in over 5 years, it may raise doubt on the part of the States about the seriousness and stability of the Federal commitment.

On balance, however, I believe the bill reported by the Finance Committee will strengthen the program. If its provisions are properly implemented, there should be a significant improvement in State efforts to obtain the support payments which are owed by absent parents to their children. I intend to vote for this bill, and I urge the Senate to approve it.

I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise as a supporter of the child-support enforcement reform bill now before the Senate. This bill is modeled on legislation that I introduced last January to insure that court-ordered child-support payments are actually made. The current record of compliance with court orders in this area is nothing short of a national disgrace. Today, we have a real chance to change that.

Mr. President, there has been a major increase in recent years in the number of children living in single-parent families. In 1980, there were over 8 million single-parent families in the United States—an increase of over 100 percent since 1970. Women headed 90 percent of these families.

For many of these families, child-support payments from the absent parent should be a major source of income. But for 40 percent of those families no child support has been awarded by a court. And what of the remaining 60 percent? Fewer than half received the full amount due; 23 percent received only part of what they were entitled to; and 28 percent received nothing at all—even though a court had ordered payments to be made.

The nonpayment cheats children out of $4 billion in support annually. I repeat, the failure of a significant proportion of absent parents to take financial responsibility for their children is a national disgrace.

Mr. President, there has been a lot written lately about the feminization of poverty—the alarming increase of women and children living below the poverty level. The statistics here are compelling. The mean income of female-headed families is only 42 percent of two-parent families' income. And a recent study concluded that two-thirds of the children in female-headed families depend on AFDC.

It is fully a proper Government role to try to help women who head single-parent families. We need to increase income assistance, and education, and training opportunities for these women and their families. And we also need to make sure that noncustodial parents fulfill their financial responsibilities for their children; if all absent parents paid their child support, we would see a significant reduction in the number of women living in poverty.

Mr. President, steps have been taken in New Jersey and elsewhere to improve child-support collections. In 1982, in New Jersey, $130 million in child-support collections were made. Over 3,000 families were removed from AFDC due to child-support collections, over 30,000 absent parents were located and almost 10,000 paternities were established. The New Jersey program is much better than average. For example, for every $1 in CSE administrative costs, the program collected over $4 in child support, much better than the national average.

The CSE program has had a positive impact, but much more needs to be done. There is a wide disparity in performance among States and no State has even a 50-percent compliance rate with court orders. The system is in major need of tightening up.

Mr. President, earlier this year Senator DURENBERGER and I introduced legislation that has been cosponsored by 20 Senators designed to help women who are not receiving the child-support payments legally due them. While the legislation before us today is not as strong in some respects as the bill we introduced, it will substantially improve the collection of child-support payments from parents who are ignoring their legal obligations. The Finance Committee bill is a bipartisan effort to insure the payment of child support through mandatory income withholding, incentive payments to States, and other improvements in the child-support enforcement program. The major provisions of the bill are as follows:

Mandatory wage withholding if child-support payments are delinquent in an amount equal to 1 month's support.

New streamlined administrative procedures to assure that States will make all reasonable efforts to improve the enforcement of child-support obligations. These procedures were set up in New Jersey in Essex County with tremendous results: child-support payments doubled, administrative costs were cut by a half million dollars, and the huge backlog of court cases was eliminated.

The withholding of State and Federal tax refunds if the noncustodial parent is delinquent in support payments.

Requiring individuals who have demonstrated a pattern of delinquent payments to post a bond, or give some other guarantee to secure payment of past-due support.

A new incentive formula. Instead of rewarding States solely for collections made on behalf of AFDC families, the new formula rewards States for collections made on behalf of both AFDC and non-AFDC families. The Federal incentive payment increases as the State's ratio of collections to administrative costs improves; $15 million a year in demonstration grants to States to test methods of improving interstate child-support collections.

Mr. President, these are significant changes that I believe will help improve our record on the child-support enforcement. But these efforts may not be enough to correct the abuse and neglect we are witnessing today. If these reforms do not prove to be a sufficient enforcement tool, we may well have to incorporate automatic withholding of child-support payments from the wages of those obligated to pay as a part of the original court decree. I will certainly be monitoring the performance of States over the next couple of years to see how effectively the changes we are making today actually work.

Mr. President, while the House and Senate bills are similar in most respects, there are a few differences between them. I am hopeful that the House-Senate conferees agree to strengthen the final version of the bill in three ways. First, I would like to see all tax refunds from noncustodial parents with delinquent payments be attached, not just refunds owed to welfare families. Second, we need a transitional measure to provide 4 months of medicaid coverage to families going off AFDC because of improved collections. And, third, the incentive payment to States should be expanded to further encourage States target all delinquent noncustodial parents, not just those whose children are on AFDC families.

Mr. President the differences between the House and Senate bills are not insurmountable. I hope that we can resolve these differences quickly and get this bill enacted so that corrective action can begin quickly. There is no reason for delay. Millions of needy children are waiting for us to act.

During the Finance Committee deliberations on the child support bill, I offered an amendment requiring States to provide 4 months of medicaid coverage for AFDC families who lose eligibility for AFDC and medicaid as a result of increased child support. Unfortunately, this amendment lost on a vote of 9 to 10 in committee. I had intended to propose an amendment on the floor that would permit States, at their option, to provide the 4 months of medicaid coverage.

Mr. President, a 4-month extension of medicaid provides critical support to families in the difficult period of transition from AFDC to self-sufficiency. Loss of medicaid is often one of the most devastating byproducts of losing AFDC, since poor children are more likely than other children to need medical care.

The concept of a 4-month extension of medicaid for a family that loses AFDC in such circumstances is not new. The Social Security Act already provides for similar coverage when a family loses AFDC due to increased income from wages. The amendment that I offered in committee was therefore simply an equitable extension of a benefit already available to families who lose AFDC due to wages.

Medicaid coverage would only assist families who desperately need the medical coverage because HHS is proposing regulations that require States to seek medical-support coverage from the absent parent whenever medical coverage is available at a reasonable cost. Therefore, most people will have private insurance available to cover medical costs and therefore won't need the medicaid coverage.

Mr. President, in an effort to expedite this bill through the Senate, the chairman of the Finance Committee has asked me not to offer this amendment on the Senate floor. Can the chairman give me some assurances that the conferees will at the least allow States at their option to provide 4 months of medicaid coverage?

Mr. DOLE. As my colleague knows, I did not support the amendment he offered with our colleague from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER) to require States to provide 4 months of medicaid coverage. However, it is my position that States should be allowed the option to provide such coverage. That will be the position I will take as a member of the conference. While I cannot speak for the other Senate conferees, given the vote in the committee, some provision for medicaid coverage is likely to emerge from the conference.

I thank my colleague from New Jersey for his courtesy and cooperation in this matter.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey and I were cosponsors of an amendment that failed I think by one vote in committee on this subject. I came to the issue before from my interest in medicaid and health policy and also from the standpoint of a very extensive study conducted in my State by the University of Minnesota over the last couple of years about what happens to families when they move off of AFDC because of increased income, either jobs or AFDC. That study reported that somewhere between one-fourth and one-third of all adults and fully one-third of all children involved even 4 months after termination of AFDC were without medical or dental coverage because they could not afford to purchase that coverage on the outside.

I am pleased that the chairman has indicated that in conference he would be willing to consider optional treatment for medicaid coverage.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, I yield to our colleague from Virginia (Mr. TRIBLE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. TRIBLE. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Colorado for yielding. I, too, commend him for his leadership and that of Senator LONG, Senator DURENBERGER, Senator DOLE, and the other distinguished members of the Finance Committee.

Our Nation can no longer tolerate the costs of our current system of child support. It perpetuates a culture of poverty, leads to the neglect of defenseless children, and fosters disrespect for the law.

A recently published Census Bureau report showed that 28 percent of the mothers owed child support during 1981 received not 1 cent during the entire year; and half the women due support did not receive the full amount they were owed. That means that children in more than 4 million homes across our land are being shortchanged and cheated. It is time we do something about it. This is nothing less than theft from innocent children.

For the mothers involved, it is an economic catastrophe. It has contributed to the "feminization of poverty." We now find that while some 14 percent of the population-at-large falls below the poverty line. Among single mothers caring for children, the figure is more than double to 35 percent.

During the depths of the Great Depression, President Roosevelt spoke of one-third of a nation being ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-fed. We confront a comparable situation in female-headed, single-parent households today.

Yet, according to a 1982 Stanford University study, most noncustodial parents who are not meeting their child support obligations are capable of doing so, and, indeed are capable of paying significantly more than the amounts awarded.

Quite clearly, the present system of child support collection is costly and ineffective. In nearly all cases, the mother lacks either the time or the money to go back to court and enforce what is legally due her and her children. When she does go back to court, she faces delays and roadblocks. The time has come for a new system of enforcing what is already a legal and moral obligation, and that includes withholding of child support payments from wages.

Mr. President, our Nation has no more important responsibility than protecting the family bond. Our laws must assert every parents responsibility to suport his or her children. That is why this is so important an initiative. I commend my colleagues for their leadership, and I urge the Senate to adopt this amendment.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, does the Senator from Florida seek recognition?

Mrs. HAWKINS. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am pleased to yield to the Senator.

Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute and 28 seconds.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield 1 minute and 20 seconds to the Senator.

Mrs. HAWKINS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is considering legislation to improve the Federal Child Support Enforcement Act. I commend the distinguished Senator from Florida for providing the leadership for passage of this most important legislation, probably the most important legislation we will handle this year.

Passage of the original act in 1975 was significant because for the first time a Federal law addressed the causes as well as the symptoms of poverty among children. While we must continue our financial support of social service programs addressing the immediate needs of children living in poverty, I feel that we must step up our efforts to address the causes. We must face the ugly fact that at least 80 percent of the families seeking aid for families with dependent children (AFDC) do so because of insufficient child support from the absent parent.

We have all heard much about the "feminization of poverty." It is almost a buzz-word. It is a very real problem for women in this country. Indeed, the statistics prove that women in this country are the ones who are bearing the great brunt of any downturn in the economy. As more and more women go to work, more and more children are left untended. More and more children are missing. I do not know when it became a right in this country for a father to abandon the responsibility of providing for his child.

I am thinking about the children all the time I am in the Senate, because they provide the basic unit of the family. Mothers and fathers are involved with making a living.

There is still much hidden discrimination against women in terms of, jobs, child care, child support, and retirement benefits. Since the 1940's there has been a tremendous increase in the female labor force—but no increase in economic security. Women are still making less money than men. Women are still by far the ones forced on welfare.

But it is the children who are most deeply affected by the "feminization of poverty." It is the children who suffer when their mother's child care needs are not properly met. And it is the children who suffer most from nonpayment of child support.

Congress made a good effort to address this problem in 1975 with the child support enforcement program. This program required each State to enforce child support by tracing fathers through the social security system and using income-tax offsets and wage withholding. It was a good start, but much more needed to be done.

My own State of Florida recognized the problem and enacted its own child support enforcement legislation in 1974, a year before passage of the Federal legislation. But reforms are needed now to improve this program and make it more effective. In 1980, our Florida Office of Child Support Enforcement entered into a contract with the Center for Governmental Responsibility at Holland Law Center at the University of Florida. They undertook a 2-year research project to determine what factors affect the collection of court-ordered child support payments and which methods of enforcement are most effective. The final results will be published this February, and then the center will embark on a 1-year pilot project in 20 Florida counties to implement some of the research findings.

The results of the research study should give Florida a better idea of how to improve the State child support enforcement program even more. It will also provide valuable data about which enforcement techniques seem to be the most effective.

Although the final research results have not yet been published, a researcher from the center did travel to Washington, DC, this November to discuss the preliminary findings with the staff of both the Senate children's caucus and family caucus. The center discovered wide discrepancies from county to county regarding enforcement and enforcement techniques. An alarming discovery was that many of the courts responsible for enforcement were unaware of the variety of enforcement techniques available to them. For example, many of the judges were not aware that Florida State law permitted the courts to impose mandatory wage assignment on non-AFDC as well as AFDC recipients if the absent parent missed two or more payments. Even worse, many judges who were aware of the provision were reluctant to use it because of the liability the provision imposed on their clerks who administer the depository account. The original language made the clerk of the court personally liable for any checks to the court depository accepted by him. The clerks were, therefore, understandably reluctant to accept support payment except in the form of money orders or certified checks. When this situation was discovered, Florida modified its law to provide that the clerks of the circuit court not be personally liable if the personal check tendered by the employer is returned by the bank. This improved and encouraged the use of

one of the most effective methods of enforcing child support payment.

A disturbing statistic that emerged from the Florida study—as well as national studies on child support enforcement—is the low percentage of nonwelfare child support cases that are processed. Although the Federal law requires that State child support agencies offer services to custodial parents who are not AFDC recipients, in Florida, our non-AFDC caseload is only 4 percent. Only 10,000 of the 267,000 cases in Florida in 1982 were nonwelfare cases. The reason is an economic one. There is a built-in disincentive for spending staff time on nonwelfare cases. But there is no other substantive difference between them; the problems of child support enforcement are common to both welfare and nonwelfare families. Unfortunately, the financial benefits of pursuing non-AFDC child support cases are not immediately apparent. However, several studies are now being done to determine the cost-avoidance aspects of the non-AFDC program.

Ultimately, the real reason for encouraging the enforcement of all child support orders, regardless of the parent's dependence on governmental support is a matter of children's right and need to be supported by their parents. We in Congress must pursue our goal of returning the responsibility of caring for children to the parents.

I commend Senator DOLE, Senator LONG, Senator BRADLEY, and Senator DURENBERGER, and all members of the Senate Finance Committee for their efforts in developing legislation that improves the child support enforcement program and insures that all children in the United States who are in need of assistance in securing financial support from their parents will receive assistance regardless of their circumstances. I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 7 minutes and 20 seconds remaining.

Mr. LONG. I yield back the remainder of our time.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am prepared to yield back our time.

Has the committee amendment been adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am prepared to proceed to adoption of the committee amendment and then to vote on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Maine (Mr. COHEN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EAST), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maine (Mr. COHEN) would vote "yea."

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) is absent because of a death in the family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOSCHWITZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall vote No. 79 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Abdnor	Goldwater	Nickles
Andrews	Gorton	Nunn
Armstrong	Grassley	Packwood
Baker	Hatch	Pell
Baucus	Hatfield	Percy
Bentsen	Hawkins	Pressler
Biden	Hecht	Proxmire
Bingaman	Heflin	Pryor
Boren	Heinz	Quayle
Boschwitz	Helms	Randolph
Bradley	Hollings	Riegle
Bumpers	Humphrey	Roth
Burdick	Inouye	Rudman
Byrd	Jepsen	Sarbanes
Chafee	Johnston	Sasser
Chiles	Kassebaum	Simpson
Cochran	Kasten	Specter
Cranston	Lautenberg	Stafford
D'Amato	Laxalt	Stennis
Danforth	Leahy	Stevens
DeConcini	Levin	Symms
Denton	Long	Thurmond
Dixon	Lugar	Tower
Dole	Mathias	Trible
Domenici	Matsunaga	Tsongas
Durenberger	Mattingly	Wallop
Eagleton	McClure	Warner
Evans	Melcher	Weicker
Exon	Metzenbaum	Wilson
Ford	Mitchell	Zorinsky
Garn	Moynihan	
Glenn	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—6

Cohen	East	Huddleston
Dodd	Hart	Kennedy

So the bill (H.R. 4325), as amended, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOSCHWITZ). The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, in a moment I will move to reconsider the vote. But, before I do, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be added as cosponsors to the amendment: Senators LONG, NUNN, HOLLINGS, BRADLEY, MOYNIHAN, MATSUNAGA, INOUYE, LEAHY, LEVIN, EXON, ANDREWS, ABDNOR, WARNER, SASSER, and BOSCHWITZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, I also would like to acknowledge that the passage of this bill—which, as several Senators have observed, is an extremely important piece of legislation—has been made possible by the smooth and quick floor debate. It also has been made possible by the truly outstanding staff work of Sydney Olson and Margaret Webber of the majority staff; and, by Mike Stern and Joe Humphreys of the minority staff.

Behind the scenes, there was a lot of negotiating, pulling and hauling, as there always is on a bill like this. The fact that we were able to handle it with such great dispatch and in a timely manner is a tribute to the work that they have done, and we are grateful to them for that.

Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senators who managed this measure, and I thank the Senators who sponsored it for their cooperation. I congratulate them on the passage of this important piece of legislation. I know it has been a great matter of interest of the Senator from Louisiana for a long time, of the Senator from Kansas, and also of the Senator from Colorado in particular.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not past the hour of 6:15 p.m. in which Senators may speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFICIT REDUCTION PACKAGE

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, yesterday in speaking on the pending deficit reduction package, I pointed out the very great danger facing our country if we are not in some way to

bring into balance the revenues and outlays of the Federal Government. The prospect of these deficits of a magnitude of $200 billion or more this year and years into the future is truly awesome. It presents a concern which I think is out of the ordinary and calls for a degree of compromise and self-sacrifice by Senators and others in the country which, as I pointed out yeaterday, I think is above and beyond what we have routinely faced.

I hope all Senators will approach the debate on this matter in a spirit of accommodation and compromise, and will, as I have suggested that I am prepared to do, relinquish all the sacred cows and do whatever is necessary to balance the budget.

My purpose in seeking recognition, however, is not to elaborate on that statement, but simply to correct one statement which I made yesterday.

Some Senators might find it embarrassing to correct themselves on such short notice but I have had a fair amount of practice in trying to correct my own mistakes. I want to put the minds of Senators at ease about one statement I made yesterday.

I pointed out that I was concerned about the real validity of the proposed spending caps in this proposal. That is, I was concerned that a majority of a quorum could waive on motion the spending caps on which this whole deficit reduction package, inadequate though I believe it to be, depends.

It is true, and I was correct in pointing out, that a majority of a quorum could waive the spending caps even though they were in the law, because there is a specific provision in the bill that permits that.

Where I erred, and I want Senators to know that I was mistaken because it is an important point, was that I mentioned that the motion for such waiver, which appears in the Senate RECORD at page S4729, would not be debatable, that it would be subject to a 1-hour time limit. The reason I mentioned that was because that would be the regular course of things under a budget reconciliation or a budget resolution. That is, points of order and waivers only get 1 hour of debate.

But upon reflection and rereading and with advice of staff, I want to make clear to the Senate that I was in error about that point. The specific waiver which is provided for in the pending amendment, the so-called leadership amendment or the rose garden budget, whatever you call it, would be subject to not 1 hour of debate but to unlimited debate. In fact, to shut off debate, cloture would be necessary.

I want to correct the record on that. I apologize for unintentionally misstating that. I put all Senators on notice that in the event these limitations are in fact enacted into law and that at some future time next year or the year after someone tried to bring to the floor an appropriations bill or an amendment which exceeded those limits specified herein, any waiver of the limit would be subject to very extended debate, and I might well propose such debate myself if circumstances warranted. I wanted to clear up the record before any time elapsed. That was my purpose in rising. I thank the majority leader for having yielded.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have some calendar items. The acting minority leader is on the floor and has been briefed about them. I would like to do them en bloc, if he does not object.

Let me now ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider en bloc the following items: Calendar Order Nos. 737, 739, 749, 751, 768, 769, 770, and 771.

Does the acting minority leader have any comments?

Mr. BINGAMAN. We have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELIEF OF HARVEY E. WARD

The bill (S. 1126) for the relief of Harvey E. Ward, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1126

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harvey E. Ward of Zion, Illinois, the sum of $15,475.59, pursuant to the findings of the United States Claims Court in Ward against United States, Congressional Reference Case numbered 6-76 (1982), in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Harvey E. Ward against the United States for withheld disability retirement pay from service in the United States Coast Guard.

SEC. 2. No part of any amount appropriated by this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. A violation of this section is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine in an amount not exceeding $1,000.

REFERRAL OF S. 413 TO THE CHIEF JUDGE OF THE U.S. CLAIMS COURT

The resolution (S. Res. 48) to refer S. 413 to the chief judge of the U.S. Claims Court, was considered, and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 48

Resolved, That S. 413, entitled "A Bill for the Relief of James P. Purvis", now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is referred to the Chief Judge of the United States Claims Court, and the Chief Judge shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509, title 28, United States Code, notwithstanding the bar of any statute of limitations, laches, or bar of sovereign immunity, and report thereon to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusion thereof as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand of the claim, legal or equitable, against the United States, or a gratuity, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to James P. Purvis.

RELIEF OF VLADIMIR VICTOROVICH YAKIMETZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1989) for the relief of Vladimir Victorovich Yakimetz, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) notwithstanding paragraphs (14) and (28) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, for purposes of such Act, Vladimir Victorovich Yakimetz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by the proper number, during the current fiscal year or the fiscal year next following, the total number of immigrant visas which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act or, if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 202(e) of such Act.

(b)(1) Vladimir Victorovich Yakimetz shall be held and considered to have satisfied the provisions of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act which relate to required periods of residence and physical presence within the United States and shall not be held or considered to be within any of the classes of persons described in section 313 of such Act.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 310(d) of that Act, Vladimir Victorovich Yakimetz may be naturalized at any time after the date of enactment of this Act if otherwise eligible for naturalization under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to invite my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 1989, a bill to confer U.S. citizenship on Mr. Vladimir V. Yakimetz. Mr. Yakimetz, recently a citizen of the Soviet Union, worked until December 1983 as an international civil servant in the United Nations Secretariat in New York City.

Before going any further, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee (Mr. THURMOND), the ranking member of the committee (Mr. BIDEN), and the chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee (Mr. SIMP-

SON) for their cooperation in expediting consideration of S. 1989. S. 1989 was introduced on October 21, 1983. On April 5, 1984, it was reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee.

S. 1989 is a private bill with a public purpose. The purpose is to encourage employees of the United Nations to believe in—and to uphold—the Charter of the United Nations.

Passage of S. 1989 will not make the U.N. perfect. But it would be a tangible demonstration of congressional support for the noble principle enshrined in the charter. It would represent a small step toward enabling the U.N. to live up to those principles.

The case for the bill before us may be put simply: Mr. Yakimetz is a man who has lived up to the charter, and—due to the intervention of the Soviet Government—has lost his job at the U.N. in consequence. With American citizenship, he will be able to return to his post as a U.N. employee, beholden to no interest other than the U.N.

I reveal no closely held secret of the intelligence community when I state that it is standard practice for Soviet bloc employees at the U.N. to accept instruction from their governments and to use their privileged diplomatic positions in New York to engage in espionage aganist the United States and other nations. This is in unambiguous violation of article 100 of the U.N. Charter which states that:

(i)n the performance of their duties the Secretary-General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization.

It may fairly be said that this provision lies at the very heart of what it is required of an international organization if it is to function as intended. If the organization is ever to enjoy the confidence of member states, the Secretariat must be truly international in character.

Vladimir Yakimetz merits our attention precisely because he has sought to live up to the principle expressed in article 100.

In 1982, while serving, as he had for several years, as a program officer responsible for budget planning in the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs, Mr. Yakimetz was instructed by officials of the Soviet mission at the U.N. to engage in activities he knew to be inconsistent with his oath as an international civil servant. He refused, and was consequently ordered back to Moscow.

Mr. Yakimetz thereupon requested, and received, on February 9, 1983, political asylum in the United States. The Soviets, not surprisingly, sought to have him dismissed from the U.N.

To his great credit, Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar decided to permit Mr. Yakimetz to remain at the U.N. through the conclusion of his employment contract, despite the fact that the country which had seconded him to the U.N.—the U.S.S.R.—no longer wanted him to remain there.

While this represented a certain measure of victory for the principle of independence in the international civil service, it was only an interim solution. When Mr. Yakimetz's contract expired on December 26, 1983, the Secretary-General was bound by the precedents of the U.N. not to employ him unless he were to be seconded by a member country of the U.N.

In order to be seconded, Mr. Yakimetz must be a citizen of said member country. For a number of reasons, the logical choice is the United States—not least because it would be in the American national interest to see that the often-abused principle of an independent U.N. civil service is strengthened in practice, as it would be by retention of Mr. Yakimetz in the U.N. Secretariat.

Thus S. 1989, and the proposal to expedite the citizenship process for Vladimir Yakimetz. With American citizenship, he will promptly be seconded and rehired. And the employees of the U.N. will see that it is possible to abide by the chapter.

It is important to note that Vladimir Yakimetz does not seek early citizenship for personal gain or convenience. Having been granted political asylum, he could look forward to becoming an American citizen in the course of time through the normal procedures. With his background as a physicist, linguist and administrator, he could also expect to fare well in the American job market.

Yet Mr. Yakimetz believes in abiding by the U.N. Charter, and would like to continue to do so as an employee of the Secretariat. If he did not, he could easily have cooperated with the Soviet mission at the U.N. in violating that charter.

The permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations, Ambassador Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, has written me in support of this effort, noting in her letter that—

The immediate bestowal of U.S. citizenship on this worthy individual who has chosen freedom seems to me not only warranted but essential.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting S. 1989. If we fail to act on this case, we will encourage the Soviet Union still further to believe they can ignore their charter commitments with impurity. And other U.N. employees from the Soviet bloc will understand that to insist on principle is to lose a livelihood.

The principles of the U.N. Charter, the noble goal of an international civil service and the personal courage of Vladimir Yakimetz deserve our recognition.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of S. 1989, as reported, and the text of Ambassador Kirkpatrick's letter in support of S. 1989, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill and letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1989

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) notwithstanding paragraphs (14) and (28) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, for purposes of such Act, Vladimir Victorovich Yakimetz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by the proper number, during the current fiscal year or the fiscal year next following, the total number of immigrant visas which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of, if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 202(e) of such Act.

(b)(1) Vladimir Victorovich Yakimetz shall be held and considered to have satisfed the provisions of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act which relate to required periods of residence and physical presence within the United States and shall not be held or considered to be within any of the classes of persons described in section 313 of such Act.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 310(d) of that Act, Vladimir Victorovich Yakimetz may be naturalized at any time after the date of enactment of this Act if otherwise eligible for naturalization under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS,

September 27, 1983.

Hon. DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PAT: I am writing to you in support of the effort to secure expedited U.S. citizenship for Mr. Vladimir Yakimetz, a former Soviet national assigned to the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs in the UN Secretariat. Last February, Mr. Yakimetz defected to the United States after he was notified by Soviet Mission authorities in New York that he was to be sent home in connection with allegations that he had participated in black market activities.

Following his confrontation with the Soviet authorities, Mr. Yakimetz contacted his UN supervisor who, in turn, assisted him in retaining Orville H. Schell, Esq., of Hughes, Hubbard and Reed, a New York law firm. Mr. Schell negotiated an agreement with the UN Secretary General that permitted Mr. Yakimetz to retain his position in the Secretariat through December 26, 1983, when his current contract expires. The agreement also appears to open the way for Mr. Yakimetz to arrange a new contract with the Secretariat after December, provided he secures U.S. citizenship by that time.

The Secretary General normally extends the employment of capable and time-tested Secretariat personnel who enjoy the support of the UN member state of which they are citizens. In this case, the hostility of the country of original nationality makes it impossible for the Secretary General to grant an extension of contract unless the staff member concerned obtains citizenship of a supportive member state. For this reason, the immediate bestowal of U.S. citizenship on this worthy individual who has chosen freedom seems to me not only warranted but essential.

Many senior officials of this Mission have been working with Mr. Yakimetz's attorneys and with interested Washington agencies to ensure that Mr. Yakimetz's rights and his status as an international civil servant and UN employee of good standing are secure. I understand that his attorney has discussed with your staff the introduction of a private bill granting Mr. Yakimetz citizenship. I want you to know that I am in full accord with the course he proposes. If I can help further, I am at your service,

Sincerely,

JEANE J. KIRKPATRICK.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMERICAN GOLD STAR MOTHERS, INC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2413) to recognize the organization known as the American Gold Star Mothers, Inc., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments:

On page 2, line 17, strike "incorporation" and insert "incorporation and shall include a continuing commitment, on a national basis, to—

(a) keep alive and develop the spirit that promoted world services;

(b) maintain the ties of fellowship born of that service, and to assist and further all patriotic work;

(c) inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation;

(d) assist veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean Conflict, Vietnam, and other strategic areas and their dependents in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration, and to aid in any way in their power the men and women who served and died or were wounded or incapacitated during hostilities;

(e) perpetuate the memory of those whose lives were sacrificed in our wars;

(f) maintain true allegiance to the United States of America;

(g) inculcate lessons of patriotism and love of country in the communities in which we live;

(h) inspire respect for the Stars and Stripes in the youth of America;

(i) extend needful assistance to all Gold Star Mothers and, when possible, to their decendants; and

(j) to promote peace and good will for the United States and all other Nations.

On page 6, line 11, strike "(60)" and insert "(62)".

So as to make this bill read:

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

CHARTER

SECTION 1. American Gold Star Mothers, Incorporated, organized and incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia, is hereby recognized as such and is granted a charter.

POWERS

SEC. 2. American Gold Star Mothers, Incorporated (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation") shall have only those powers granted to it through its bylaws and articles of incorporation filed in the State or States which it is incorporated and subject to the laws of such State or States.

OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes for which the corporation is organized shall be those provided in its articles of incorporation and shall include a continuing commitment, on a national basis, to—

(a) keep alive and develop the spirit that promoted world services;

(b) maintain the ties of fellowship born of that service, and to assist and further all patriotic work;

(c) inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation;

(d) assist veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean Conflict, Vietnam, and other strategic areas and their dependents in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration, and to aid in any way in their power the men and women who served and died or were wounded or incapacitated during hostilities;

(e) perpetuate the memory of those whose lives were sacrificed in our wars;

(f) maintain true allegiance to the United States of America;

(g) inculcate lessons of patriotism and love of country in the communities in which we live;

(h) inspire respect for the Stars and Stripes in the youth of America;

(i) extend needful assistance to all Gold Star Mothers and, when possible, to their descendants; and

(j) promote peace and good will for the United States and all other nations.

SERVICE OF PROCESS

SEC. 4. With respect to service of process, the corporation shall comply with the laws of the States in which it is incorporated and those States in which it carries on its activities in furtherance of its corporate purposes.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 5. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall be as provided in the bylaws of the corporation.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 6. The board of directors of the corporation and the responsibilities thereof shall be as provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States in which it is incorporated.

OFFICERS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 7. The officers of the corporation, and the election of such officers shall be as is provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation in conformity with the laws of the State or States wherein it is incorporated.

RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 8. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director of the corporation or be distributed to any such person during the life of this charter. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to the officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the board of directors.

(b) The corporation shall not make any loan to any officer, director, or employee of the corporation.

(c) The corporation and any officer and director of the corporation, acting as such officer or director, shall not contribute to, support or otherwise participate in any political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation.

(d) The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock not to declare or pay any dividends.

(e) The corporation shall not claim congressional approval or Federal Government authority for any of its activities.

(f) The corporation shall retain and maintain its status as a corporation organized and incorporated under the laws of the State or States wherein it is incorporated.

LIABILITY

SEC. 9. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 10. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of any proceeding of the corporation involving any of its members, the board of directors, or any committee having authority under the board of directors. The corporation shall keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of all members having the right to vote. All books and records of such corporation may be inspected by any member having the right to vote, or by any agent or attorney of such member, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time. Nothing in this section shall be construed to contravene any applicable State law.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 11. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law", approved August 30, 1964 (36 U.S.C. 1101), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(60)*(62)* American Gold Star Mothers, Incorporated".

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 12. The corporation shall report annually to the Congress concerning the activities of the corporation during the preceding fiscal year. Such annual report shall be submitted at the same time as is the report of the audit required by section 11 of this Act. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 13. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved to the Congress.

DEFINITION OF "STATE"

SEC. 14. For purposes of this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

TAX-EXEMPT STATUS

SEC. 15. The corporation shall maintain its status as an organization exempt from taxation as provided in the Internal Revenue

Code of 1954. If the corporation fails to maintain such status, the charter granted hereby shall expire.

TERMINATION

SEC. 16. If the corporation shall fail to comply with any of the restrictions or provisions of this Act the charter granted hereby shall expire.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. President, the American Gold Star Mothers, Inc., was originally founded on June 4, 1928, by a group of 25 mothers residing in Washington, DC, as a nondenominational, nonprofit, and nonpolitical national organization. On January 5, 1929, the organization was incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia.

The organization is composed of mothers whose sons or daughters served and died in the line of duty in the Armed Forces in World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, Vietnam, and other strategic areas, or who died as a result of injuries received during such service. It is open for membership to all eligible women regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin.

The noble objectives of the organization include:

Maintaining the ties of fellowship born of service, and assisting and furthering all patriotic work;

Inculcating a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation;

Assisting veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, Vietnam, and other strategic areas and their dependents in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration, and providing all possible assistance to the men and women who served and died or were wounded or incapacitated during hostilities;

Perpetuating the memory of those whose lives were sacrificed in the line of duty;

Maintaining true allegiance to the United States of America;

Inculcating lessons of patriotism and love of country in the communities in which they live;

Inspiring respect for the Stars and Stripes in the youth of America;

Extending needed assistance to all Gold Star Mothers and, when possible, to their descendants; and

Promoting peace and good will for the United States and all other nations.

The organization has accomplished those objectives during the past 55 years through its total commitment to public service, a commitment that entails working with families to help adjust to a way of life without their loved ones and to providing many hours of volunteer work and personal service in all hospitals for veterans. The organization exemplifies a high level of patriotism in its efforts to protect the rights of mothers whose sons or daughters made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of their country.

Mr. President, the organization met all the requirements outlined in the "Standards for the Granting of Federal Charters" and it met the Judiciary Committee's requirement for cosponsors, having collected 77 cosponsors. On April 4, 1984, the bill was favorably reported with amendments.

I believe that it is appropriate for the Congress to grant a Federal charter to an organization that strives to promote the patriotic ideals of public service. The words and deeds of the American Gold Star Mothers truly justify favorable congressional action.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 2413.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SOLIDARITY SUNDAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 367) to express the sense of the Senate in support of "Solidarity Sunday."

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today to invite my colleagues to join me in supporting Senate Resolution 367, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress supports Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry. On April 11, 45 Senators having joined as original cosponsors, I introduced Senate Resolution 367. Thanks to the gracious cooperation of the majority leader, (Senator BAKER), the minority leader (Senator BYRD), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee (Senator THURMOND), and the ranking member (Senator BIDEN), the resolution was placed immediately on the Senate Calendar.

Sunday, May 6, 1984, is Solidarity Sunday, in New York City, when thousands of Americans of all faiths will gather to march together in a demonstration of their solidarity with the nearly 3 million oppressed Jews of the Soviet Union. First organized and coordinated by the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry 13 years ago, Solidarity Sunday has become a tradition. One regrets that this has been necessary, but one is heartened by the continuing willingness of Americans to undertake this effort.

This resolution would be an important expression of our unwavering concern as a free people for the plight of Soviet Jews and other persecuted minorities in the Communist world. Solidarity Sunday is especially important this year, given the increasing pressure by the Soviet Government on Soviet Jews who wish to express themselves religiously and culturally. Despite commitments undertaken in the Helsinki Final Act and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Soviet Government has in recent months intensified its persecution of Jewish citizens. Hebrew classes are disrupted, prayer services are dispersed, Jews are prevented from practicing their faith.

In this season of Passover—the holiday when Jews around the world commemorate the exodus of the ancient Israelites from slavery in Egypt—Jews in the Soviet Union remain in religious and cultural bondage. The Passover Seder is an expression of freedom that is not allowed in the Soviet Union. Soviet authorities will not even permit Jews to gather to share the holidays of their history, so central to their faith.

One obvious measure of the officially sanctioned campaign of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union is the ease or restrictiveness of emigration. In 1983, only 1,314 Jews were permitted to emigrate from the Soviet Union. This represents the lowest level of Jewish emigration in 20 years, and the declining trend appears to be continuing in 1984. In March, only 51 Jews were allowed to leave the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Government, and the official Anti-Zionist Committee it established 1 year ago, would have the world believe that most of the Jews who wish to emigrate already now have done so. They assert, contrary to all evidence, that religious freedom is not an issue in the Soviet Union. We know this is deception; we must never forget the facts.

It is a fact that there are close to 3 million Jews today in the Soviet Union. It is a fact that at least 400,000 Jews have begun the difficult process of applying for emigrant visas. It is a fact that once a Soviet Jew has applied for a visa, he or she is subjected to KGB harassment, physical intimidation, and often outright dismissal from their jobs. Sadly, there is no insurance that conditions for Soviet Jews are improving in 1984.

Mr. President, the free world must continue to speak out against this injustice. The hopes of the beleaguered Jews of the Soviet Union rest on our efforts.

Anatoly Shcharansky's suffering in Chistopol Prison must teach us to never forget the fate awaiting observant Jews in the Soviet Union who do dare to speak out. In October 1983, Iosef Begun received a sentence of 12 years, for the crime of teaching Hebrew. Aleksandr Paritsky, Ida Nudel, Levi Elbert—the list goes on and on, of people yearning for freedom. We will not forget them.

I invite all my colleagues to join me in supporting Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry. May 6, 1984, can and must send an important message to the Government of the Soviet Union.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, today I am pleased to join in recognizing Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry.

Soviet Jewry faces a crisis in emigration. In 1979, Jewish emigration reached a highpoint of 51,320. In 1982, the number plummeted to 2,688. Last year, a mere 1,314 Soviet Jews were allowed to emigrate. To date in 1984 only 229 have been allowed to leave. Clearly this disturbing trend merits concern and condemnation.

As disturbing as these numbers are, it is even more unsettling to recognize the vicious turn that Soviet policy has taken. In April of last year, the Soviet Government organized an official Anti-Zionist Committee to renounce Zionism, hasten forced assimilation and foster anti-Semitism. Under the guise of anti-Zionism anti-Semitic articles have increased in the Soviet press in an attempt to cut through the very fiber of Jewish culture. The most outlandish attempt to break the will and spirit of the Jewish people purports that Soviet Jews collaborated with the Nazis during World War II. Such propaganda invokes chilling analogies; these are indeed ominous forces at work in the Soviet Union.

The Soviets appear to believe they are somehow punishing the United States for its hard-line policies. Moscow maintains Washington's tough talk rhetoric has seriously harmed United States-Soviet relations. In reaction to the current East-West chill, the Soviets have frozen shut emigration's door. Today I believe we must make the Soviet Union understand we will never forget Soviet Jewry and that a relaxation of emigration restrictions would send a promising signal. We must never unnecessarily escalate tensions with our principal adversary—for such escalation affects the very lives of those forcibly contained within Soviet borders.

I believe Solidarity Sunday helps to bring the difficulties of Soviet Jewry to the forefront of national and world attention. We all hope these efforts may someday convince the Soviets to end their use of Jews as political pawns and to respect their rights as human beings. We hope these efforts may someday show the Soviets that they must treat the Helsinki Accords as a serious international commitment.

It is a sad fact that injustice and anti-Semitism exist around the world—where Jews fear in the future the shadows of the past. It is a sad fact that Jews today still suffer many of the hardships and injustices they have endured for so many years. This sad legacy of the Jewish past must be interrupted. Anti-Semitism must be extinguished. We must continue to stand up for the principles of human liberty and religious freedom on which our Nation was founded. I salute the organizers and participants of Solidarity Sunday.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, May 6, 1984, will be the 13th annual Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry. On that day, Americans of all faiths will participate in rallies and other activities to show their support for Soviet Jews and their determination to force the Soviet Union to provide all of its citizens, Jewish and non-Jewish alike, with basic human rights and freedoms, including the freedom to emigrate. As one who has spent many years working on behalf of Soviet Jews and other oppressed peoples in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, I strongly support the campaign to be undertaken on Solidarity Sunday.

As a party to the U.N. Charter and various international covenants on human rights and as a signatory of the Helsinki Final Act, the Soviet Union has pledged respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Yet, it has repeatedly violated these pledges, especially in its treatment of Soviet Jews.

In recent years, discrimination against Jews, particularly in the areas of education and employment, has increased. Since 1980, the Soviet Government has stepped up its campaign against Jews who exercise their right of religious worship and/or participate in Jewish self-study groups. Those attempting to organize unofficial Jewish religous study groups have been subjected to threats of arrests, harassment, house searches, surveillance, and other forms of intimidation. This treatment is akin to that received by Jewish activists in the dissident, human rights, and emigration movements—men and women such as Anatoly Shcharansky, Iosif Begun, and Ida Nudel, to name only a few, who have endured unjust treatment to secure human rights for themselves and their fellow citizens. In an effort to escape the anti-Semitic policies and practices of the Soviet Government, many Soviet Jews have turned to emigration as a means of self-preservation. But emigration is no longer a solution. In fact, Soviet Jewish emigration is in a state of crisis.

In 1979, a record level of 51,320 Jews were allowed to leave the Soviet Union. Since that time, however, the annual rate of Jewish emigration has decreased steadily and markedly. In 1980, 21,471 Jews emigrated to the West. In 1981, 9,447 Jews were allowed to leave, and in 1982, Jewish emigration plummeted to 2,688. In 1983, only 1,315 Jews were permitted to leave. This figure is the lowest since the Jewish emigration movement began in the late 1960's; 1984 does not promise to reverse the trend. Only 229 Jews were allowed to leave in the first 3 months of this year. On the basis of an average monthly figure of 76, the total for 1984 will be approximately 912—a figure less than that of 1983 and a sure indication that the Soviet Union is trying to halt Jewish emigration entirely.

The frustration and despair of not being able to obtain an exit permit are compounded by the treatment which Soviet Jews receive after applying to emigrate. Many are removed from their jobs, evicted from their apartments, and subjected to constant harassment by the authorities.

Soviet Jews are crying out for our help. In the past, we have seen that the Soviet Union does respond to the pressure of public opinion from the West. On Solidarity Sunday, Americans will bring that pressure to bear once again. Senate Resolution 367, which I cosponsor, expresses Congress support for Solidarity Sunday and encourages Americans to take part in the important events to take place on that day.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution as a symbol of our commitment to Soviet Jews.

The resolution (S. Res. 367) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, and the preamble, are as follows:

S. RES. 367

Whereas on May 6, 1984, the constituent agencies of the Greater New York Conferences on Soviet Jewry will convene the thirteenth annual "Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry" in reaffirmation of the American People's resolve to secure freedom for Soviet Jews and beleaguered persons everywhere; and

Whereas Americans of all faiths will join in myriad activities on that day in public expression of soldarity with the long suffering Jewish community in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the right to emigrate freely and to be reunited with one's family abroad is denied Jews and many others in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations, and the Helsinki Final Act explicitly assert guarantees of those rights; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union has nevertheless continued to implement new restrictive measures further reducing the number of persons able to emigrate, bringing Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union to a virtual halt in 1983; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union is persecuting its Jewish citizens and denying them even those few rights and privileges accorded other recognized religions in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union discriminates against Jewish cultural activities by banning and suspending Hebrew and Jewish cultural classes, by arresting teachers of Hebrew, and by harassing those Soviet Jews who seek only to practice their religion; and

Whereas leading Soviet Jewish activist and prisoner of conscience Anatoly Shcharansky, who was arrested in March of 1977 and falsely charged with espionage and "anti-Soviet agitation", continues to suffer exceptionally harsh treatment in Chistopol prison; and

Whereas a virulent anti-Semitic campaign continues unabated in the Soviet Union and Soviet Jews are increasingly deprived of occupational and educational opportunities; and

Whereas thousands of innocent Jews and other persons, having applied to leave the Soviet Union, have been subjected to immediate induction into the armed forces, improper incarceration in mental institutions, explusion from school, and constant surveillance and harassment; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union will not succeed in isolating Soviet Jews from their friends in the free world so long as those who cherish liberty continue to speak on behalf of beleaguered people everywhere; and

Whereas "Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry" shall provide vigorous expression of American determination to secure freedom for Soviet Jewish prisoners of conscience incarcerated solely for their desire to emigrate; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union refuses to permit the free exercise of religious beliefs and cultural expression and also refuses to remove all obstacles to the free emigration of its Jewish citizens and others who wish to leave and live in other countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Congress fully supports "Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry" and encourages Americans to participate.

NATIONAL NURSING HOME RESIDENTS DAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 198) designating April 27, 1984, as "National Nursing Home Residents Day."

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues for their support of Senate Joint Resolution 198, designating April 27 of this year as "National Nursing Home Residents Day." I am pleased that the Senate has shown its approval of my efforts to gain recognition of a small but important segment of our population—the nursing home residents of this Nation.

I have introduced this legislation consistently over the past several years, and I want my colleagues to know that my efforts have been rewarded many times over by residents of these facilities who have shared with me the manner in which they have celebrated their special day. I can think of no better or more satisfying form of thanks.

In recent years the Congress has been, and will continue to be focusing its attentions on some very basic issues which will impact in a major way on the lives of our Nation's elderly—financing of the social security retirement system, restructuring of the medicare program, and the like. We are painfully aware of the need for our Nation to begin to ready itself for future health care needs. Among these will be a variety of alternatives to institutionalization. But the nursing home setting will remain a very necessary and important part of long-term health care.

And so it is of the greatest necessity that we remain aware of nursing home residents' needs, and that we do our utmost to see that these needs are met. I believe that recognition of a special day in honor of our nursing home residents is a first step toward the encouragement of community recognition of, and involvement in, the lives of nursing home residents, something which is so vitally needed.

Once again, I would like to thank my colleagues for their support of this measure.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 198) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution and preamble are as follows:

S.J. RES. 198

Whereas over one million older Americans reside in nursing homes and one in five older Americans likely will reside in a nursing home at some time;

Whereas nursing home residents have contributed to the growth, development, and progress of this Nation and, as elders, offer a wealth of knowledge and experience;

Whereas Congress recognizes the importance of the continued participation of these institutionalized senior citizens in the life of our Nation;

Whereas in an effort to foster reintegration of these citizens into their communities Congress encourages community recognition of and involvement in the lives of nursing home residents;

Whereas the Congress recognizes the importance of safeguarding the rights of nursing home residents; and

Whereas it is appropriate for the American people to join in support of nursing home residents to demonstrate their concern and respect for these citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 27, 1984, is designated as "National Nursing Home Residents Day", a time of renewed recognition, concern, and respect for the Nation's nursing home residents. The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

NATIONAL WOMEN VETERANS RECOGNITION WEEK

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 227) designating the week beginning November 11, 1984, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week."

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the author of this resolution, I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 227, a measure I introduced on February 7 to designate the week beginning November 11, 1984, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week." Joining with me as original cosponsors of this measure were the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, my good friend and colleague from Wyoming (Mr. SIMPSON), as well as Senators RANDOLPH, MATSUNAGA, DECONCINI, and INOUYE.

The response to this initiative has been very gratifying. In particular, I want to thank the chairman and ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, Senator THURMOND and Senator BIDEN, for their support and assistance in bringing this measure through the Judiciary Committee from which it was reported on April 12, and before the Senate so quickly.

Mr. President, despite the fact that many women have served bravely and well in the Armed Forces—there are at present 1.15 million women veterans—their service in the military has, until very recently, been largely ignored. As a consequence, for far too long neither did they receive the public recognition and thanks they deserved nor, in many instances, were they made aware of the many benefits available to them from the Federal Government because of their service.

In 1982, the General Accounting Office issued a report—GAO HRD 82-98—based on an important study requested by the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) on the VA's efforts to provide health care to women veterans. Although the GAO report focused directly only on medical benefits for women veterans, its findings highlighted the fact that many women veterans were unaware of the veterans' benefits available to them and that there were many shortcomings in the VA's efforts to locate and contact women veterans and to meet their needs for benefits and services.

Since that GAO report was issued, a number of important actions have increased the awareness of the contributions of women veterans. Most prominent was the establishment of a VA Advisory Committee on Women Veterans, first on an administrative basis last year by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Harry N. Walters, and in November 1983 by a statutory provision I authored in the Senate that was enacted in Public Law 98-160. The Advisory Committee will have its third meeting very shortly and has already issued its first set of recommendations to the VA Administrator. It is most gratifying that almost all of these recommendations were accepted by the Administrator. I believe that the Advisory Committee will continue to make many important contributions in the months and years ahead as it identifies problem areas in the Federal Government's response to women veterans and recommends solutions.

Another area relating to women veterans in which important steps have recently been taken involves access to VA health care. In Public Law 98-160,

the Congress enacted legislation I proposed directing the VA to "ensure that each VA health-care facility is able to provide appropriate care, in a timely fashion, for any gender-specific disability of a woman veteran." The VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery has issued several directives to its facilities across the country in order to try to insure that all of its health-care facilities are aware of women veterans' health-care needs and are prepared to meet them. I hope that these steps will result in meaningful progress toward correcting the problems identified by the GAO.

Mr. President, I have been involved for several years in another area of concern to many women veterans—namely efforts to see that studies of the health effects of exposure to the herbicide agent orange that was sprayed in Vietnam include examination of its possible effects on the women who served there. I am happy to say that some progress is finally being made on this score as well. However, the way this has occurred clearly demonstrates how the needs and service of women veterans have so often been overlooked.

As we undertook efforts to insure that women were included in studies on agent orange, it became apparent that little was known about the women who served in Vietnam. In fact, when I first began my inquiries in this area, no one even knew how many women had served there. Consequently, the scientific community expressed doubt that valid epidemiological study of women Vietnam veterans could be accomplished.

To its credit, the Army Agent Orange Task Force, headed by a very energetic and exacting individual, Mr. Richard Christian, undertook to determine, through manual review of military records, how many women served in Vietnam and their names. He recognized the need for this information and believed that his task force, working in conjunction with representatives from the other three services, had the ability to research and provide the information.

As a direct result of the efforts of the Army Agent Orange Task Force, the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta is presently evaluating the feasibility of conducting a study of women veterans as one component of the epidemiological study of Vietnam veterans mandated by Public Law 96-151 and modified by Public Law 97-72. As the author of these statutory provisions on the study, I am very pleased at this development and will continue working to insure that this component is carried out.

Mr. President, I ask that a March 27, 1984, letter to me from Mr. Christian, detailing the Army Agent Orange Task Force's progress in identifying women Vietnam veterans, be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, despite the important strides made on behalf of women veterans, a concern lingers that far too many citizens remain unaware of the contributions women veterans have made to our Nation. It is for this reason that I proposed with my colleagues that the week beginning on Veterans' Day this year be designated as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week." Our goal has been and is to provide a fitting and proper focus on the many contributions of women veterans over the years. Such a week, with appropriate ceremonies and events, should help bring these patriotic women into public view and gain for them the proper degree of recognition they so richly deserve.

Thus, I am delighted by the warm reception and the rapid consideration that Senate Joint Resolution 227 has received in the Senate. I hope and strongly urge that our colleagues in the other body will take swift action to insure enactment of this measure in time to allow advance publicity of the week it proposes to proclaim.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
ARMY AGENT ORANGE TASK FORCE,
Washington, DC, March 27, 1984.

Hon. ALAN CRANSTON,
Ranking Minority Committee Member on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: This is in response to your letter of April 11, 1983 regarding the Veterans' Affairs Committee hearings held on March 9 and 10, 1983. During the hearings, you indicated that a lack of reliable data existed on the number of women who served in the Armed Forces in the Vietnam War. You requested that I provide, for the record, information on the status of the project to identify these veterans. I submitted testimony that the research was underway and more complete data would be furnished to the committee in 12 months.

With the exception of the Air Force which had the needed information available on computer, this effort has been time consuming as units involved in the Vietnam War did not maintain separate lists of assigned women. Consequently, a manual analysis was required of personnel reporting records of the many units known to have, or believed to have had, women attached.

The most reliable data sources were morning reports, personnel diaries, distribution control reports and, in certain cases, computer tapes. These provided personnel information. Organizational and historical records, as well as oral histories, were also of use.

To date we have determined that women were assigned to 92 U.S. Army units in Vietnam. The Air Force has identified 33 units and the Navy, eight. Marine Corps women were assigned to Headquarters, Military Assistance Command Vietnam and Commander Naval Forces Vietnam.

From these units we have been able to identify 5,816 women who served in the Vietnam area of operations between 1961 and 1973. A breakdown by service reveals the following distribution of women: 4,588 (Army), 771 (Air Force), 421 (Navy), and 36 (Marine Corps). We are continuing our research and will keep you informed.

I am happy to be of assistance in this important matter.

Sincerely,

RICHARD S. CHRISTIAN, C.R.M.,
Director, Environmental Support Group.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 227) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution and preamble are as follows:

S.J. RES. 227

Whereas there are more than one million one hundred thousand women veterans in this country, representing 4.1 per centum of the total veteran population;

Whereas the number and proportion of women veterans will continue to grow as the number and proportion of women serving in the Armed Forces continue to increase;

Whereas women veterans through honorable military service often involving hardship and danger have contributed greatly to our national security;

Whereas the contributions and sacrifices of women veterans on behalf of this Nation have not been adequately recognized;

Whereas this lack of recognition has denied women veterans the public appreciation and praise they deserve;

Whereas the special needs of women veterans, especially in the area of health care, have often been overlooked or inadequately addressed by the Federal Government;

Whereas this lack of attention to the special needs of women veterans has discouraged or prevented women veterans from taking full advantage of the benefits and services to which they are entitled as veterans of the United States Armed Forces; and

Whereas recognition of women veterans by the Congress and the President throught enactment of legislation declaring the week beginning on November 11, 1984, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week" would serve to create greater public awareness and recognition of the contributions of women veterans, to express the Nation's appreciation for their service, and to inspire more responsive care and services for women veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning on November 11, 1984, is designated "National Women Veterans Recognition Week". The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon all citizens, community leaders, interested organizations, and government officials to observe that week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

NATIONAL ASTHMA AND ALLERGY AWARENESS WEEK

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 244) designating the week beginning on May 6, 1984, as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution and preamble are as follows:

S.J. RES. 244

Whereas asthma and allergic diseases result in physical, emotional, and economic hardship for more than thirty-five million Americans and their families;

Whereas thousands of Americans, many of them young, die each year from asthma even though sufficient medical knowledge and resources exist to prevent many asthma-related deaths;

Whereas student absenteeism is due in significant part to asthma and allergic diseases;

Whereas environmental conditions in the workplace often cause or exacerbate asthma and allergic diseases among employees;

Whereas many hospital patients suffer allergic reactions to prescribed medications;

Whereas it is estimated that the American public pays $2,000,000,000 per year in medical bills directly attributable to the treatment and diagnosis of asthma and allergic diseases and pays another $2,000,000,000 per year as a result of the indirect social cost of such illnesses;

Whereas, because of recent developments in the study of immunology, health care providers are better equipped to diagnose and treat asthma and allergic diseases; and

Whereas increased public awareness of recent scientific advancements in the study of immunology will help dispel many of the common misconceptions concerning asthma, allergic diseases, and the victims of those illnesses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning on May 6, 1984, is hereby designated as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the several items were passed and/or agreed to.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

COMMITTEES DISCHARGED FROM CONSIDERATION AND BILLS PLACED ON CALENDAR—H.R. 3259, H.R. 3376, AND H.R. 3555

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have a few other brief matters that I shall run through quickly.

I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Indian Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3259, a bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pueblo DeCochiti, and that the bill be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Indian Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3376, a bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Makah Indian Tribe, and that the bill be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Indian Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3555, a bill to declare certain lands held by the Seneca Nation of Indians to be part of the Allegany Reservation in the State of New York, and that the bill be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS PLACED ON CALENDAR—H.R. 4170 AND H.R. 5394

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate receives from the House of Representatives H.R. 4170, the House tax bill, it be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate receives from the House H.R. 5394, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1984 Medicare and Medicaid Budget Reconciliation Amendments of 1984, it be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CREDIT AND DEBIT CARD COUNTERFEITING AND FRAUD ACT OF 1983

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate S. 1870, Calendar Order No. 725.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1870) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide penalties for credit and debit card counterfeiting and related fraud.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments:

On page 2, line 6, strike "in circumstances" and insert "in a circumstance".

On page 2, line 9, after "buys," insert "receives".

On page 2, line 11, after "knowingly," insert "and with intent to defraud or transfer unlawfully,".

On page 2, line 13, strike "with intent to defraud or transfer unlawfully,"

On page 3, strike lines 2 through 4 and insert:

for not more than fifteen years, or both, if the offense involves—

"(A) any device-making equipment;

"(B) five or more fraudulent payment devices; or

"(C) money, goods, services or any other things of value aggregating $20,000 or more in value in any one or more transactions occurring in any twelve-month period; or

On page 3, line 16, strike "circumstances" and insert "circumstance".

On page 4, line 3, strike "existing for the purpose of obtaining," and insert "that can be used".

On page 4, line 5, after "device" insert "to obtain".

On page 4, line 6, strike "for the purpose of initiating" and insert "that can be used to initiate".

On page 4, line 14, after "incomplete" insert "expired, revoked, canceled".

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Credit and Debit Card Counterfeiting and Fraud Act of 1983".

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new section 1029 at the end thereof:

"§ 1029. Fraud and related activity in connection with payment devices

"(a) Whoever, in a circumstance described in subsection (c) of this section—

"(1) knowingly and with intent to defraud, produces, buys, receives, sells, or transfers a fraudulent payment device;

"(2) knowingly, and with intent to defraud or transfer unlawfully, possesses or has control or custody of, five or more fraudulent payment devices;

"(3) knowingly produces, buys, sells, transfers, has control or custody of, or possesses device-making equipment, with the intent that such equipment be used in the production of a fraudulent payment device; or

"(4) attempts or conspires to do so,

shall be punished as provided in subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) The punishment for an offense under subsection (a) of this section is—

"(1) a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than ten years, or both;

"(2) a fine of not more than $50,000 or imprisonment for not more than fifteen years, or both, if the offense involves—

"(A) any device-making equipment;

"(B) five or more fraudulent payment devices; or

"(C) money, goods, services or any other things of value aggregating $20,000 or more in value in any one or more transactions occurring in any twelve-month period; or

"(3) a fine of not more than $100,000 or imprisonment for not more than twenty years, or both, in the case of second or repeated offenses.

"(c) The circumstance referred to in subsection (a) of this section is that—

"(1) the offense affects a financial institution or interstate or foreign commerce;

"(2) the offender in the course of the offense uses an instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce; or

"(3) the fraudulent payment device or device-making equipment, or any aspect or component thereof, has been in interstate or foreign commerce.

"(d) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'payment device' means any card, plate, code, account number, or other means of account that can be used, alone or in conjunction with another payment device, to obtain money, goods, services, or any other thing of value, or that can be used to initiate a transfer of funds (other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument);

"(2) the term 'fraudulent payment device' means—

"(A) any payment device or a representation, depiction, facsimile, aspect or component of a payment device that is counterfeit, fictitious, altered, forged, lost, stolen, incomplete, expired, revoked, canceled, fraudulently obtained or obtained as part of a scheme to defraud; or

"(B) any invoice, voucher, sales draft, or other reflection or manifestation of such a device;

"(3) the term 'produce' means to make, design, alter, authenticate, duplicate, or assemble;

"(4) the term 'financial institution' means an institution that holds deposits or accounts insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, or the National Credit Union Administration; and

"(5) the term 'device-making equipment' means any equipment, mechanism, or impression designed, used, or that can be used to produce a payment device, a fraudulent payment device, or any aspect or component thereof.".

"(e) The United States Secret Service shall have jurisdiction to investigate offenses under this section, in addition to any other agency having such jurisdiction.".

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 47 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"1029. Fraud and related activity in connection with payment devices.".

Mr. BAKER. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 1870, the Credit and Debit Card Counterfeiting and Fraud Act of 1983. I was pleased to have had the opportunity to work with Senator THURMOND and representatives of the credit card industry in developing this legislation which takes aim at providing more effective penalties for credit card and debit card fraud. As a cosponsor of S. 1870, I would urge my colleagues to join in my support of this effort to strengthen penalties against the fraudulent use of credit cards.

In the context of enacting major revisions to the Criminal Code, the Committee on the Judiciary has been frequently approached by groups representing important commercial interests who wish to see Federal criminal jurisdiction expanded to deal with particular problems of their industry. The difficulty arises when the harsh reality is faced that the Federal enforcement resources are quite limited.

The fact is that hard choices must be made by Federal enforcement authorities as to which areas of the Federal criminal law will receive the primary thrust of enforcement activities. Testimony received during the course of the hearings on S. 1870 from Justice Department officials made it abundantly clear that credit fraud enforcement would command a relatively low priority, unless, for example, a particular case involved a nationwide scheme by organized crime. It would be impossible to have the FBI investigate every possible case of credit card fraud—even if all other Federal enforcement activities came to a halt.

Under these circumstances it becomes incumbent on the credit industry to adopt self-help measures which reduce the likelihood of credit card abuse. The industry—in the early 1970's, acting in cooperation with the National Bureau of Standards—adopted uniform specifications on the dimensions of credit cards. Likewise, credit companies should be encouraged to develop and apply new card identification technology to reduce the potential for fraud and abuse. Cost-effective means can be developed and implemented that will insure the reliability of credit card transactions.

IDENTIFICATION DOCUMENT FRAUD

During the first session of the 98th Congress, the Judiciary Committee held 3 days of hearings on S. 1706, my bill dealing with abuses of Federal identification systems. This bill would amend the Federal Criminal Code to move toward the positive identification of persons holding identification documents. It is intended to serve as a vehicle to focus executive and congressional attention on the confusion, conflict, and redundancy which now exists in the various Federal and State identification systems, to explore the dimensions of the problem, and develop possible solutions.

The May 12, 1983, report of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations dealing with Federal identification fraud underscores the tremendous need for reforms. The report shows that this fraud is costing the taxpayers, through various Federal, State, and local entitlement programs, in excess of $24 billion annually. Illegal aliens have easy access to identification documents such as social security cards, birth certificates, and drivers licenses. At present, more than 7,000 agencies using more than 1,000 different formats issue original or duplicate birth certificates. These certificates are then used to obtain drivers licenses, passports, social security cards, food stamp identification cards, and innumerable additional documents. These documents then enable fraud artists to collect unemployment compensation, food stamps, tax refunds, student loans, and other Government benefits. The problem is serious and its magnitude expands with each passing year.

S. 1706 has now passed the Senate in the form of a committee amendment to the omnibus crime bill, S. 1762.

DOLE AMENDMENT

Mr. President, I shall offer an amendment aimed at establishing the goal of positive verification for credit card transactions. This amendment would be compatible with the positive identification objective of S. 1706. If approved, it would encourage and assist private industry to help itself in dealing with the problem of credit card fraud. To the extent that the bona fides of a particular credit card transaction can be established at the time of the transaction, the opportunity for fraud and abuse will be greatly reduced.

Discussions have been held with representatives of the credit card manufacturers and issuers. I understand that the proposed amendment is not opposed by those groups who have been urging passage of the legislation before us today.

The industry should work with Federal and State officials having responsibility for the development and operation of identification documents to standarize identification data elements and formats. Perhaps someday, it will be possible for fraud-proof identification documents to be utilized directly for credit or debit transactions in automated point-of-sale systems.

Rapidly developing technology in the field will allow highly reliable means of identity verification on a real-time basis. This technology should be utilized to eliminate fraud and abuse as well as redundancy and unnecessary expense.

I appreciate the willingness of the floor managers to accommodate me on this matter.

AMENDMENT NO. 3029

(Purpose: To encourage the establishment of a system to positively verify persons holding and using payment devices)

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), for Mr. DOLE, proposes an amendment numbered 3029.

On page 4, add the following after the matter which follows line 23:

SEC. 3. As soon as feasible, reliable, and economically viable, all persons who produce, have control or custody of or possess device-making equipment, or systems utilizing payment devices should attempt to establish a system or systems which are capable of positively verifying the holder of such payment device or the transaction in which such device is or has been utilized while minimizing intrusions on personal privacy.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, the amendment to S. 1870 offered by Senator DOLE is an important addition to the Credit and Debit Card Counterfeiting and Fraud Act. It calls upon the credit industry to take steps to protect itself against credit-card fraud

and abuse. I commend the Senator from Kansas for his initiative, which encourages the industry's self-help efforts, in connection with legislation that will also bring Federal law enforcement resources to bear on this serious and growing problem.

I am also pleased that Senator DOLE has agreed to include in his amendment language encouraging efforts to minimize intrusions on personal privacy. Clearly, the Senator from Kansas recognizes that improvements in security in credit and debit card systems may involve tradeoffs in privacy protection.

Credit is an essential ingredient in our economy. Few Americans can satisfy their needs for food, clothing, shelter, and transportation without taking advantage of extensions of credit. Banks, insurance companies, and other financial institutions have by now amassed extensive data banks containing a wide variety of information about the millions of Americans who have borrowed money for one reason or another. The widespread computerization of these data banks has made it easier than ever to collect, store, manipulate, and retrieve this personal information. While important steps have been taken, both through industry self-regulation and through legislation on the State and Federal levels, to subject these data banks to controls designed to protect privacy, the fact remains that data banks in the hands of private financial institutions pose a real threat to the right to privacy.

The establishment of positive verification mechanisms for credit and debit card systems is an important and worthwhile goal. Its achievement will prevent the loss of tens of millions of dollars that are today misappropriated every year by credit-card criminals. All law-abiding users of credit will benefit from this savings. But positive verification mechanisms may also exact a price from each of the millions of Americans involved in the credit system. That price may be as minimal as the inconvenience of memorizing yet another random number in order to be permitted access to an approved line of credit. But that price may also be as intrusive as the demand to submit a fingerprint, voiceprint, or some other physical exemplar in order to establish one's right to use a credit or debit card. I do not think that the U.S. Senate should adopt an attitude of neutrality toward the choice among the proposed alternative means of attaining positive verification of the identity of persons presenting credit or debit cards or similar payment devices.

Mr. President, the Senate has demonstrated its continuing concern about issues of privacy by creating a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee with explicit jurisdiction over privacy matters. As chairman of this subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Patents, Copyrights, and Trademarks, I am committed to protecting the privacy of Americans against the challenges posed by a host of powerful new technologies, including those incorporated into today's sophisticated credit and debit card systems. I know that the senior Senator from Kansas, who is a valued member of that subcommittee, shares my commitment. I commend him for his sensible amendment to S. 1870, and I look forward to working with him in the months ahead to explore more fully these complex and important issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3029) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3030

(Purpose: To make a technical change in the short title of the bill)

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment by Mr. THURMOND and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), for the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) proposes an amendment numbered 3030: On page 1, line 4, strike out "1983" and insert "1984".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3030) was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as the sponsor of S. 1870, the Credit and Debit Card Counterfeiting and Fraud Act, I urge my colleagues to join me in strong support of this important measure. Since I introduced the bill last September, this has been a bipartisan undertaking by the Judiciary Committee, which has also enjoyed great cooperation from numerous members of the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee. Cosponsors of the bill include the ranking minority member of the Judicary Committee, Senator JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.; the chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Law, Senator PAUL LAXALT; the chairman of the Banking Committee, Senator JAKE GARN; and the distinguished Senator from New York, ALFONSE D'AMATO.

I introduced S. 1870 after consultations with affected industry representatives, the Department of Justice, and the Secret Service. It responds to the recent substantial increase in the counterfeiting of credit and debit cards, and related fraudulent activities by correcting certain inadequacies in current Federal criminal law. It is patterned after legislation enacted in the 97th Congress in response to the equally troublesome phenomenon of false identification.

As reported by the Judicary Committee, S. 1870 would create new Federal offenses in title 18 of the United States Code relating to manufacturing and trafficking in counterfeit credit and debit cards. Specifically, where jurisdictional requirements are met, it would make it illegal to:

First, knowingly and with intent to defraud, produce, buy, receive or transfer fraudulent payment devices;

Second, knowingly, and with intent to defraud or transfer unlawfully, possess five or more fraudulent payment devices; or

Third, knowingly produce, buy, transfer, or possess equipment capable of producing fraudulent payment devices.

Attempts and conspiracies to commit these offenses are also punishable under the bill.

Mr. President, the Judiciary Committee received compelling testimony concerning the nature and magnitude of the counterfeiting and fraud problems in this country relating to credit and debit cards. For instance, according to the American Bankers Association, losses stemming from VISA and Mastercard counterfeiting and alteration activities increased from $175,000 in 1978 to more than $25 million in 1982. Witnesses also indicated that these activities are frequently the work of traditional organized crime and crime rings formed specifically for these purposes. In order to provide an effective deterrent, the bill contains stiff maximum penalties for the offenses which I have outlined. The basic penalty is $10,000 and/or 10 years of imprisonment. Where device-making equipment, five or more devices, or large losses are involved, the penalty is $50,000 and/or 15 years of imprisonment. Finally, for repeat offenders, the penalty is $100,000 and/or 20 years of imprisonment.

The amendment sponsored by Senator DOLE would express the sense of Congress that, as soon as feasible and economically viable, persons producing or possessing device-making equipment, or systems utilizing payment devices, should attempt to establish reliable systems which are capable of positively verifying cardholders or the transaction. We all recognize, as the Justice Department did in its testimony before the committee, that a Federal law alone will not be sufficient to quell the rising tide of counterfeiting and other fraudulent activities. This must be a joint effort between government and industry if we are to succeed. This provision is exhortatory only and would not, of course, serve as a basis for any criminal or civil proceeding.

Based on discussions with the Treasury Department, we anticipate that

any costs incurred in fiscal year 1984 in connection with enforcement efforts relating to these new offenses would be absorbed in existing appropriations.

Mr. President, S. 1870 is urgently needed legislation. According to the International Association of Credit Card Investigators, which is composed of many State and local law enforcement members, where major traffickers and manufacturers are involved. Federal assistance is essential. I therefore urge my colleagues to support S. 1870 and its prompt enactment.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, as a cosponsor, I rise to speak in support of the legislation entitled the "Credit and Debit Card Counterfeiting and Fraud Act of 1984." This bill will assist Federal agencies in the investigation and prosecution of a growing crime problem that has ties to organized crime.

The American Bankers Association, a supporter of the bill, estimates that losses from VISA and MasterCard counterfeiting and alteration of cards have increased one hundred and fifty-fold, from $175,000 in 1978 to more than $25 million in 1982. The Justice Department estimates that the losses from bank robberies were approximately one-third of those attributable to credit card fraud in 1982.

My interest in the bill goes beyond protecting banks from economic loss. I am also very concerned about the loss to the consumer. Consumers lose every time their bank is, in effect, held up by the use of a fraudulent or counterfeit credit card. Those unfortunate citizens who have their own cards stolen suffer a financial loss and must pay an inflated cost of goods charged by retailers who must protect themselves from business losses due to processing counterfeit credit cards. Consumers as well as banks must be protected from the increasing incidence of these crimes and the Federal Government has the resources to assist them, particularly with respect to large-scale organizations that have become involved in complex networks of counterfeiting and fraud.

My one concern about this bill was how to insure that the relationship between State and local law enforcement and the Federal agencies is coordinated in the investigation and prosecution of these offenses. Witnesses at the hearing chaired by Senator THURMOND, documented the need for Federal involvement in appropriate cases. The increasing sophistication and organized nature of these activities makes Federal involvement and resources useful, particularly where counterfeiting activities take place in connection with other criminal endeavors, such as drug trafficking and the manufacture of false identification. Second, the interstate and international aspects of the problem were amply demonstrated at the committee's hearing. Finally, the involvement of federally chartered banks and financial institutions and Federal regulation of credit cards and electronic funds transfers serve as additional reason for Federal criminal legislation.

While the Federal interest is clear, witnesses testifying before the committee emphasized that Federal involvement was not desirable in small or routine cases. I agree with this and am satisfied the bill reported by the Judiciary Committee calls for Federal involvement only on major counterfeiting and trafficking activities. Provisions of the bill that require an offense must affect a financial institution or interstate commerce or foreign commerce before there is Federal jurisdiction, adequately resolves my concern.

I compliment Chairman THURMOND for his expedience in moving this bill to the Senate floor. As in the past, I enjoyed working with the chairman as a cosponsor of this bill and in guiding another important piece of crime legislation through the Judiciary Committee and now before the full Senate.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, are there further amendments to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are no further amendments.

If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1870

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Credit and Debit Card Counterfeiting and Fraud Act of 1984".

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new section 1029 at the end thereof:

"§ 1029. Fraud and related activity in connection with payment devices

"(a) Whoever, in a circumstance described in subsection (c) of this section—

"(1) knowingly and with intent to defraud, produces, buys, receives, sells, or transfers a fraudulent payment device;

"(2) knowingly, and with intent to defraud or transfer unlawfully, possesses or has control or custody of, five or more fraudulent payment devices;

"(3) knowingly produces, buys, sells, transfers, has control or custody of, or possesses device-making equipment, with the intent that such equipment be used in the production of a fraudulent payment device; or

"(4) attempts or conspires to do so,

shall be punished as provided in subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) The punishment for an offense under subsection (a) of this section is—

"(1) a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than ten years, or both;

"(2) a fine of not more than $50,000 or imprisonment for not more than fifteen years, or both, if the offense involves—

"(A) any device-making equipment;

"(B) five or more fraudulent payment devices; or

"(C) money, goods, services or any other things of value aggregating $20,000 or more in value in any one or more transactions occuring in any twelve-month period; or

"(3) a fine of not more than $100,000 or imprisonment for not more than twenty years, or both, in the case of second or repeated offenses.

"(c) The circumstance referred to in subsection (a) of this section is that—

"(1) the offense affects a financial institution or interstate or foreign commerce;

"(2) the offender in the course of the offense uses an instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce; or

"(3) the fraudulent payment device or device-making equipment, or any aspect or component thereof, has been in interstate or foreign commerce.

"(d) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'payment device' means any card, plate, code, account number, or other means of account access that can be used, alone or in conjunction with another payment device, to obtain money, goods, services, or any other thing of value, or that can be used to initiate a transfer of funds (other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument);

"(2) the term 'fraudulent payment device' means—

"(A) any payment device or a representation, depiction, facsimile, aspect or component of a payment device that is counterfeit, fictitious, altered, forged, lost, stolen, incomplete, expired, revoked, canceled, fraudulently obtained or obtained as part of a scheme to defraud; or

"(B) any invoice, voucher, sales draft, or other reflection or manifestation of such a device;

"(3) the term 'produce' means to make, design, alter, authenticate, duplicate, or assemble;

"(4) the term 'financial institution' means an institution that holds deposits or accounts insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, or the National Credit Union Administration; and

"(5) the term 'device-making equipment' means any equipment, mechanism, or impression designed, used, or that can be used to produce a payment device, a fraudulent payment device, or any aspect or component thereof."

"(e) The United States Secret Service shall have jurisdiction to investigate offenses under this section, in addition to any other agency having such jurisdiction.".

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 47 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"1029. Fraud and related activity in connection with payment devices.".

SEC. 3. As soon as feasible, reliable, and economically viable, all persons who produce, have control or custody of or possess device-making equipment, or systems utilizing payment devices should attempt to establish a system or systems which are capable of positively verifying the holder of such payment device or the transaction in which such device is or has been utilized while minimizing intrusions on personal privacy.

Mr. BAKER. I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed.

Mr. BAKER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ARMENIAN MARTYRS' DAY

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the 20th century has tragically seen unprecedented mass slaughter of whole peoples. Yesterday we commemorated the 69th anniversary of Armenian Martyrs Day. In 1915 and for several years thereafter, an estimated 1.5 million Armenians were killed or died of hunger, disease, and exposure in the forced killing or dispersal of the Armenian population of the lands that had formed the old Ottoman Empire.

The Armenians we honor today were sadly not the last ethnic identity to be threatened by mass extermination in our century. The Nazi Holocaust sought to eliminate the Jews, and in recent years millions of Cambodians have been slaughtered.

Our purpose is thus twofold. We are here to honor the memory of the Armenian martyrs and the Armenian heritage that lives on and has made a significant contribution to our own country. We are here also to pledge our best efforts to insure that there are not future genocides and that all ethnic identities are free to live in peace and security.

THANK YOU, SECRETARIES

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, saying thank you is not always an easy thing. The hurried pace of events here as elsewhere in the working world, often causes us to ask much of others without properly thanking them. And so we in Congress designate days in which to express the Nation's gratitude to many of the people whom we often forget to thank.

Today, Mr. President, is Professional Secretaries Day, a day set aside to express publicly our appreciation to secretaries for the contributions they make. Without secretaries, my office, most certainly, would cease to function. My office is a busy place, and virtually every matter of business which must be attended to involves a secretary in one way or another. I cannot imagine what I or my staff would do without them.

Indeed, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the secretaries in my office: Ms. Vicki Bear, Ms. Emily Cavanagh, Ms. Fran Cochran, Ms. Kelley Prunesti, and Ms. Julie Smith. Each is a treasure without par. I do not always remember to thank them. I wish to do so now. Thank you Emily, Fran, Kelley, Julie, and Vicki. I and everyone else in the office, owes you more than we could imagine—and far more, I am sure, than you would ever let us know. I am proud to have all of you on my staff. Indeed, to Kelley Prunesti I extend my best wishes for a speedy recovery. We miss you and hope to have you back with us again soon.

PLAY BALL

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, last Tuesday, April 17, I had the pleasure of attending the baseball home opener of the Milwaukee Brewers; 53,038 fans braved 40-degree weather, 16-mile-an-hour winds, rain, snow, and sleet to see the Brewers defeat the Chicago White Sox 7 to 3.

Milwaukee, America's 16th largest city, had baseball's second largest opening day crowd this year. A real tribute to the team, the management and the ownership of the Milwaukee Brewers.

The Wisconsin baseball tradition contrasts sharply with some other franchises and I would like to share with my colleagues the baseball commentary by Lewis H. Lapham in the April 21 edition of the Washington Post. Mr. Lapham laments in his article about a baseball owner's degradation of America's great pastime and the fantasies of the fans were they to be owners.

The "owner-to-be" fans nostalgically agreed that their team would be as in the days of yesteryear: No electronic scoreboard, no instant replay. The team would travel by train and their salaries would be on par with the President of the United States. Relief pitchers would walk from the bullpen. And the beer served is from the local brewery.

But it is 1984, not 1944, and Milwaukee has its electronic scoreboard, an instant replay machine, salaries higher then the President's, a mascot who slides down a beer mug after each win, and double-knit uniforms. And even though we wish our baseball heroes wore belted uniforms made of wool—baggy trousers and socks worn high, just below the knee, we can be thankful in Milwaukee for owners who revere the franchise and the fans.

Wisconsin is blessed with civic leaders who happen to also be the owners of the Milwaukee Brewers. The team is a part of the heart of our city and our State and the players give of themselves in youth work, beautification programs and other civic works.

Milwaukee is a very lucky baseball franchise. And we can thank Bud Selig, Harry Dalton and the other owners. Their ownership goals for baseball and Milwaukee are dreams and hopes of the fans. They are fans who happen to be owners.

Spring is here. The fans are in the stands. "Play ball" are the two most melodic words we hear. And things just seem a little better today—baseball's back.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AND NOW BACK TO THE GAME

(By Lewis H. Lapham)

NEW YORK.—On opening day at Yankee Stadium, the cognoscenti behind first base talked mostly about the avarice of George Steinbrenner. Nobody bothered to say much about the game in progress against the Minnesota Twins. After a week on the road, the Yankees already looked dispirited and old, as if they were playing out their sentences on a prison team in West Texas. The concensus of opinion in the field-level seats held that Steinbrenner would fire Yogi Berra as manager before July 4, and that after the usual trades and recriminations, the team would finish a poor fourth in the Eastern Division behind Baltimore, Toronto and Detroit.

What was left to talk about except the ways in which the principal owner had degraded the great American game? The television screen in right center field was showing commercials, and a Dixieland jazz band was trying to make what it thought was a happy sound. The pregame ceremonies had involved a fund-raising spiel for the 1984 Olympics; a tiny figure skater, cute as a button in sneakers and designer jeans, had thrown out the first ball.

"Maybe next year Steinbrenner will hire cheerleaders," a fan wearing a Brooklyn Dodgers cap said.

"Maybe," said somebody else, "he'll rent advertising space in the latrines."

Within a community of about five rows, the fans in residence had accumulated roughly 200 years of attendance at baseball games. Their disgust with Steinbrenner was unequivocal, but they understood that the man's swinishness was symptomatic of the times. The game had been lost to the networks and the big money, and it was hard to conceive of an owner who wouldn't put his mother out on waivers.

Before the end of the fourth inning, the cognoscenti had lost interest in the events on the field, and they began to speculate on what they would do if they owned a team in some congenial city, possibly Cleveland or St. Louis. "Almost anywhere except New York," said the fan in the Dodgers cap. "In New York, the media eats out the heart of a thing."

Drinking beer they were sure had been watered by Steinbrenner's thieving concessionaires, the fans comforted themselves with the dream of innocence regained. I didn't take notes, but as best as I can remember their desiderata, they agreed—in no particular order of importance—on the following points:

Dimensions of park: Irregular and designed for baseball. No ovals, domes or bowls.

Hot dogs: Standard size. The vendors apply the mustard with a stick.

Designated hitters: None, not even if the team is in the American League.

Night games: None.

Gloves: Standard size and color. No gloves that look like jai alai baskets.

Relief pitchers: All must walk from the bullpen, slowly and with an ambling gait. No golf carts; no Toyotas.

Billboard advertising: Accepted only from local merchants. A sign in left center field

promises a free suit to any batter who can bounce a ball off it.

Televised games: Limited to 26 away games, two with each of the other teams in the league.

Center field bleacher seats: Distributed free to local youth groups. All other bleacher seats sell for $1.

Scoreboard: Not electronic. A spotter climbs a ladder and places the number in the slot. No television screens in the park; no instant replays; no neon exclamations of joy.

Misconduct in the stands: Suppressed without apology or delay.

Beer: Supplied in long-necked bottles by a local brewery. The vendors open the bottle in the presence of the patron.

Playing field: Grass. When obliged to play on astroturf in alien arenas, the team files a formal protest.

Uniforms: Belted and made of wool. No polyester or double-knit materials. Trousers must be baggy in shape, and socks must be worn high, just below the knee.

Travel: By train—whenever distance and schedule permit.

Names of players; Traditional—Roy, Eddie, Early, Moose, Buck, Tim, Mickey.

Radio announcers: Former players whose voices reflect their border-state origins.

Security of franchise: Absolute. The owners sign a binding agreement with the municipal authorities. Even to make jokes about selling the team to Indianapolis is cause for a public hearing.

Mascots and clowns: Shot on sight.

Salaries: On a par with salaries paid to the chief justice of the Supreme Court and the president of the United States. The baseball club doesn't make deals in the free agent market. Players come up through the farm system.

In the middle of the seventh inning, a cynic suggested that a team operated on such noble principles surely would go broke. The fan in the Dodgers cap thought otherwise. "On the contrary, gentlemen," he said, "the team would earn a fortune."

Such a team, he said, would be the wonder of the world. The mercenary pygmies employed elsewhere in the league would learn the meaning of the game. Even fans as debased as those in New York would pay to see ballplayers made of the old stuff.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. MARK WAYNE CLARK

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on April 17, 1984, one of America's finest soldiers, my very good friend, Gen. Mark Wayne Clark, passed away at the age of 87. He was the last of our legendary World War II field commanders to die, taking his place in history alongide Generals Eisenhower, MacArthur, Patton, and Bradley.

I was honored to attend his funeral at the Citadel in Charleston, SC, and I want to again extend my sincere condolences to his devoted wife, Mary, son, Bill, five grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren.

From his birth at a military post in New York, to his burial at the Citadel, General Clark was consumed with a strong desire to serve his country in the Armed Forces. Born the son of an Army infantry colonel, he aspired to a similar destiny, graduating from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1917, and subsequently pursuing an illustrious military career which spanned nearly 40 years of his life. When asked several years ago how he wanted to be remembered, the four-star general humbly replied, "For what I am: A military man."

However, history will remember General Clark as being much more than a military man. Indeed, he will be immortalized as a military giant whose undying patriotism and courageous leadership elevated him to a position of preeminence as a great defender of freedom throughout the world.

Early in 1943, General Clark was promoted to commanding general of the U.S. 5th Army, which invaded Italy and soundly defeated the Italian and German forces of Mussolini and Hitler. The liberation of Rome, which General Clark called the proudest accomplishment of his life, stands as one of the many great achievements of his distinguished Army career.

Perhaps one of his most famous accomplishments occurred in 1952, when as commander in chief of the United Nations Command, he signed the military armistice agreement between the United Nations Command and the North Korean Army and the Chinese forces, thus marking the end of the Korean war in 1953.

The end of the Korean conflict drew to a close General Clark's remarkable career on active duty, yet, his service to our national defense continued for many years following.

Shortly after his retirement, then South Carolina Gov. James F. Byrnes recommended him to take on the duties of the president of the Citadel in 1953. For 11 years, he performed his administrative duties there with the same high standards which typified his military career. He retired from this post in 1965, leaving behind a stronger educational program and a renewed commitment to military strength and discipline.

Mr. President, accomplishments of General Clark's magnitude are rare, and are the product of his natural leadership ability and diligent work. The sincerity of his actions won him universal honor and admiration. He was a champion of freedom because he was an enemy of tyranny and oppression. General Clark despised the cancer of communism and hated the terror of Hitler's reign, and fought with all his strength to conquer any enemy which threatened freedom-loving peoples worldwide.

Those who served under him and with him, as well as those who had the privilege of knowing him in other capacities, fully recognized his lifetime of contributions. President Reagan said of General Clark:

We are free because of men like him. His professionalism and dedication will be the standard of every soldier who takes the oath to defend our Nation.

Dr. Billy Graham, who was a personal friend of General Clark's, was unable to attend the funeral, but wrote the homily which was delivered at the memorial service. In his remarks, Dr. Graham highlighted four principles which characterized General Clark's life:

Quality over quantity; commitment, not convenience; character, not compromise; and a belief in Christ and commitment to Christian ideals.

General Clark's deep religious convictions served as a motivating force behind his service to mankind, and his contributions to South Carolina, the Nation, and the entire free world were but an extension of his service to God.

Mr. President, I knew Gen. Mark Clark to be a man of honesty, integrity, and determination. His courage rivals that of other great men in American history, and his uncommon valor will forever serve as a shining example to future soldiers. He will, indeed, be missed by many in military and civilian circles; yet, we are grateful for his valiant efforts which helped secure peace for our Nation and for all friends of democracy.

Mr. President, in order to provide my colleagues with a more comprehensive account of the remarkable life and accomplishments of Gen. Mark W. Clark, I ask unanimous consent that the following articles and editorials, as well as Dr. Graham's eulogy, be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNERAL SERVICE OF GEN. MARK WAYNE CLARK

(Written by Dr. Billy Graham—Delivered by Col. Sidney R. Crumpton)

We are gathered here today to pay our respects to General Mark Wayne Clark.

General Clark was much more than a soldier—he was a soldier/statesman; a man who saw the big picture. He had all the qualities that would have made him a great president of the United States.

It was my privilege to know him first in the winter of 1952. I was in Tokyo, Japan, on my way to Korea near Christmas to speak to missionaries and Christians in Korea, when totally unexpectedly I was asked to come to his office. I did not know that he had ever heard of me. I went, and after a rather long chat he turned to me and said. "Mr. Graham, I would like for you to go to Korea and preach to the troops at Christmas. Everyone will cooperate and it will be a great encouragement to our troops." I was overwhelmed, and immediately answered that I would. I wrote a book about my experiences.

When his time was finished in the Far East, it was my privilege to be with him on a number of occasions. He honored me by giving me an honorary degree here at The Citadel, and he invited me to speak here on a number of occasions. I had talks with him a number of times and from his lips I heard some of the most thrilling stories about

World War II, the Korean War, politics and religion as we sat for hours at a time either alone, or with friends.

There are many lessons we can learn from his life. But today I would like to briefly mention four.

First, Mark Clark was a man who was concerned with quality not quantity. He believed that a well-trained, well-disciplined, courageous fighting unit could overcome an enemy that was numerically superior. And he proved it during the long and bitter Italian campaign of World War II.

His writings and speeches show that he returned from Europe convinced that every man in the Army should be trained first as an infantryman before going on to other specialized training. When the situation demanded it, he wanted every man in the army—cook, driver, typist, mechanic, everyone—to be trained and able to pick up a rifle and take his place on the fighting line.

As Chief of Army Field Forces from 1949-52, he put his ideas into practice and today's training still reflects his influence.

In his emphasis on quality rather than quantity, he mirrors the experience of one of the great military commanders in the Bible—a man named Gideon.

Second, Mark Clark demonstrated his belief in commitment, not convenience. His four decades of military service were punctuated by long and painful separations from his family. He was unable to attend his daughter's wedding and almost missed his son's because of his commitment to his country and to duty.

Service of any kind—military, political, or spiritual—has never been a matter of convenience and it never will. Somehow, in our modern age, we have allowed ourselves to become captives to set periods of time. We want to know just exactly how long everything is going to last, and when the time is up, we're ready to pack up and go home.

But the people who have left their mark on history have been those who committed themselves to a task with no thought of quitting until it was finished. I believe we need to recapture that spirit in America today.

General Clark once closed a speech commemorating the anniversary of the Chaplains Corps by quoting these lines:

There are people who carry life's burdens,
Their own and others beside;
There are people who stand in their places,
And who stand there whatever betide.

There are two kinds of people—you know them,
As you journey along life's track,
The people who take your strength from you,
And the others who put it all back.

As he observed the world picture at the end of the Korean War, Mark Clark considered the global struggle and wrote something we should recall today:

"Perhaps, both sides, with the frightening instruments of total destruction in their hands, may decide that these terrible weapons must never be used. I pray fervently that this be true, not only because of the lives that would be saved, but also because I know America can reap a richer harvest from peace than can her enemies." (Calculated Risk, p. 330)

But he also had a conviction that peace will be granted us only if we are strong. He believed that peace, like life itself, was a matter of commitment, not convenience. Mark Clark, lover of peace, believed that there are certain things for which a man must be willing to lay down his life.

Thirdly, Mark Clark believed in character, not compromise. He was always concerned about the spiritual lives of those under his command.

While serving as Chief of Army Field Forces, he was observing a live ammunition training exercise in which recruits crawled on their bellies under barbed wire while machine gun bullets were being fired over their heads.

He noticed a group of chaplains standing nearby, also observing, and asked one of them if he had been through this training exercise. When the chaplain said, "No," General Clark said, "Don't you think it would be a good idea if you shared the hardships and the dangers of the men and went through these exercises?"

From that time on, he officially urged chaplains to share as many of the trainees' hardships and dangers as they could. By making the long marches and crawling through the mud with the soldiers, the chaplains gained the respect and confidence of the men. The result was a marked increase in the rapport between the chaplains and the soldiers, and increased chapel attendance, not just in training, but also in combat areas.

He once told of receiving a letter from a woman who said she hoped he would make a man out of her son who had just enlisted in the army. She hoped that the army would develop her son's character.

Mark Clark wrote her back, saying that he would do his best to see that her son's military service would help him. But, he said, the army would have her son for only eighteen months. She had had him for eighteen years. He closed by reminding her, and all of us today, that the job of developing character in our youth is primarily the responsibility of the home, the churches, and the schools. Mark Clark believed in character.

And finally, Mark Clark was a man who believed in Christ. His belief was more than just an intellectual assent or lip service to Christian ideals, but a personal faith in Christ as his own Lord and Savior.

In 1953, he concluded an Easter message to all those serving in Korea by saying:

"Easter, commemorating the resurrection of Jesus Christ, is a time of renewed conviction in the triumph of life over death, of good over evil, of the spiritual over the material. That conviction will carry us through whatever lies ahead."

As we honor General Mark Clark today, his life and his memory challenge us to live lives of Quality, of Commitment, and of Character.

Today we do not say goodby to Mark Clark. We say, as the French would say, "Au revoir!" "Till we meet again."

CLARK RECALLED AS COURAGEOUS SOLDIER, PATRIOT

[From the Charleston Evening Post, Apr. 17, 1984]

Generals, statesmen, religious leaders and friends remembered Gen. Mark W. Clark Tuesday as a courageous soldier and patriot.

"A noble and gentle friend has left us," said Maj. Gen. T. Eston Marchant, S.C. Adjutant General. "Gen. Mark Clark was not only one of our greatest military commanders, but one of the most respected and admired Americans in our country's history. He recognized the threats to our survival as a free nation. He conveyed them in a forceful and effective manner. The general will be sorely missed."

Gov. Richard W. Riley said Clark will be remembered "as a great patriot and a great leader both on the battlefield and as president of The Citadel. He had an enduring love of country throughout his life and a later love for South Carolina, which he made his adopted state after his retirement from the military," Riley said.

A long-standing friend of Clark, U.S. Sen. Strom Thurmond, R-S.C., said the nation "has lost one of its most courageous and dedicated soldiers. His death is a great loss for me, as well as for the nation. I am deeply saddened by his passing."

Thurmond spoke with Clark last week and tried to visit him at the hospital but doctors didn't think the visit would be advisable.

"The Citadel and this state have lost a priceless asset," said Citadel President Maj. Gen. James A. Grimsley. "He is . . . the last of the World War II giants. Those of us who were alive at that time and who fought that war saw at that time America reach its greatest heights."

"The Citadel today directly reflects Gen. Clark's many contributions to this college" as president from 1954 to 1965, Grimsley said.

Retired Gen. William C. Westmoreland, who served under Clark in the Korean War, recalled that Clark treated him much as a son.

"He was very popular with his troops. He had quite a personal touch and was quite popular with his troops and subsequently with the cadets he had under him at The Citadel," Westmoreland said.

Maj. Gen. Jack Farris, commander of the U.S. Army troops in last fall's invasion of Grenada, was the regimental commander of cadets in The Citadel class of 1958. Farris recalled that some of the lessons he learned from Clark were useful during the Grenadan invasion.

"He talked to me about his command in Italy and what it meant in terms of leadership to command at that level," Farris said. "He used to emphasize that you had to take care of your soldiers and if you did, they would take care of you. He said you had to be tough-minded enough to make the tough decisions. They're never clear cut, they're just areas of grays."

"Another thing I'll never forget that he told me was that as a complete military commander you never make pure military decisions," Farris said. "There are political and social nuances that have real impact on how you conduct your war."

Clark was "the kind of fellow who really wouldn't have wanted too many flowery things said about his passing," said Citadel Board of Visitors Chairman George C. James. But "Gen. Clark contributed as much as anyone to the country and to the world and there is going to be a big void with him gone."

U.S. Sen. Ernest F. Hollings, D-S.C., said Gen. Clark's contribution to The Citadel, the state and the nation is unequaled. "Gen. Clark is one of the great Americans of my time."

Rep. Thomas F. Hartness, R-S.C., termed Clark "one of America's last, truely great heroes."

"He felt such a real deep love for this country and the way of life he had fought to preserve," Hartness said of Clark. The congressman said he found the depth of Clark's patriotism "almost sad" to observe because it isn't shared by the vast majority of Americans today.

Rep. Butler Derrick, D-S.C., also mentioned Clark's contribution to youth, noting

the summer camps Clark had established at The Citadel. "The state of the nation suffered a great loss" with Clark's death, said Derrick. "He will go down in history as one of the great warriors of our time, together with Gens. Eisenhower, Bradley, Patton and others, as World War II heroes."

"The passing of Gen. Clark really is the passing of an era * * *" said North Charleston Mayor John E. Bourne, Jr. "His tremendous service to the nation and to the world, really, as a military commander, and then his major contributions to education as president of The Citadel and contributions he's made to every walk of life can hardly be duplicated."

Novelist Pat Conroy, author of "The Lords of Discipline" and a 1967 graduate of The Citadel, said the general was president of The Citadel for two years while the novelist attended the school.

"My greatest impression of him is that he was—by far—the most exciting, exhilerating, wonderful public speaker I've ever heard," Conroy said, adding that he remenbers Clark "from the vantage point of a kid."

"To me, he appeared to be the soul of how a great man looked and acted.* * * He had this aura of grandeur and I guess you could say I was terrified of him. But, then, great men scare people who are not great. * * * Everything that he did, everything that he touched, seemed to have importance. Because he was the soul of honor."

Charleston Mayor Joseph P. Riley, Jr. said, "The city of Charleston and the United States of America today lost a very special citizen. It was Charleston's great fortune that after Gen. Clark's extraordinary military career as one of the great generals of World War II and Supreme Commander in Korea that we enjoyed 30 years of his leadership at The Citadel and in our community."

In addition to his many contributions to this community and nation, the Roman Catholic Church is indebted to Clark "for the humane way in which he governed Italy during the tragic days of World War II," said the Most Rev. Ernest L. Unterkoefler, bishop of the Diocese of Charleston. "He had close association with Pope Pius XII and Pope Paul VI."

"The world is indebted to Gen. Clark for his understanding of human freedom and civil liberty. * * * We pray for his family. May he rest in peace," Unterkoefler said.

GEN. MARK W. CLARK

[From the Columbia Record, Apr. 17, 1984]

At the Medical University of South Carolina early today, retired four-star Army Gen. Mark W. Clark breathed his last. As he expired, the last of the fabled combat commanders of the Second World War passed from us.

Throughout his adult years, Mark Clark remained with snappy salute a good and faithful servant of this nation of free peoples, believing in his innermost being in the intrinsic values of the country. He valued the sanctity and security of the individual, without fear or favor of oppressive governments, as a military protector.

A brilliant and successful strategist and tactician who always strove to proceed to decisions with cared consideration for each life, he was a West Point graduate commissioned in 1917 whose future career was both illustrious, appreciated and dutiful.

With care, precision and personal ardor in the Second World War, he helped plan the invasion of North Africa as Deputy Commander in Chief of Allied Forces. Few will ever know the full weight of responsibilities that fell on his shoulders and struck his heart.

He coordinated plans for the Salerno invasion of Italy in 1943, tried vainly to secure more troops and extra naval firepower—and landed. Citizen soldiers of National Guard components fought brilliantly against skilled German defense counter-attacks and, rather swiftly, the Fifth Army captured Rome, the first Axis capital to be liberated.

A confidante and friend of the late Dwight Eisenhower, Clark felt that in Korea military success was conceivable but dutifully saluted in acquiescence to a peace treaty to end that conflict.

As president of The Citadel, he again served well. As a good and faithful servant, he deserves a global salute.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 18, 1984]

GEN. MARK CLARK DIES; COMMANDED ALLIED FORCES IN ITALY IN WORLD WAR II

Retired Gen. Mark Clark, 87, a brilliant and sometimes controversial Army group commander in Italy in World War II and the last head of United Nations forces in Korea during the conflict there, died of pancreatic cancer yesterday at the Medical University of South Carolina in Charleston, S.C.

Gen. Clark first saw combat in World War I, during which he was wounded. His service in World War II included a notable cloak-and-dagger mission to North Africa and command of the U.S. Fifth Army in Italy, the job for which he was best known. His principal campaigns were the bloody landing at Salerno, Italy, in which he himself led an attack against German tanks threatening the beachhead; the lost opportunity of Anzio, an amphibious attack that might have opened the way to Rome but resulted in a lengthy stalemate; the bitter and costly fighting for Monte Cassino; the capture of Rome and the ultimate liberation of Italy.

After the war, he was U.S. High Commissioner in Austria and commander of Army Ground Forces. He retired from active duty in 1953 at the conclusion of his service in Korea and the end of the conflict there. From 1954 to 1965, he was president of The Citadel, a military college in Charleston, S.C.

Gen. Clark, a tall, energetic man known for his intelligence, courage and charm, was the youngest Allied-Army group commander in the war. Winston Churchill called him "an American eagle." General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower said he was "the best organizer, planner and trainer of troops that I have met." General of the Army George C. Marshall, the wartime chief of staff, praised him as "a very good soldier and very loyal."

If his superiors praised him at the time, most historians have been content to state the problems Gen. Clark faced and the solutions he brought to them, and to let these speak for themselves. In general, they provide a sense that the general did a difficult job well.

Like other major operations, the one Gen. Clark conducted in Italy was dictated not only by the relative strength of the opposing sides, but by geography, politics, and strategic considerations, both in the Mediterranean theater and elsewhere in the world. In some of these categories Gen. Clark and his troops were at a loss to muster parity, much less superiority.

Most obvious was the matter of terrain. The Allies' task was to dislodge an enemy that enjoyed nearly every advantage the lay of the land could offer. The narrow Italian peninsula with its high ribbing of mountains forced attackers into head-on assaults. There were few opportunities for rapid and sweeping armored envelopments, such as those conducted by the Germans early in the war and by Gen. George S. Patton and other Allied commanders on the plains of northern and eastern Europe later in the conflict.

The frontal attacks were costly and gained little. An alternative was an amphibious flanking movement, such as the one at Anzio. For want of effective leadership on the ground, the opportunity presented by Anzio was lost, and it, too, settled into months of bitter and unproductive fighting.

In addition to terrain, there were the problems inherent in such a heterogeneous force as the 15th Army Group. Gen. Clark took command in December 1944, succeeding Field Marshal Sir Harold R. L. G. Alexander of Britain. The group was made up of units from 26 nations and the general had only varying degrees of control over the various components. His enemy, by contrast, was led by a unified German command that had some of the best soldiers and officers in the history of Europe.

Adding to those problems was the fact that for political and strategic reasons Italy was to a certain extent a "forgotten" war. The Normandy invasion and the battle in the Pacific received priority in terms of officers, men, materiel and precious naval units.

Whatever the difficulties, Gen. Clark never lacked critics, including some subordinate commanders and some historians.

They fault him for Salerno, where the Allies nearly were thrown back into the sea, and for Anzio. They fault him for the destruction of the historic abbey at Monte Cassino. They fault him for the heavy casualties his army took for little gain.

They fault his strategy, asserting that it contributed to the degeneration of the Italian fighting into a prolonged slugging match. They contrast it to the lightning advances achieved in northern Europe and the comparatively bloodless drives of Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the Southwest Pacific.

But the criticism does not change the fact that Gen. Clark conducted one of the most difficult campaigns of the war and brought it to a successful conclusion.

In a written statement, President Reagan praised Gen. Clark as a soldier who served "with courage, dignity, integrity and, above all, honor. General Clark's memory will live forever in the hearts of his countrymen."

Mark Wayne Clark was born on May 1, 1896, at Madison Barracks, N.J. He graduated from the U.S. Military academy at West Point in 1917 and was commissioned in the infantry. He was wounded in France in 1918 and later served with occupation forces in Germany.

Between the world wars, he graduated from the Army War College, the Command and Staff College and the Infantry School at Fort Benning. He was attached to the Army General Staff when this country entered World War II. He became chief of staff of Army Ground Forces in May 1942, and in July of that year he became commander of all American Ground Forces in Europe.

Before the 1942 Anglo-American invasion of French North Africa, Gen. Clark made a daring secret trip to Algiers, where he attempted to persuade French Vichy Forces to welcome rather than fight American

forces when they came ashore. His memoirs of this hazardous voyage by submarine and rubber boat, and his nocturnal wanderings and secret rendezvous with French officials, make exciting reading.

Although the mission was not entirely successful, it resulted in arrangements that greatly reduced the opposition that French forces put up to Allied landings.

The Fifth Army was activated in January 1943 at Oujda, Morocco. It was composed of the U.S. VI Corps under Maj. Gen. John P. Lucas and the British X Corps. With the British Eighth Army under Field Marshal Sir Bernard L. Montgomery, it made up the 15th Army Group.

The Army Group, led by Field Marshal Alexander, invaded Italy in September 1943. The Fifth Army hit the beaches at Salerno on the 9th. Italy had announced it was leaving the Axis and surrendering to the Allies only hours before the landing. The Americans, perhaps anticipating little opposition, were stunned by furious counterattacks by German forces, who had no intention of conceding Italy to the Allies.

With the beachhead in danger and some senior commanders planning to evacuate the troops, Gen. Clark announced that he was landing to take command of the forces ashore. He personally led an infantry assault against a group of 18 tanks that almost had reached the shore. The Germans were turned back and six of their tanks were destroyed. The general called upon airborne troops to drop between the Allied front line and the sea to reinforce the beachhead.

For his actions on the beachhead, Gen. Clark was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Army's highest award for valor except for the Medal of Honor. The citation spoke of his "utter disregard for personal safety" while he "spread an infectious spirit of determination and courage."

The northward advance from Salerno, through the mountains, was slow and costly. In January 1944, halted 90 miles south of Rome by the German Gustav Line, Gen. Clark developed a plan calling for a coordinated attack on the German positions and an amphibious end-run 60 miles behind the line.

The forces aimed across the Rapido River at the Liri Valley were bloodily repulsed in the Gustav Line, while the VI Corps went ashore unopposed at Anzio. Instead of driving for Rome or moving to take the Gustav positions in the rear, Gen. Lucas, the corps commander, chose to advance less than 10 miles and await reinforcements and supplies. The Germans had time to gather enough forces to halt the Anzio invasion in its tracks.

These operations were the ones that brought the greatest criticism of Gen. Clark. After the war, a group of former 36th Infantry Division officers appeared before a Senate committee to oppose a promotion for Gen. Clark. They said his order to cross the Rapido sent their division against impossible odds at the cost of enormous casualties. A War Department investigation concluded that the commander had exercised "sound judgment," and he was promoted.

The Anzio landing took place on Jan. 22, 1944. On Feb. 15, heavy artillery and air bombardment destroyed the historic Benedictine monastery on Monte Cassino. Gen. Clark had opposed this, not only on religious and cultural grounds, but also because the attack would be of little military significance. He was overruled and the abbey was turned to ruins. For some, the responsibility remains with Gen. Clark.

It was not until May 25 that the forces fighting through the Gustav Line and those at Anzio linked up.

Just prior to this, Gen. Clark made what was perhaps his biggest mistake of the war. He tried to seize Rome rather than encircle German forces on the Gustav Line. The result was that large numbers of German soldiers escaped to the north and Rome was not captured until June 4, 1944, just as Allied forces were preparing to go ashore in Normandy.

The war ended for Mark Clark on May 2, 1945. He spent the next two years as Allied High Commissioner in Austria, where his flinty disposition was a fitting match for his Red Army counterparts.

From 1949 to May 1952, he was commander of Armed Ground Forces. He then succeeded Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway as U.S. commander and supreme commander of U.N. forces in Korea. It was a time of frustrating negotiation rather than fighting. On July 27, 1953, he signed the armistice that resulted in the end of the Korean conflict.

In the 1950s, Gen. Clark, who lived in Charleston, wrote two volumes of war memoirs, "Calculated Risk" and "From the Danube to Yalu."

In addition to the Distingushed Service Cross, his decorations included four Distinguished Service Medals, the Legion of Merit and the Purple Heart Medal. He also received high honors from Britain, France, Belgium, Morocco, Poland, Brazil and the Soviet Union.

Gen. Clark's first wife, the former Maurine Doran, died in 1966. Their daughter, Patricia Ann Oosting, died in 1962.

Survivors include his wife of 17 years, the former Mary Mildred Applegate, of Charleston; a son by his first marriage, retired Army Maj. William Doran Clark of Washington, and four grandchildren.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Apr. 20, 1984]

GENERAL CLARK LAID TO REST AT THE CITADEL

In a simple funeral service, as he had wished, retired Army General Mark Wayne Clark was laid to rest Thursday near The Citadel parade ground where he had reviewed thousands of young cadets over the years.

The last of the four-star generals from World War II, and president emeritus of The Citadel, Clark died Tuesday at the age of 87.

Two sprays of white gladiolus decorated the altar in Summerall chapel, where about 1,250 people heard former Citadel Chaplain Sidney R. Crumpton read a homily written by the Rev. Billy Graham. Graham was in Europe Thursday and could not attend the funeral.

"General Clark was much more than a soldier—he was a soldier/statesman; a man who saw the big picture. He had all the qualities that would have made him a great president of the United States," Graham wrote.

Graham met Clark in 1952 and was surprised by Clark's request that he preach to American troops in Korea at Christmas. The two met again many times after the war, and Clark recognized Graham with an honorary degree from The Citadel.

"There are many lessons we can learn from his life . . . First, Mark Clark was a man who was concerned with quality and not quantity. He believed that a well-trained, well-disciplined, courageous fighting unit could overcome an enemy that was numerically superior. And he proved it during the long and bitter Italian campaign of World War II."

A man who believed in commitment, not convenience, Clark often had long and painful separations from his family during his four decades of military service, Graham wrote. "But the people who have left their mark on history have been those who committed themselves to a task with no thought of quitting until it was finished. I believe we need to recapture that spirit in America today."

Graham drew on Clark's writings in the book "Calculated Risk" to show that the general was a lover of peace who "believed that there are certain things for which a man must be willing to lay down his life." Musing on the world picture at the end of the Korean War, Clark wrote:

"Perhaps, both sides, with the frightening instruments of total destruction in their hands, may decide that these terrible weapons must never be used. I pray fervently that this be true, not only because of the lives that would be saved, but also because I know America can reap a richer harvest from peace than can her enemies."

Clark also believed in character over compromise, Graham wrote.

"He once told of receiving a letter from a woman who said she hoped he would make a man out of her son who had just enlisted in the Army. She hoped that the Army would develop her son's character.

"Mark Clark wrote her back, saying that he would do his best to see that her son's military service would help him. But, he said, the army would have her son for only 18 months. She had had him for 18 years. He closed by reminding her, and all of us today, that the job of developing character in our youth is primarily the responsibility of the home, the churches, and the schools.

The funeral also included readings of Psalm 121 and Psalm 23, as well as a reading from the Gospel of John. The Citadel Choir Chorale sang "The Lord's Prayer" by Malotte.

At the graveside, Crumpton read words of committal that were also written by Graham.

"Mark Clark was a man who believed in Christ. His belief was more than just an intellectual assent of lip service to Christian ideals, but a personal faith in Christ as his own Lord and Savior."

Clark's life and memory should challenge everyone "to live lives of quality, of commitment, and of character," Graham wrote.

"Today we do not say goodbye to Mark Clark. We say, as the French would say, 'Au revoir!' Till we meet again."

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Apr. 20, 1984]

GEN. MARK W. CLARK

Gen. Mark Wayne Clark was laid to rest yesterday at The Citadel, the military college of South Carolina over which he presided for 12 fruitful years after retiring from a distinguished career.

Mark Clark was an Army man literally all his life. Born on a military base, he grew up in the Army, and naturally became a graduate of West Point. He saw much combat and was wounded in World War I. He attained international fame as combat commander and military diplomat in World War II, in which he became liberator of Rome and all of Italy, and was credited with saving Austria for the West.

It was Mark Clark who commanded United Nations forces in the final stages of the Korean War and negotiated the cease-fire.

General Clark was courageous, tough, candid. He had the respect of subordinates and of the world leaders with whom he dealt. But his toughness and candor led him into some political disfavor after World War II.

An indication of his sense of propriety was refusal to go to Rome as ambassador to the Vatican 30 years ago, as suggested by President Truman, without Senate confirmation.

Proof of his abiding concern for the nation came in the general's declining years when he chose to discuss controversial security issues, rather than sit quietly in earned retirement.

And so it was that many admirers paid tribute to a revered individual as he went to honored rest at the college he loved and served and in the state which proudly made him an adopted son.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The Select Committee on Indian Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the following bills, and the bills were placed on the calendar by unanimous consent:

H.R. 3259. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pueblo de Cochita;

H.R. 3376. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Makah Indian Tribe, Washington; and

H.R. 3555. An act to declare certain lands held by the Seneca Nation of Indians to be part of the Allegany Reservation in the State of New York.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-3065. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Installations, Logistics, Military Personnel, and Force Management transmitting, pursuant to law, a report listing persons who have filed reports under section 410 of Public Law 91-121; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3066. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Shipbuilding and Logistics transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a decision to convert the storage and warehousing function at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va. to performance under contract; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3067. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on real and personal property of the Department of Defense as of September 30, 1983; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3068. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual Animal Welfare Enforcement Report; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3069. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to ensure continued financial integrity of Rural Electrification and Telephone Revolving Fund: to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3070. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to simplify administration, contain escalating costs, and create greater flexibility in operation of programs under National School Lunch Act and Child Nutrition Act; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3071. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Rural Development Strategy; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3072. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on revised estimates of the President's budget for 1985 and projections for 1984-89; jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget.

EC-3073. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on three new deferrals of budget authority; jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, to the Committees on Appropriations, the Budget, Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and the Judiciary.

EC-3074. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of the balance sheets of the Office of the Attending Physician Revolving Fund, 1982 and 1983; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3075. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System transmitting, pursuant to law, the Seventieth Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3076. A communication from the chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1983 report of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3077. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1984 consolidated report on Community Development programs; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3078. A communication from the chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commission to regulate the proxy processing activities of banks, associations, and other entities; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3079. A communication from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's 97th annual report on its activities during 1983; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3080. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act to authorize appropriations; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3081. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the Automotive Fuel Economy program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3082. A communication from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, the FAA's report on the effectiveness of the Civil Aviation Security program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3083. A communication from the Secretaries of Commerce, the Interior and the Executive Director of the Marine Mammal Commission transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations through fiscal year 1987 for the Marine Mammal Protection Act; to the Committee on Commerce; Science, and Transportation.

EC-3084. A Communication from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, financial statements of the Colorado River Basin Project for 1983; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3085. A Communication from the Secretary of Energy transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the delay of a decision relative to location of test and evaluation facilities at sites of nuclear waste repositories; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3086. A Communication from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the study of existing and alternative programs for improving quality assurance and quality control in the construction of commercial nuclear powerplants; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3087. A Communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States within the 60 days previous to April 18, 1984; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3088. A Communication from the Acting Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States in the 60-day period prior to April 10, 1984; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3089. A Communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual reports on voluntary contributions to international organizations for the period April 1983-September 1983; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3090. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the Presidential determination and justification for the furnishing of defense articles and services to Grenada; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3091. A communication from the Acting Director of the Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Agency on activities under title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act (Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger) for fiscal year 1983; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3092. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of

proposed legislation to eliminate the requirement for a decennial census of drainage; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3093. A communication from the chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Public Defender Service of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Board for fiscal year 1982; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3094. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of the reports issued by the General Accounting Office during March 1984; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3095. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Reported Purchase of LaMancha, Inc."; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3096. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Follow Up Audit of the University of the District of Columbia's Athletic Department"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3097. A communication from the Secretary of the Postal Rate Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission on implementation of the Government in the Sunshine Act during calendar year 1983; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3098. A communication from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission on implementation of the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1983; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3099. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report on the Boxing and Wrestling Commission; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3100. A communication from the chairman and members of the Personnel Appeals Board, General Accounting Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Personnel Appeals Board for fiscal year 1983; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3101. A communication from the Executive Secretary of the National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Board on implementation of the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1983; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3102. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General (administration), transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of a computerized matching program being run by the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3103. A communication from the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on competition in the award of subcontracts by Federal prime contractors in fiscal year 1982; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-3104. A communication from the Executive Director of the Civil Air Patrol, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Civil Air Patrol for calendar year 1983; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3105. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual Freedom of Information Act report of the Commission for calendar year 1983; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3106. A communication from the Director of the National Institute of Corrections, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Institute of Corrections for fiscal year 1983; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3107. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1110 of title 11, United States Code; to the Committee on Judiciary.

EC-3108. A communication from the Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice that the annual report on activities under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 will be submitted by August 3, 1984; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3109. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a document on assistance for local education agencies in areas affected by Federal activities and arrangements for education of children where local educational agencies cannot provide suitable free public education—elective school board for section 6 schools; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3110. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend and amend programs under the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3111. A communication from the chairman of the National Arthritis Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplement to the 1983 annual report of the Board; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3112. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth annual report on implementation of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 by departments and agencies which administer programs of Federal financial assistance; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3113. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf for fiscal year 1983; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-3114. A communication from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 201(b) of Public Law 96-22; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-3115. A communication from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a response to a subcommittee report on the "status of the staffing guidelines effort by March 1, 1984"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TOWER, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 2100. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to sell ammunition for use for avalanche-control purposes (Rept. No. 98-411).

By Mr. GARN, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2597. An original bill to authorize the awarding of special congressional gold medals to the daughter of Harry S. Truman, to Lady Bird Johnson, and to Elie Wiesel.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Armed Services: James H. Webb, Jr., of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

By Mr. TOWER, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the following nominations:

In the Air Force there are 50 appointments to the grade of colonel—list begins with Ted K. Broyhill, in the Air Force there are five appointments to the grade of second lieutenant—list begins with Jeffery L. Amerine, and in the Air Force Reserve there is one promotion to the grade of colonel for David F. Rice. Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to save the expense of printing again, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The nominations ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk were printed in the RECORDS of April 12 and April 24, 1984, at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

By Mr. PERCY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Harry E. Bergold, Jr., of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Republic of Nicaragua:

Contributions are to be reported for the period beginning on the first day of the fourth calendar year preceding the calendar year of the nomination and ending on the date of the nomination.

Nominee: Harry E. Bergold, Jr.

Post: Nicaragua.

Contributions, amount.

1. Self, none.
2. Spouse, none.
3. Children and spouses names, none.
4. Parents names, none.
5. Grandparents names, none.
6. Brothers and spouses names, none.
7. Sisters and spouses names, none.

Thomas H. Anderson, Jr., of Mississippi, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Barbados, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Commonwealth of Dominica, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Saint Lucia,

Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Antigua and Barbuda, and Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to St. Christopher and Nevis.

Contributions are to be reported for the period beginning on the first day of the fourth calendar year preceding the calendar year of the nomination and ending on the date of the nomination.

Nominee: Anderson, Thomas H., Jr.

Post: Ambassador to Barbados.

Contributions, amount.

1. Self, none.

2. Spouse, Katherine Milner Anderson, none.

3. Children and spouses names, none.

4. Parents names, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Hulsey Anderson, none.

5. Grandparents names, none.

6. Brothers and spouses names, none.

7. Sisters and spouses names, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Buchas, none.

(The above nominations were reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with the recommendation that they be confirmed, subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BENTSEN:

S. 2588. A bill to assist the United States and Mexican border economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM:

S. 2589. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to impose certain requirements with respect to the acquisition of substantial energy reserves holders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. SASSER):

S. 2590. A bill to designate certain lands in the Cherokee National Forest, Tenn., as wilderness areas and wilderness study areas, and to allow management of certain lands for uses other than wilderness; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. HAWKINS:

S. 2591. A bill to increase the penalties for major drug offenses and provide for the forfeiture of illegal drug profits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. 2592. A bill to authorize the President to award a Medal of Honor to the unknown American of the Vietnam era; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TRIBLE (for himself and Mr. GORTON):

S. 2593. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 respecting retransmission of programs originated by local television broadcast stations; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. BRADLEY):

S. 2594. A bill to name the U.S. Post Office Building in Moorestown, N.J., as the "Edwin B. Forsythe Post Office Building;" to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself and Mr. MOYNIHAN):

S. 2595. A bill to transfer jurisdiction from the Government of the State of New York to the Federal Government for a portion of Fire Island, N.Y., and to transfer jurisdiction for Camp Hero from the Federal Government to the Government of the State of New York; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

S. 2596. A bill to extend duty free treatment to scrolls or tablets imported for use in religious observances; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GARN:

S. 2597. An original bill to authorize the awarding of special congressional gold medals to the daughter of Harry S. Truman, to Lady Bird Johnson, and to Elie Wiesel; from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. KASTEN (for himself, Mr. JEPSEN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. PERCY, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DOLE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. EAST, Mr. GORTON, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ZORINSKY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DOMENICI, and Mrs. HAWKINS):

S.J. Res. 279. Joint resolution to designate the week of November 11, 1984, through November 17, 1984, as "Women in Agriculture Week;" to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. BRADLEY):

S.J. Res. 280. Joint resolution designating the Barnegat and Brigantine units of the National Wildlife Refuge System as the Edwin B. Forsythe Barnegat National Wildlife Refuge and the Edwin B. Forsythe Brigantine National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. GARN and Mr. SASSER):

S.J. Res. 281. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr. as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. GARN and Mr. SASSER):

S.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Anne Legendre Armstrong as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. BAKER, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. DOLE):

S. Res. 372. Resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding exposure of members of the Armed Forces to ionizing radiation and to herbicides containing dioxin; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution authorizing the rotunda of the Capitol to be used from May 25, 1984, through May 28, 1984, for the unknown American of the Vietnam era to lie in state; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BENTSEN:

S. 2588. A bill to assist the United States and Mexican border economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

UNITED STATES-MEXICAN BORDER ECONOMIC RECOVERY ACT

● Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, I have long been profoundly concerned about the economic problems that exist along the United States-Mexican border. Recent events, including a dramatic reduction in the value of the peso and disastrous weather conditions, have increased the problems to a point that demands the attention of the Congress.

The problems that have resulted from the economic shocks of the peso devaluation and severe weather conditions are grim indeed. Unemployment in one county along the Rio Grande in Texas—Starr County—has reached 46.2 percent, a result of severe damage in both the agricultural sector because of the December freeze and the retail sector because of the peso devaluation. In the first 6 months after the peso devaluation, retail sales in Brownsville declined $136 million, causing over 200 businesses to close their doors. The situation has not improved since. Many of the businesses still in operation along the border are teetering on the brink of financial disaster. The losses in the agricultural sector resulting from the freeze are still being totaled, but will surely exceed $50 million.

The ripple effect of these losses is felt all along the border: Employee layoffs, lowered purchasing power, and a decline in tax revenues for municipalities that are among the poorest in the Nation. The desperation of the jobless in these depressed, crippled counties can hardly be overstated or overemphasized. I have been working for several weeks to develop a number of ideas to aid the border economy, both short and long term. The legislation I am introducing today is the product of that effort.

It is an omnibus measure, containing seven titles. I ask unanimous consent that a factsheet providing details on the several titles be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

Mr. President, I think we have to be realistic about the prospects for passing this legislation this year. I do not want to get into a position of getting hopes too high for millions of Americans who are, at best, in very difficult circumstances. I expect that some elements of this proposal will be approved by this Congress, and I am prepared to work very hard toward that objective. But I am also aware that some elements will require considerable deliberation and it may not be possible to complete that process in this abbreviated session. I want to emphasize, however, that I am serious about this proposal, and I will be back in the next Congress with those portions not approved this year.

I believe the time has come for the Senate to address the pressing needs of the people who live along the United States-Mexican border. My legislation will start the Senate down that path. I hope that we can work aggressively to solve these problems in a bipartisan fashion and restore the prosperity and a sense of well-being that the American people along the border demand and deserve.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTSHEET ON SENATOR LLOYD BENTSEN'S BORDER AID INITIATIVE

TITLE I: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

The Bentsen proposal would reauthorize the Economic Development Administration, which is now operating under authority of the Continuing Resolution. The Bentsen proposal will include two changes of current law that will benefit the Border economy:

Current law providing aid to communities suffering from sudden and severe economic hardship will be amended to provide a specific setaside for areas suffering from the effects of extraordinary, severe and temporary natural conditions, and foreign currency devaluations.

Expired provisions allowing the EDA to place funds into other agencies for programs providing fast jobs availability will be renewed.

TITLE II: TRADE

The Trade Act of 1974 will be amended to direct the Secretary of Commerce to make technical assistance available to cities which are located on or near the Border between the United States and Mexico to assist them to develop, apply for, and implement programs to increase the localities' foreign trade capacity.

TITLE III: CUSTOMS

The Customs Authorization Act of 1983 will be amended to prohibit the Customs Service from implementing any personnel cuts Fiscal Year 1985. Such a provision will prevent the Administration's proposed reduction of 954 positions from being put into effect.

TITLE IV: ENTERPRISE ZONES

This title will provide that if any Federal law is enacted which provides for the designation of enterprise zones, that the head of the department or agency making such decisions shall designate any county meeting the following requirements:

Economic dislocation resulting from foreign currency devaluations.

An unemployment rate at least one and one half times the national unemployment rate.

A poverty rate 20 percent or more above that of the United States.

TITLE V: VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Veterans Assistance Act will be amended to require the Administrator of the Veterans Administration to conduct a study to determine the need for the construction of a Veterans Administration Hospital to serve the 78,000 veterans in the 14 southern-most counties in Texas. The study is to be completed by the end of Fiscal Year 1985, with a report to be submitted to Congress by September 31, 1985.

TITLE VI: SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The Small Business Act will be amended to authorize loans to any small business concern located in an area suffering from economic dislocations resulting from extraordinary, severe and temporary natural conditions, and foreign currency devaluations. As under the expired foreign currency devaluation assistance program, loans would be limited to $100,000 and the interest rate could not exceed 8 percent.

TITLE VII: FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Title VII will reauthorize the Farmers Home Administration community loan programs which have had no authorization since Fiscal Year 1982. These loan programs include assistance for water and sewer, community facilities, and business and industry development. In addition, the community facilities section would be corrected to make migrant health care clinics eligible once again for loans.●

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM:

S. 2589. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to impose certain requirements with respect to the acquisition of substantial energy reserves holders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mrs. KASSEBAUM on this legislation appear earlier in today's RECORD.)

By Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. SASSER):

S. 2590. A bill to designate certain lands in the Cherokee National Forest, TN, as wilderness areas and wilderness study areas, and to allow management of certain lands for uses other than wilderness; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Foresty.

TENNESSEE WILDERNESS ACT OF 1984

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, it is with great pride that I introduce the Tennessee Wilderness Act of 1984. This Nation has maintained the highest standard of excellence in its national wilderness legislation, and Tennessee's forests should be no exception. The timberlands of Tennessee are among the finest, and this act would be a most effective safeguard against any possible future exploitation.

Up to this time, no significant wilderness acreage has been recommended or designated in the Cherokee National Forest as part of the national wilderness preservation system. The Tennessee Wilderness Act would protect the four most outstanding areas in the southern part of the forest—Citico Creek, Bald River Gorge, Little Frog Mountain, and Big Frog Mountain. These areas are home to various numbers of rare or threatened animals which, along with a rich assortment of virgin timber, characterize the forests' unusual pristine quality.

These lands are virtually untouched, and designating them as wilderness areas would only insure that they remain in their present unspoiled condition. Because of the small amount of development that has taken place in these areas there are few, if any, adverse consequences in protecting them under the Wilderness Act of 1964.

Once again, I stress the importance of preserving our Nation's forests, and the Tennessee Wilderness Act of 1984 provides such an opportunity. It is essential to maintain the existence of today's wilderness not only for the enrichment of our generation, but also for the lifetimes of many Americans to come.

I urge the Senate to act positively on this legislation.

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my distinguished senior colleague, Mr. BAKER, in sponsoring S. 2590, a bill to designate certain lands in the Cherokee National Forest as wilderness. The Cherokee National Forest is the only one of its kind in Tennessee. Future generations deserve an opportunity to observe firsthand the beauty and rare physical integrity of the Cherokee National Forest.

The bill which we are introducing today is almost identical to a bill already in the other body and cosponsored by the majority of the Tennessee delegation in that body.

Mr. President, S. 2590 addresses four outstanding areas in the southern portion of the Cherokee National Forest—Citico Creek, Bald River Gorge, Little Frog Mountain, and Big Frog Mountain. The combined acreage that would be protected in the southern portion under S. 2590 constitutes only 12 percent of the 298,526 acres located in the southern portion of the Cherokee National Forest.

Mr. President, wilderness designation for this area has received broad-based support. The Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency, the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society, Trout Unlimited, Tennessee Citizens for Wilderness Planning, Tennessee Trails Association, Izaak Walton League, Tennessee Ornithological Society, Smoky Mountains Hiking Club, Chota Canoe Club, and the Chattanooga Trout Association all support wilderness designation for the southern portion of the Cherokee National Forest.

In addition, Mr. President, the Cherokee National Forest is contiguous

with another outstanding resource—the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The Smoky Mountains lie directly north of the Cherokee National Forest. Like the Smokies, the Cherokee National Forest is already being managed administratively as wilderness. However, Mr. President, we must go one step further to insure that the Cherokee National Forest and the Smokies maintain their high wilderness value for future generations to come.

Mr. President, an adequate appreciation of our growth as a nation depends, in large part, on our past. Opportunities to reflect quietly upon our evolution as a people are rare indeed. Wilderness areas provide unique and enduring windows to our past.

Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor this measure with Senator BAKER. I look forward to swift approval of S. 2590.●

By Mrs. HAWKINS:

S. 2591. A bill to increase the penalties for major drug offenses and provide for the forfeiture of illegal drug profits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DRUG AND VIOLENT CRIME SENTENCING ACT OF 1984

Mrs. HAWKINS. Madam President, I send a bill to the desk.

Madam President, this body talks a great deal about crises. We have talked this morning about deficit crises. I have listened to inflation crises speeches. I have listened to worldwide recession crises speeches. We talk about a trade deficit crisis. But the real crisis in the United States today is that major drug traffickers walk out on light bails and soft sentences. Drug traffickers are nothing less than mass murderers who poison our children and communities.

In an effort to strike back, as chairman of the 48-member Senate Drug Enforcement Caucus, I am introducing the Drug and Violent Crime Sentencing Act of 1984. My legislation would provide for capital punishment for drug traffickers involved in murder and mandate life sentences, heavy fines, and forfeiture of drug profits for major traffickers.

Narcotics trafficking has become one of this Nation's largest business. Illegal drug sales have been estimated to exceed $100 billion. It has been responsible for an explosive growth in other illegal enterprises. A study by Dr. John Ball found that the criminal activity of most drug addicts is staggering in scope and scale. Dr. Ball studied 243 heroin addicts over an 11-year period.

Of the addicts in his study, he discovered that 237 were active criminals, the rest of them were thieves. He described 156 as career thieves: 57 engaged in at least one theft a month, 58 committed at least a theft a week, and 41 scored a theft every day. Besides theft, the addicts in the study also dabbled in the full range of street crime—armed robbery, assault, burglary, and of course drug trafficking. The findings of this study shocked even law enforcement officers. During the 11-year study, the 237 drug addicts chalked up more than 500,000 crimes. They were nothing more than violent crime machines. Today, we have nearly half a million heroin addicts.

A February 1984 Department of Justice report on Federal drug law violators revealed that major traffickers now receive soft sentences, light fines, and early parole. Narcotic violators are now sentenced to less than half the prison time of bank robbers. Drug traffickers get an average sentence of 54 months while bank robbers are sentenced to an average of 122 months. The average time actually served in prison was 41 months for drug trafficking and 67 months for bank robbers. The study found that 80 percent of the people convicted of drug trafficking did not use drugs themselves. In fact, more bank robbers, 35 percent, used narcotics than did traffickers. Only 36 percent of all investigations into drug violations presented to U.S. attorneys resulted in imprisonment. The imprisonment rate for bank robbers was 47 percent.

The Department of Justice study reviews eight major offenses: drugs, bank robberies, illegal weapons, embezzlement, fraud, forgery, immigration, and larceny. The conviction rate in drug cases was the lowest of all the crimes studied, at 76 percent.

Soft-hearted judges have allowed low bails to be a cost of doing business for drug kingpins, as only a few cases make clear.

A kingpin of a major underground organization was arrested for smuggling marihuana. The Government requested $1 million bail. The bail, however, was set at only $50,000. The suspect posted bail and fled.

A man who controlled several drug trafficking operations was delivering hundreds of pounds of marihuana from the Gulf of Mexico to the Southeastern United States. He was making $250,000 to $500,000 a month. He was arrested and bail was set at $21 million. Later, however, bail was reduced to $10 million, then to $500,000. The man posted bail, fled, and is still at large.

Two people were arrested in Miami for possession of 20 kilograms of cocaine. The Government recommended that each be held on $5 million bail. A bail of only $500,000 was set for one. The suspect posted bail, fled and is still at large. The original recommendation was followed for the other suspect, however. He remained in jail, was convicted, and is now serving a prison term.

In Virginia, five men were convicted of smuggling 25 tons of marihuana. At the time of their arrest, these men had $1.7 million in cash in their possession. The presiding judge sentenced the offenders to prison terms ranging from 10 to 20 years, but recently the judge ordered the early release of three of the men. Of the three men released, two had served less than a year in jail. The third had served only 13 months. In another case from 1981, several men were arrested and charged with conspiring to import 2,937,000 quaalude pills and 7,500 pounds of marihuana into Florida. One of the men pleaded guilty to the charge, and in February 1982, a U.S. district judge gave the man a sentence of 5 years probation. The felon did not serve a day in jail.

This problem is particularly disturbing and insidious disturbing because drug abuse and drug-related crimes are so often committed in the vicinity of our schools; insidious because the victims of drug abuse are so often vulnerable and deeply impressionable adolescents and even children.

DRUG AND VIOLENT CRIME SENTENCING ACT OF 1984

For murder committed during the production, or trafficking of an illegal or controlled substance—drug—the individual shall be imprisoned for life or punished by death if the verdict of the jury shall so direct. Also property is subject to criminal forfeiture.

For possession with intent to sell heroin or cocaine—10 kilograms or more—the individual shall be sentenced to a mandatory term of life imprisonment, and in addition, a fine of not more than $500,000. Also property is subject to criminal forfeiture.

For possession with intent to sell heroin or cocaine—at least 100 grams but less than 10 kilograms—the individual shall be sentenced to a mandatory term of imprisonment of 20 years, and, in addition, a fine of not more than $250,000. Also property is subject to criminal forfeiture.

For possession with intent to sell marihuana—10 kilograms or more—the individual shall be sentenced to a mandatory term of imprisonment of 20 years, and, in addition, may be fined not more than $250,000. Also property is subject to criminal forfeiture.

PRESENT DRUG SENTENCES

For murder committed during the production, or trafficking of an illegal or controlled substance—drug—this is not a Federal offense and is dealt with through the State courts.

For possession with intent to sell heroin or cocaine—quantity is not set at a certain standard—first offense, not more than 15 years and/or $25,000 or both; second offense, not more than 30 years and/or $50,000 or both.

For possession with intent to sell marihuana—quantity is not set at a certain standard as long as it is not 1,000 pounds or more—first offense, 5 years and $15,000; second offense, 10 years and $30,000.

For possession with intent to sell marihuana—1,000 pounds or more—first offense, up to 15 years and $125,000; second offense, up to 30 years and $250,000.

Drug trafficking is a pernicious but enormously profitable crime; 1 ounce of impure cocaine retails at a higher cost than an ounce of pure gold. Thousands and thousands of pounds of cocaine are dealt annually. Because money is the reward of drug trafficking, punishments must be harsh enough, a deterrent strong enough, to outweigh the tremendous incentives.

Mandatory sentences and forfeiture of narcotics would be powerful weapons in the fight against drug trafficking. Depriving a criminal or a criminal organization of its ill-gotten gains serves, along with bail reform and imprisonment, to disrupt or cripple the criminal enterprise, to impair its financial viability, and to reduce the incentives others may perceive in narcotics trafficking.

Drug traffickers are not merely petty thieves. Money—the taxpayers, the buyers, the smugglers—is not the chief issue here. The problem is graver than that. These criminals must be punished as the murderers and saboteurs they are, strangling our way of life, betraying our children, and sabotaging the future. The time has come to put crime-prone addicts and amoral drug traffickers on ice, and take the heat off crime-plagued American citizens.

This is a crisis that can be solved by action of this body, by quick action, by severe action, and the solution is up to Congress, if we have the courage to pass this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2591

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Drug and Violent Crime Sentencing Act of 1984".

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 401 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841 (b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by—

(A) redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively, and inserting after "(1)" a new subparagraph to read as follows:

"(A) (i) In the case of a violation of subsection (a) of this section involving at least 100 grams but less than 10 kilograms of a controlled substance in schedule I or II which is a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of a narcotic drug other than a narcotic drug consisting of—

"(I) coca leaves;

"(II) a compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, or preparation of coca leaves; or

"(III) a substance chemically identical thereto; such person shall be sentenced to a mandatory term of imprisonment of 20 years, and in addition, a fine of not more than $250,000.

"(ii) In the case of a violation of subsection (a) of this section involving 10 kilograms or more of a controlled substance in schedule I or II which is a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of a narcotic drug other than a narcotic drug consisting of—

"(I) coca leaves;

"(II) a compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, or preparation of coca leaves; or

"(III) a substance chemically identical thereof; such person shall be sentenced to a mandatory term of life imprisonment, and in addition, a fine of not more than $500,000.".

SEC. 3. Paragraph (6) of subsection (b) of section 401 of such Act is further amended to read as follows:

"(6) In the case of a violation of subsection (a) of this section involving a quantity of marihuana of 10 kilograms or more, such person shall be sentenced to a mandatory term of imprisonment of 20 years, and in addition, may be fined not more than $250,000.".

SEC. 4. Section 401 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(e) (1) Whoever, in committing, or attempting to commit, any offense defined in this section, or in avoiding or attempting to avoid apprehension for the commission of such offense, or in freeing himself or attempting to free himself from arrest or confinement for such offense, kills any person, shall be sentenced to a mandatory term of life imprisonment, or punished by death if the verdict of the jury shall so direct.

"(2) (A) A person shall be subjected to the penalty of death for the offense prohibited by this subsection only if a hearing is held in accordance with this paragraph.

"(B) When a defendant is found guilty of or pleads guilty to an offense under this subsection, the judge who presided at the trial or before whom the guilty plea was entered shall conduct a separate sentencing hearing to determine the existence or nonexistence of the factors set forth in subparagraphs (F) and (G), for the purpose of determining the sentence to be imposed. The hearing shall not be held if the Government stipulates that none of the aggravating factors set forth in subparagraph (G) exists or that one or more of the mitigating factors set forth in subparagraph (F) exists. The hearings shall be conducted—

"(i) before the jury which determined the defendant's guilt;

"(ii) before a jury impaneled for the purpose of the hearing if—

"(I) the defendant was convicted upon a plea of guilty;

"(II) the defendant was convicted after a trial before the court sitting without a jury; or

"(III) the jury which determined the defendant's guilt has been discharged by the court for good cause; or

"(iii) before the court alone, upon the motion of the defendant and with the approval of the court and of the Government.

"(C) In the sentencing hearing the court shall disclose to the defendant or his counsel all material contained in any presentence report, if one has been prepared, except such material as the court determines is required to be withheld for the protection of human life. Any presentence information withheld from the defendant shall not be considered in determining the existence or the nonexistence of the factors set forth in subparagraph (F) or (G). Any information relevant to any of the mitigating factors set forth in subparagraph (F) may be presented by either the Government or the defendant, regardless of its admissibility under the rules governing admission of evidence at criminal trials; but the admissibility of information relevant to any of the aggravating factors set forth in subparagraph (F) shall be governed by the rules governing the admission of evidence at criminal trials. The Government and the defendant shall be permitted to rebut any information received at the hearing, and shall be given fair opportunity to present argument as to the adequacy of the information to establish the existence of any of the factors set forth in subparagraph (F) or (G). The burden of establishing the existence of any of the factors set forth in subparagraph (G) is on the Government. The burden of establishing the existence of any of the factors set forth in subparagraph (F) is on the defendant.

"(D) The jury, or if there is no jury, the court shall return a special verdict setting forth its findings as to the existence or nonexistence of each of the factors set forth in subparagraph (F) and as to the existence or nonexistence of each of the factors set forth in subparagraph (G).

"(E) If the jury or, if there is no jury, the court finds by a preponderance of the information that one or more of the factors set forth in subparagraph (G) exists and that none of the factors set forth in subparagraph (F) exists, the court shall sentence the defendant to death. If the jury or, if there is no jury, the court finds that none of the aggravating factors set forth in subparagraph (G) exists, or finds that one or more of the mitigating factors set forth in subparagraph (F) exists, the court shall not sentence the defendant to death but shall impose any other sentence provided for the offense for which the defendant was convicted.

"(F) The court shall not impose the sentence of death on the defendant if the jury or, if there is no jury, the court finds by a special verdict is provided in subparagraph (D) that at the time of the offense—

"(i) he was under the age of eighteen;

"(ii) his capacity to appreciate the wrongfulness of his conduct or to conform his conduct to the requirements of law was significantly impaired, but not so impaired as to constitute a defense to prosecution;

"(iii) he was under unusual and substantial duress, although not such duress as to constitute a defense to prosecution;

"(iv) he was a principal (as defined in section 2(a) of title 18 of the United States Code (18 U.S.C. 2(a))) in the offense, which was committed by another, but his participation was relatively minor, although not so minor as to constitute a defense to prosecution; or

"(v) he could not reasonably have foreseen that his conduct in the course of the commission of the offense for which he was convicted would cause, or would create a grave risk of causing death to another person.

"(G) If no factor set forth in subparagraph (F), is present, the court shall impose the sentence of death on the defendant if the jury, or, if there is no jury, the court

finds by a special verdict as provided in subparagraph (D) that—

"(i) the death of another person resulted from the commission of the offense but after the defendant had seized or exercised control of the aircraft; or

"(ii) The death of another person resulted from the commission or attempted commission of the offense, and

"(I) the defendant has been convicted of another Federal or State offense (committed either before or at the time of the commission or attempted commission of the offense) for which a sentence of life imprisonment or death was imposable;

"(II) the defendant has previously been convicted of two or more State or Federal offenses with a penalty of more than one year imprisonment (committed on different occasions before the time of the commission or attempted commission of the offense), involving the infliction of serious bodily injury upon another person;

"(III) in the commission or attempted commission of the offense, the defendant knowingly created a grave risk of death to another person in addition to the victim of the offense or attempted offense; or

"(IV) the defendant committed or attempted to commit the offense in an especially heinous, cruel, or depraved manner.".

SEC. 5. Subsection (b) of section 1010 of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by—

(A) redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively, and inserting after "(b)" a new paragraph to read as follows;

"(1) (A) In the case of a violation of subsection (a) of this section involving at least 100 grams but less than 10 kilograms of a controlled substance in schedule I or II which is a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of a narcotic drug other than a narcotic drug consisting of—

"(i) coca leaves;

"(ii) a compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, or preparation of coca leaves; or

"(iii) a substance chemically identical thereto; such person shall be sentenced to a mandatory term of imprisonment of 20 years, and in addition, a fine of not more than $250,000.

"(3) In the case of a violation of subsection (a) of this section involving 10 kilograms or more of a controlled substance in schedule I or II which is a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of a narcotic drug other than a narcotic drug consisting of—

"(i) coca leaves;

"(ii) a compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, or preparation of coca leaves; or

"(iii) a substance chemically identical thereto;

such person shall be sentenced to a mandatory term of imprisonment of life imprisonment, and in addition, a fine of not more than $500,000.".

SEC. 6. (a) Part D of title II of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 841 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections 413 and 414:

"CRIMINAL FORFEITURES

"Property Subject to Criminal Forfeiture

"SEC. 413. (a) Any person convicted of a violation of this title or title III punishable by imprisonment for more than one year shall forfeit to the United States, irrespective of any provision of State law—

"(1) any property constituting, or derived from, any proceeds the person obtained, directly or indirectly, as the result of such violation;

"(2) any of the person's property used, or intended to be used, in any manner or part, to commit, or to facilitate the commission of, such violation; and

"(3) in the case of a person convicted of engaging in a continuing criminal enterprise in violation of section 408 of this title (21 U.S.C. 848), the person shall forfeit, in addition to any property described in paragraph (1) or (2), any of his interest in, claims against, and property or contractual rights affording a source of control over, the continuing criminal enterprise.

The court, in imposing sentence on such person, shall order, in addition to any other sentence imposed pursuant to this title or title III, that the person forfeit to the United States all property described in this subsection.

"MEANING OF TERM 'PROPERTY'

"(b) Property subject to criminal forfeiture under this section includes—

"(1) real property, including things growing on, affixed to, and found in land; and

"(2) tangible and intangible personal property, including rights, privileges, interests, claims, and securities.

"THIRD PARTY TRANSFERS

"(c) All right, title, and interest in property described in subsection (a) vests in the United States upon the commission of the act giving rise to forfeiture under this section. Any such property that is subsequently transferred to a person other than the defendant may be the subject of a special verdict of forfeiture and thereafter shall be ordered forfeited to the United States, unless the transferee establishes in a hearing pursuant to subsection (o) that he is a bona fide purchaser for value of such property who at the time of purchase was reasonably without cause to believe that the property was subject to forfeiture under this section.

"(d) If any of the property described in subsection (a)—

"(1) cannot be located;

"(2) has been transferred to, sold to, or deposited with a third party;

"(3) has been placed beyond the jurisdiction of the court;

"(4) has been substantially diminished in value by any act or ommission of the defendant; or

"(5) has been commingled with other property which cannot be divided without difficulty;

the court shall order the forfeiture of any other property of the defendant up to the value of any property described in paragraphs (1) through (5).

"REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION

"(e) There is a rebuttable presumption at trial that any property of a person convicted of a felony under this title or title III is subject to forfeiture under this section if the United States establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that—

"(1) such property was acquired by such person during the period of the violation of this title or title III or within a reasonable time after such period; and

"(2) there was no likely source for such property other than the violation of this title or title III.

"PROTECTIVE ORDERS

"(f)(1) Upon application of the United States, the court may enter a restraining order or injunction, require the execution of a satisfactory performance bond, or take any other action to preserve the availability of property described in subsection (a) for forfeiture under this section—

"(A) Upon the filing of an indictment or information charging a violation of this title or title III for which criminal forfeiture may be ordered under this section and alleging that the property with respect to which the order is sought would, in the event of conviction, be subject to forfeiture under this section; or

"(B) prior to the filing of such an indictment or information, if, after notice to persons appearing to have an interest in the property and opportunity for a hearing, the court determines that—

"(i) there is a substantial probability that the United States will prevail on the issue of forfeiture and that failure to enter the order will result in the property being destroyed, removed from the jurisdiction of the court, or otherwise made unavailable for forfeiture; and

"(ii) the need to preserve the availability of the property through the entry of the requested order outweighs the hardship on any party against whom the order is to be entered:

Provided, however, That an order entered pursuant to subparagraph (B) shall be effective for not more than ninety days, unless extended by the court for good cause shown or unless an indictment or information described in subparagraph (A) has been filed.

"(2) A temporary restraining order under this subsection may be entered upon application of the United States without notice or opportunity for a hearing when an information or indictment has not yet been filed with respect to the property, if the United States demonstrates that there is probable cause to believe that the property with respect to which the order is sought would, in the event of conviction, be subject to forfeiture under this section and that provision of notice will jeopardize the availability of the property for forfeiture. Such a temporary order shall expire not more than ten days after the date on which it is entered, unless extended for good cause shown or unless the party against whom it is entered consents to an extension for a longer period. A hearing requested concerning an order entered under this paragraph shall be held at the earliest possible time and prior to the expiration of the temporary order.

"(3) The court may receive and consider, at a hearing held pursuant to this subsection, evidence and information that would be inadmissible under the Federal Rules of Evidence.

"WARRANT OF SEIZURE

"(g) The Government may request the issuance of a warrant authorizing the seizure of property subject to forfeiture under this section in the same manner as provided for a search warrant. If the court determines that there is probable cause to believe that the property to be seized would, in the event of conviction, be subject to forfeiture and that an order under subsection (f) may not be sufficient to assure the availability of the property for forfeiture, the court shall issue a warrant authorizing the seizure of such property.

"EXECUTION

"(h) Upon entry of an order of forfeiture under this section, the court shall authorize the Attorney General to seize all property ordered forfeited upon such terms and conditions as the court shall deem proper. Following entry of an order declaring the property forfeited, the court may, upon application of the United States, enter such appro-

priate restraining orders or injunctions, require the execution of staisfactory performance bonds, appoint receivers, conservators, appraisers, accountants, or trustees, or take any other action to protect the interest of the United States in the property ordered forfeited. Any income accruing to or derived from property ordered forfeited under this section may be used to offset ordinary and necessary expenses to the property which are required by law, or which are necessary to protect the interests of the United States or third parties.

"DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY

"(i) Following the seizure of property ordered forfeited under this section, the Attorney General shall direct the disposition of the property by sale or any other commercially feasible means, making due provision for the rights of any innocent persons. Any property right or interest not exercisable by, or transferable for value to, the United States shall expire and shall not revert to the defendant, nor shall the defendant or any person acting in concert with him or on his behalf be eligible to purchase forfeited property at any sale held by the United States. Upon application of a person, other than the defendant or a person acting in concert with him or on his behalf, the court may restrain or stay the sale or disposition of the property pending the conclusion of any appeal of the criminal case giving rise to the forfeiture, if the applicant demonstrates that proceeding with the sale or disposition of the property will result in irreparable injury, harm, or loss to him.

"AUTHORITY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

"(j) With respect to property ordered forfeited under this section, the Attorney General is authorized to—

"(1) grant petitions for mitigation or remission of forfeiture, restore forfeited property to victims of a violation of this chapter, or take any other action to protect the rights of innocent persons which is in the interest of justice and which is not inconsistent with the provisions of this section;

"(2) compromise claims arising under this section;

"(3) award compensation to persons providing information resulting in a forfeiture under this section;

"(4) direct the disposition by the United States, in accordance with the provisions of section 511(e) of this title (21 U.S.C. 881(e)), of all property ordered forfeited under this section by public sale or any other commercially feasible means, making due provision for the rights of innocent persons; and;

"(5) take appropriate measures necessary to safeguard and maintain property ordered forfeited under this section pending its disposition.

"APPLICABILITY OF CIVIL FORFEITURE PROVISIONS

"(k) Except to the extent that they are inconsistent with the provisions of this section, the provisions of section 511(a) of this title (21 U.S.C. 881(d)) shall apply to a criminal forfeiture under this section.

"BAR ON INTERVENTION

"(l) Except as provided in subsection (o), no party claiming an interest in property subject to forfeiture under this section may—

"(1) intervene in a trial or appeal of a criminal case involving the forfeiture of such property under this section; or

"(2) commence an action at law or equity against the United States concerning the validity of his alleged interest in the property subsequent to the filing of an indictment or information alleging that the property is subject to forfeiture under this section.

"JURISDICTION TO ENTER ORDERS

"(m) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to enter orders as provided in this section without regard to the location of any property which may be subject to forfeiture under this section or which has been ordered forfeited under this section.

"DEPOSITIONS

"(n) In order to facilitate the identification and location of property declared forfeited and to facilitate the disposition of petitions for remission or mitigation of forfeiture, after the entry of an order declaring property forfeited to the United States, the court may, upon application of the United States, order that the testimony of any witness relating to the property forfeited be taken by deposition and that any designated book, paper, document, record, recording, or other material not privileged be produced at the same time and place, in the same manner as provided for the taking of depositions under Rule 15 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

"THIRD PARTY INTERESTS

"(o)(1) Following the entry of an order of forfeiture under this section, the United States shall publish notice of the order and of its intent to dispose of the property for at least seven successive court days in such manner as the Attorney General may direct. The Government may also, to the extent practicable, provide direct written notice to any person known to have alleged an interest in the property that is the subject of the order of forfeiture as a substitute for published notice as to those persons so notified.

"(2) Any person, other than the defendant, asserting a legal interest in property which has been ordered forfeited to the United States pursuant to this section may, within thirty days of the final publication of notice or his receipt of notice under paragraph (1), whichever is earlier, petition the court for a hearing to adjudicate the validity of his alleged interest in the property. The hearing shall be held before the court alone, without a jury.

"(3) The petition shall be signed by the petitioner under penalty of perjury and shall set forth the nature and extent of the petitioner's right, title, or interest in the property, the time and circumstances of the petitioner's acquisition of the right, title, or interest in the property, any additional facts supporting the petitioner's claim, and the relief sought.

"(4) The hearing on the petition shall, to the extent practicable and consistent with the interests of justice, be held within thirty days of the filing of the petition. The court may consolidate the hearing on the petition with a hearing on any other petition filed by a person other than the defendant under this subsection.

"(5) At the hearing, the petitioner may testify and present evidence and witnesses on his own behalf, and cross-examine witnesses who appear at the hearing. The United States may present evidence and witnesses in rebuttal and in defense of its claim to the property and cross-examine witnesses who appear at the hearing. In addition to testimony and evidence presented at the hearing, the court shall consider the relevant portions of the record of the criminal case which resulted in the order of forfeiture.

"(6) If, after the hearing, the court determines that the petitioner has established by a preponderance of the evidence that—

"(A) the petitioner has a legal right, title, or interest in the property, and such right, title, or interest renders the order of forfeiture invalid in whole or in part because the right, title, or interest was vested in the petitioner rather than the defendant or was superior to any right, title, or interest of the defendant at the time of the commission of the acts which gave rise to the forfeiture of the property under this section; or

"(B) the petitioner is a bona fide purchaser for value of the right, title, or interest in the property and was at the time of purchase reasonably without cause to believe that the property was subject to forfeiture under this section;

the court shall amend the order of forfeiture in accordance with its determination.

"(7) Following the court's disposition of all petitions filed under this subsection, or if no such petitions are filed following the expiration of the period provided in paragraph (2) for the filing of such petitions, the United States shall have clear title to property that is the subject of the order of forfeiture and may warrent good title to any subsequent purchaser or transferee.".

"(p) The provisions of this section shall be liberally construed to effectuate its remedial purposes.

"INVESTMENT OF ILLICIT DRUG PROFITS

"SEC. 414. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person who has received any income derived, directly or indirectly, from violation of this title or title III punishable by imprisonment for more than one year in which such person has participated as a principal within the meaning of section 2 of title 18, United States Code, to use or invest, directly or indirectly, any part of such income, or the proceeds of such income, in acquisition of any interest in, or the establishment or operation of, any enterprise which is engaged in, or the activities of which affect interstate or foreign commerce. A purchase of securities on the open market for purposes of investment, and without the intention of controlling or participating in the control of the issuer, or of assisting another to do so, shall not be unlawful under this section if the securities of the issuer held by the purchaser, the members of his immediate family, and his or their accomplices in any violation of this title or title III after such purchase do not amount in the aggregate to 1 per centum of the outstanding securities of any one class, and do not confer, either in law or in fact, the power to elect one or more directors of the issuer.

"(b) Whoever violates this section shall be fined not more than $50,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

"(c) As used in this section, the term 'enterprise' includes any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity, and any union or group of individuals associated in fact although not a legal entity.

"(d) The provisions of this section shall be liberally construed to effectuate its remedial purposes.".

(b) Section 304 of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 824) is amended by adding at the end of subsection (f) the following sentence: "All right, title, and interest in such controlled substances shall vest in the United States upon a revocation order becoming final.".

(c) Section 408 of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 848) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking out "(1)";

(B) by striking out "paragraph (2)"; each time it appears, and in lieu thereof "section 413 of this title"; and

(C) by striking out paragraph (2); and

(2) by striking out subsection (d).

(d) Section 511 of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 881) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(7) All real property, including any right, title, and interest in the whole of any lot or tract of land and any appurtenances or improvements, which is used, or intended to be used, in any manner or part, to commit, or to facilitate the commission of, a violation of this title punishable by more than one year's imprisonment, except that no property shall be forfeited under this paragraph, to the extent of an interest of an owner, by reason of any act or omission established by that owner to have been committed or omitted without the knowledge or consent of that owner.";

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting "civil or criminal" after "Any property subject to"; and

(B) by striking out in paragraph (4) "has been used or is intended to be used in violation of" and inserting in lieu thereof "is subject to civil or criminal forfeiture under";

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting in the second sentence "any of" after "Whenever property is seized under"; and

(B) by inserting in paragraph (3) ", if practicable," after "remove it";

(4) in subsection (d), by inserting "any of" after "alleged to have been incurred, under";

(5) in subsection (e)—

(A) by inserting "civilly or criminally" in the first sentence after "Whenever property is"; and

(B) by striking out in paragraph (3) "and remove it for disposition" and inserting in lieu thereof "and dispose of it"; and

(6) by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(h) All right, title, and interest in property described in subsection (a) shall vest in the United States upon commission of the act giving rise to forfeiture under this section.

"(i) The filing of an indictment or information alleging a violation of this title or title III which is also related to a civil forfeiture proceeding under this section shall, upon motion of the United States and for good cause shown, stay the civil forfeiture proceeding.

"(j) In addition to the venue provided for in section 1395 of title 28, United States Code, or any other provision of law, in the case of property of a defendant charged with a violation that is the basis for forfeiture of the property under this section, a proceeding for forfeiture under this section may be brought in the judicial district in which the defendant owning such property is found or in the judicial district in which the criminal prosecution is brought.".

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. HAWKINS. I yield to my gracious colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I commend the documentary evidence presented in a very straightforward manner by our able colleague from Florida.

I wish to add for the record that in the Federal Court for the Northern District of West Virginia the initial trial began yesterday involving 4 of the 39 defendants named in a 465-page indictment relating to a drug ring that covers areas in north central West Virginia and many areas of the United States. There is evidence of intrigue and very careful planning for the distribution and sale of drugs that apparently amounts to hundreds of millions of dollars nationwide.

What our colleague has said about leniency in certain drug-related cases should be taken to heart by all Members of Congress. The warning she has given is one that is dramatic, as we listen, and it is factual.

For that reason, I think that we in this body must attempt to reach the point which we have not yet come to, where we will begin to understand that there is an undermining of the very governmental system of the United States by these individuals who not only are trafficking with the lives of people who use drugs, but also, in a real sense, are aiding even the enemies of government itself in disrupting the legal and moral functions of this country.

I thank the Senator from Florida for the opportunity to make this observation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. TRIBLE (for himself and Mr. GORTON):

S. 2593. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 respecting retransmission of programs originated by local television broadcast stations; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

RETRANSMISSION OF PROGRAMS ORIGINATED BY BROADCAST STATIONS

Mr. TRIBLE. Mr. President, Senator GORTON and I introduce today legislation to insure that our citizens who subscribe to cable television system will continue to receive quality local programing.

It is my belief that the localism principle is of such surpassing importance that it should be codified, and the legislation I have introduced today accomplishes that goal.

Simply put, the "local carriage" or "must carry" rules require cable systems to carry the signals of local television stations. They require a station to be carried, upon its request, by all cable systems within a 35-mile radius or within the station's predicted grade B contour. They also require carriage of distant stations which have such a large audience that they are defined as "significantly viewed" in the cable system's service area.

Since 1965, when the Federal Communications Commission adopted the "local carriage" rule (47 C.F.R. § 76.51 et seq.), this principle of localism has been under attack. The most recent example was a petition filed by the Turner Broadcasting System which was denied by the FCC earlier this month.

If the continued attacks on the "local carriage" provisions ever prove successful, the results would be deterimental to many of our citizens. Many local television stations outside of the major metropolitan markets would be eliminated by cable systems. As a consequence, the ability of cable subscribers to receive local news, sports, and weather, and other programing of unique local interest, would be curtailed. Once connected to a cable system, a viewer's ability to receive channels is either eliminated or the signal is subject to interference which reduces the quality of reception.

I wish to note that this legislation does not seek a change in FCC policy. Rather, it simply ratifies the practice which has existed for the past 19 years, and it is drafted to give the FCC the flexibility to alter its current regulations in response to changing circumstances.

This is a sound and necessary intiative, and I urge its prompt passage.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2593

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

RETRANSMISSION OF PROGRAMS ORIGINATED BY BROADCAST STATIONS

SECTION 1. Section 303(g) of Title 47 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof, the following new language: "to that end, the Commission shall maintain and enforce rules requiring cable television systems to carry the signals of local television broadcast stations as provided in 47 C.F.R. sections 76.51 through and including 76.61 as those provisions existed on October 1, 1983, except that the Commission shall retain authority to modify said rules from time to time for the purpose of ease of administration but not alteration of the substance of or principles embodied in those rules."

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. BRADLEY):

S. 2594. A bill to name the U.S. Post Office Building in Moorestown, NJ, as the "Edwin B. Forsythe Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

S.J. Res. 280. Joint resolution designating the Barnegat and Brigantine units of the national wildlife refuge system as the Edwin B. Forsythe-Barnegat National Wildlife Refuge and the Edwin B. Forsythe-Brigantine Na-

tional Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

COMMENDING EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, last month, we marked the passing of a respected citizen of New Jersey and valued Member of the Congress, Ed Forsythe.

Today, I am introducing two measures, cosponsored by my colleague from New Jersey, Senator BRADLEY, to create fitting memorials to Ed Forsythe, and his contribution to his district, our State, and the public at large.

Ed Forsythe was in the midst of his seventh term as Representative for the 13th and old Sixth Districts, when he passed away. The people of Moorestown, in Burlington County, perhaps know him best of all. Born in Pennsylvania, Ed was reared in Burlington County and was a longtime resident of Moorestown. His family owned a dairy farm nearby. He began his political carreer in Moorestown in 1948 as a secretary to the board of adjustment. He rose to other local positions and was elected to the State senate in 1963, where he served in leadership positions until his election to the House of Representatives in 1970.

In recognition of his dedication to his hometown, we introduce a bill to name the U.S. Post Office Building there for Ed Forsythe. By taking this action, as the House of Representatives has already done, we will provide the people of Moorestown with a lasting tribute to Ed Forsythe as an exemplary public servant.

Our second measure acknowledges Ed Forsythe's contributions to preserving our precious wildlife and natural resources. He was a defender of our coast. He was a leader in the passage of the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and the Nongame Wildlife Act. As ranking member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, he occupied a valued role in the protection of the State's natural resources. In tribute to him, and his accomplishments, and his commitment, we are also introducing a point resolution to designate the Barnegat and Brigantine units of the national wildlife refuge system in his name. Congressman JOHN BREAUX, Ed's colleague in the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, has introduced similar legislation in the House of Representatives. That resolution is cosponsored by the entire New Jersey delegation in the House as well as many others.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these two measures be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill and joint resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2594

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States Post Office Building located at 200 Chester Avenue, Moorestown, New Jersey, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Edwin B. Forsythe Post Office Building". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to such building shall be held to be a reference to the "Edwin B. Forsythe Post Office Building".

S.J. RES. 280

Whereas, Congressman Edwin B. Forsythe, in his role as Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment, was an outstanding leader for conservation of our natural resources and protection of our Nation's natural beauty;

Whereas, during his career he played a critical role in such important natural resource legislation such as the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976;

Whereas, he was the major Congressional sponsor of the Nongame Wildlife Act, which increased public interest and concern for species of wildlife not subject to taking for sport;

Whereas, throughout his Congressional career, he was a strong defender of the National Wildlife Refuge System;

Whereas, he had a deep affection for the coastal wildlife refuges in his home State of New Jersey; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Barnegat National Wildlife Refuge and the Brigantine National Wildlife Refuge in the State of New Jersey shall hereafter be named and designated as the "Edwin B. Forsythe-Barnegat National Wildlife Refuge" and the "Edwin B. Forsythe-Brigantine National Wildlife Refuge". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to the Barnegat Wildlife Refuge shall be held to be a reference to the "Edwin B. Forsythe-Barnegat National Wildlife Refuge", and any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to the Brigantine Wildlife Refuge shall be held to be a reference to the "Edwin B. Forsythe-Brigantine National Wildlife Refuge".●

● Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, on Thursday, March 29, 1984, Congressman Edwin B. Forsythe died of lung cancer at his home in Moorestown, NJ; 68 years old at the time of his death, Mr. Forsythe was New Jersey's senior Republican in the U.S. House of Representatives, having first been elected to the Congress in 1970. Mr. Forsythe had a long career in the public sector, first becoming active in municipal government in 1948 as secretary of the Moorestown Board of Adjustment. For the next 36 years, Ed served the public interest in a variety of positions including mayor of Moorestown, NJ, State senator—including president of the senate and acting Governor, delegate to the New Jersey Constitutional Convention in 1966, delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1968 and 1976, and, finally, as Congressman for the sprawling 13th district for 14 years.

In recognition of Ed Forsythe's dedication to his district, the Garden State, and this Nation, I am cosponsoring, along with my colleague Senator LAUTENBERG, two measures that will create permanent memorials.

First, we are introducing a bill to name the U.S. Post Office Building in Moorestown, NJ, Ed's hometown, for the late Congressman. It is only proper that the community that Ed enjoyed as a private citizen and served as a public official should have a permanent memorial.

The second measure, a joint resolution, will rename the Barnegat National Wildlife Refuge and the Brigantine National Wildlife Refuge as the Edwin B. Forsythe-Barnegat National Wildlife Refuge and the Edwin B. Forsythe-Brigantine National Wildlife Refuge. This change recognizes Ed's dedication and work as a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. As the ranking member of this committee, Ed worked hard to preserve wildlife and our natural resources: in fact, for the last several years he sponsored legislation that would force communities in the New York metropolitan area to stop dumping their sewage 12 miles off the North Jersey coast.

I am honored to have been a member of the New Jersey delegation with Congressman Forsythe. New Jersey has lost a loyal advocate and dedicated public servant. Because I believe these memorials will remind the people of the Garden State of this special legislator for years to come, I ask that my colleagues join in support of this tribute.●

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself and Mr. MOYNIHAN):

S. 2595. A bill to transfer jurisdiction from the government of the State of New York to the Federal Government for a portion of Fire Island, NY, and to transfer jurisdiction for Camp Hero from the Federal Government to the government of the State of New York; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OF CERTAIN LAND IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation which I believe presents a reasonable solution to a very divisive conflict. The conflict to which I refer has pitted the Federal Government against the State of New York and its residents—it has centered around disposition of the old Air Force base in Montauk, Long Island.

The General Services Administration (GSA) has caused this controversy by attempting to sell a parcel of

land previously used as an Air Force base. The opposition to this sale is based primarily on the fact that this land is an environmentally sensitive tract which ought to be preserved. The intrusion of saltwater, the proximity of precious wetlands, and the migratory habits of rare species of birds at the site are compelling reasons to keep this land in its natural state. Any other use would be foolish.

Senator MOYNIHAN and I originally supported a proposal which would have transferred title to the land to the State outright. This proposal was opposed by GSA as a giveaway. While I do not believe this to be the case, I understand those objections.

Consequently, we now have decided to introduce legislation to mandate an exchange of properties: We propose to transfer to the Federal Government property worth considerably more than that which it will give to the State. This is indeed a compromise. The Department of the Interior would acquire valuable lands contiguous to existing holdings of the Department and New York State would acquire a park for its citizens.

Mr. President, this bill is put forward as a good faith effort to meet the needs of both the State and Federal Governments. I urge its swift adoption. I also ask unanimous consent that the legislation be printed in the RECORD in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks.

Thank you, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2595

Be it enacted by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, The Administrator of General Services shall assign to the Secretary of the Interior for use as a public park or recreation area, portions of the Montauk Air Force Station in East Hampton Township, Suffolk County, New York, totaling two hundred and seventy-eight acres that were declared surplus to the needs of the United States Government on December 21, 1981.

The Administrator of General Services shall assign the land identified in the first section of this Act to the Secretary of the Interior within thirty days of enactment of this Act. Within thirty days of said assignment, the Secretary of the Interior shall, in exchange for the transfer of the fee title to one hundred and twenty-five acres of the real property owned by the State of New York at Fire Island, New York, to the Secretary of the Interior, convey the property to the State of New York for public park or recreation uses in accordance with section 203(k)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484(k)(2).●

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today and join my colleague from New York, Senator D'AMATO, in offering legislation compelling the Administrator of General Services to relinquish to the Secretary of the Interior 278 acres of the Montauk Air Force Station in Suffolk County, NY. This land was declared surplus by the Federal Government in December 1981. The Secretary of the Interior will exchange the land for 125 acres of State-owned property on Fire Island.

This legislation, similar to a bill, S. 2041, I introduced last year; simply directs the Government to do that which a 35-year-old statute authorizes and encourages. Since 1949, Federal law has allowed the free transfer of surplus Federal property for park and recreation uses. The desire of the current administration has been inconsistent with the intent of the law; GSA has sold such properties to the highest bidder and, in fact, attempted to do just that with Montauk Air Force Base.

This amendment will insure that a marvelous tract of recreational land is added to Montauk State Park, in accordance with the unanimity of opinion among elected officials and citizens of eastern Long Island. The Department of the Interior will be compensated by acquiring a stretch of beach property worth perhaps three times that of the Montauk tract. A gap in the Fire Island National Seashore will be closed because of this kind offer from the New York State Office of Parks and Recreation.

My feelings on the fate of the land in question are a matter of record. I shall not belabor the point. This amendment satisfies the intent of a Federal statute and the desires of many New Yorkers who will benefit greatly from the added parkland and increased recreational opportunities. The legislation we now offer will preserve as parkland that which would otherwise be unjustly sold for development by GSA as part of an unwise and unsuccessful program of property dissolution.●

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

S. 2596. A bill to extend duty-free treatment to scrolls or tablets imported for use in religious observances; to the Committee on Finance.

DUTY-FREE TREATMENT OF RELIGIOUS SCROLLS OR TABLETS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill designed to accord duty-free status to scrolls or tablets, commonly known as Gohonzon, imported for use in public or private religious observances. Gohonzon, literally defined as "most respected object of worship," embody the essential religious doctrines of certain Buddhist denominations and are enshrined by believers in home altars, much as Christians use the cross as a symbol of their faith.

Duty-free treatment is currently not accorded to Gohonzon distributed to believers due to an administrative interpretation limiting such treatment to such religious articles as are used solely by religious institutions. I believe that such a distinction between church and home use of religious articles is tenuous, particularly as to those articles which are integral to the practice of one's faith. Moreover, in regard to those religions which emphasize home as opposed to church worship, any such distinction must be regarded as fundamentally unfair and inappropriate.

The Gohonzon is an integral part of the practice of certain Buddhist denominations and home worship is the focal point of such faiths. The bill which I am introducing is consistent with the recent amendment to the tariff schedules according duty-free status to prayer shawls, whether or not imported for the use of religious institutions. This legislation will serve to insure equivalent tariff treatment to Gohonzon whether used in public or private religious observances. A companion measure has been introduced in the House by Congressman ROBERT MATSUI.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2596

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part 4 of schedule 8 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and 854.30" in headnote 1 and inserting in lieu thereof "854.30, and 854.40"; and

(2) by inserting in numerical sequence the following:

" 854.40	Scrolls or tablets of wood or paper, commonly known as gohonzons, imported for use in public or private religious observances.	Free	Free ".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. KASTEN, (for himself, Mr. JEPSEN, Mr. BOREN, Mr. PERCY, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DOLE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. EAST, Mr. GORTON, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ZORINSKY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DOMENICI, and Mrs. HAWKINS):

S.J. Res 279. Joint resolution to designate the week of November 11, 1984, through November 17, 1984, as

"Women in Agriculture Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WOMEN IN AGRICULTURE WEEK

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I am proud and pleased to introduce a joint resolution to designate the week of November 11, 1984, as "Women in Agriculture Week." My distinguished colleague, Congressman FOLEY, will today introduce this resolution to the House of Representatives.

More than 1 million women are solely or jointly responsible for individual farming and ranching operations in the United States. They act as accountants, merchandisers, managers, counselors, educators, and bankers. In addition, many combine their on-farm career with off-farm employment. Coupled with their many work responsibilities, these women also volunteer and contribute their valuable time to community, church school, professional, and civic organizations.

Their commitment to achieving a more prosperous agriculture is strengthened through the organizations they have formed with this objective in mind: The American Agri-Women (AAW), Women Involved in Farm Economics (WIFE), Rural American Women (RAW), American Farm Bureau Federation Women, American National Cowbells, National Porkettes, and Wheathearts are but a few of these organizations.

Women involved in agriculture are well informed and articulate when sharing their message with others. Not only are they strong advocates and participants in educating the public to the story of agriculture, but they have been active proponents in advancing needed changes in estate tax law, commonly referred to as the widow's tax.

Dr. Hiram Drache, a well-known agricultural history writer and speaker of Concordia College in Moorhead, MN, conducted a study of farm couples in several States. He discovered that the more innovative the farm, the more sophisticated the involvement by the farm wife. His research established that the wife of a successful farmer possesses seven key traits which are crucial to the farm business. I ask that Dr. Drache's article, which appeared in the November 1982 issue of Farm Wife News, be made a part of the RECORD. Dr. Drache eloquently describes the importance of the woman's role in agriculture.

I invite my colleagues to join with me in honoring these outstanding women for their accomplishments and commitment to agriculture, their community, and country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article and the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 279

Whereas farm women contribute substantially to the stabilization of family farms in the United States;

Whereas more than one million women are engaged, either solely or jointly, in the operation of farms in the United States;

Whereas farm women are involved in all aspects of farming operations either as accountants, machine operators, veterinarians, crop specialists, businesswomen, mothers, or other occupations;

Whereas farm women also make significant contributions to agriculture, the leading employer in the United States, by virtue of their motivation and pride;

Whereas farm women are committed to the preservation of their families and farming operations and to the prosperity of our nation's agricultural economy; and

Whereas the appropriate recognition of the contributions made by our nation's farm women is long overdue: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of November 11, 1984, through November 17, 1984, is designated as "Women in Agriculture Week" and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

FARM WOMEN ARE THE SECRET OF AGRICULTURE'S SUCCESS

(By Dr. Hiram Drache)

Just how much do farm women contribute to the short and longrun success of farming? And what qualities do these women bring to the farm business and home?

THE FARM WIFE?

After interviewing farm couples in several states. I've discovered that the more innovative the farm, the more sophisticated the involvement by the farm wife. Besides doing the marketing and running into town for parts, the farm wife also drives the truck or combine during harvest, feeds the livestock and keeps the books.

Many hours of research on this topic have established that the wife of a successful farmer posesses seven key traits which are crucial to the farm business. These are:

The progressive farmer's wife is generally risk-oriented. This is an important trait during a period when farmers must borrow large amounts of money in the face of rapidly changing markets.

The farmer's wife is most often the attitude setter in the family. She is the key to getting family cooperation. It is generally the mother's attitude which is crucial in deciding whether or not any of the children will farm.

The farm wife is a stabilizer in the farming business. This is also a crucial trait during a period when national and international events can change farm outlook drastically overnight. During the period of heavy capital obligations, blight, drought, falling prices and other tension-causing disasters, the farm wife can be a major factor in overcoming the adversity.

The wife frequently helps share the burden when problems or workloads become so great a single person cannot endure them. It is a historic fact that a large portion of early farm failures came when the wife could no longer mentally or physically withstand the burden.

The farm wife asks the key question. While the farmer asks the questions "how and can we?" the wife asks "why?" This determines the true reason why farmers do what they do and keeps them setting goals.

The final two traits found in the successful farm wife are motivation and pride. The wife knows how to motivate those around her. She is proud of being a farm wife. All people need these two traits if they are to succeed.

* * * * *

The challenges that face the family farm in the 1980's will be greater than ever before. Experts advise farmers to increase production so that there will be enough food to feed the country's growing population plus export abroad. Yet, any farmer knows overproduction is one of his greatest enemies.

Environmental legislation faces agriculture. Many people object to the use of fertilizers and pesticides in food production. These individuals want farmers to grow food like they did 100 years ago. But at the same time consumers expect a wide variety of meats, fruits and vegetables at the lowest possible cost.

The farm wife of the future will need to keep abreast of all of these issues. She'll need to be politically "aware". And, she will need to help find the means to manage the farm in the most profitable and environmentally responsible way.

* * * * *

I'm optimistic about the long-term outlook for agriculture. In the Book of Genesis, 8:22, the Lord said, "While the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease." That prediction has held true for thousands of years. There is no doubt in my mind that it will hold true for the future—with the help of the farm wife.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, they keep the records and do the books. They run the combines and drive the trucks. They tend the flocks and milk the cows. They move irrigation pipe, bale hay, pull calves, and hedge on the futures market. They are not your average farmer. They are the women in agriculture today.

Today, more than 1 million women are solely or jointly responsible for individual farming and ranching operations in the United States. I see them every time I am out in Idaho. They act as accountants, merchandisers, bankers, and brokers. They own, operate, or manage part of the Nation's largest industry. In addition, many combine their on-farm career with off-farm employment.

In addition to their on-farm and off-farm work responsibilities many women also volunteer their time and valuable knowledge to community, church, school, professional, and civic organizations. The accomplishments and commitment of these women to agriculture is often overlooked but deserves the highest recognition.

Today I join with my distinguished colleagues in the Senate to introduce a joint resolution requesting the President to designate the week of Novem-

ber 11, 1984, as "Women in Agriculture Week." I urge the President to acknowledge the contributions that women have made and continue to make to the most efficient food-producing machine in the world, American agriculture. It is time to recognize the valuable contributions that women have made to agriculture by setting aside a week in their honor.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, when Americans think of farmers, they too often picture "American Gothic" scenes of men in overalls wielding pitchforks and women in gingham dresses serving up hearty meals for the menfolk. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Today's men and women in agriculture are highly educated professionals who combine specialized knowledge of their own field with an understanding of business, marketing, and many other areas to compete in a very risky financial endeavor.

Women in agriculture, especially, are misunderstood. Many are "farm wives," but they have never been confined to the kitchen, at least in the way in which urban Americans often imagine. Most are as capable of driving a tractor or balancing the books as their husbands, fathers, brothers, and sons.

Over 1 million American women are solely or jointly responsible for farming and ranching operation. Many run the financial side of the business, but just as many are likely to be in the fields at planting or harvesting time. Many farm women supplement the family's income with a career off the farm.

But women in agriculture do not just live on farms. They are veterinarians, crop specialists, extension economists, marketing specialists, agribusiness representatives, and more.

What all these women in their diverse fields share is a commitment to furthering the well-being of the agriculture community. In honor of their dedication and their contributions to agriculture, and with the hope of perhaps helping to correct the mistaken impression many Americans hold about the role of women in agriculture, I am today joining my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator KASTEN, in introducing a joint resolution requesting the President to designate the week of November 11, 1984, as "Women in Agriculture Week."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 875

At the request of Mr. MATHIAS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 875, a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to strengthen the laws against the counterfeiting of trademarks, and for other purposes.

S. 1201

At the request of Mr. MATHIAS, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ARMSTRONG), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES) were added as cosponsors of S. 1201, a bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code to protect semiconductor chips and masks against unauthorized duplication, and for other purposes.

S. 1405

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EAST) were added as cosponsors of S. 1405, a bill to assure the first amendment rights of all citizens and to provide criminal penalties for violations thereof.

S. 1651

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. PRESSLER), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BRADLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1651, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for presumption of service connection to be established by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for certain diseases of certain veterans exposed to dioxin or radiation during service in the Armed Forces; to require the Administrator to develop, through process of public participation and subject to judicial review, regulations specifying standards for the presumptions applicable to the resolution of claims for disability compensation based on such exposures; to require that such regulations address certain specified diseases; and to require that all claimants for Veterans' Administration benefits be given the benefit of every reasonable doubt in claims adjudications, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. MELCHER), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1651, supra.

S. 1795

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1795, a bill to further the national security and improve the economy of the United States by providing grants for the improvement of proficiency in critical languages, for the improvement of elementary and secondary foreign language instruction, and for per capita grants to reimburse institutions of higher education to promote the growth and improve the quality of postsecondary foreign language instruction.

S. 1857

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. BOSCHWITZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1857, a bill to amend the International Revenue Code of 1954 to remove certain impediments to the effective philanthropy of private foundations.

S. 2014

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2014, a bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to provide for assistance in locating missing children.

S. 2116

At the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2116, a bill to accept the findings and to implement the recommendations of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians.

S. 2152

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2152, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assure adequate controls on social investing by pension plans.

S. 2256

At the request of Mr. HUDDLESTON, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. JEPSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2256, a bill to exempt restaurant central kitchens from Federal inspection requirements.

S. 2266

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from California (Mr. WILSON), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2266, a bill to grant a Federal charter to Vietnam Veterans of America, Inc.

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 2266, supra.

S. 2299

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2299, a bill entitled the "Antifraudulent Adoption Practices Act of 1984."

S. 2374

At the request of Mr. STAFFORD, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIXON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2374, a bill to extend the authorization for 5 years for the low-income home energy assistance program, for the community services block grant, and for the Head Start program, and for other purposes.

S. 2375

At the request of Mr. WEICKER, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2375, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the operation of the secondary market for loans guaranteed by the Small Business Administration.

S. 2378

At the request of Mr. ABDNOR, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 2378, a bill to provide authorizations of appropriations for the impact aid program under Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress, and for other purposes.

S. 2515

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2515, a bill to extend the provisions of chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code, relating to retirement and separation for physical disability, to cadets and midshipmen.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 165

At the request of Mr. MATHIAS, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 165, a joint resolution to commemorate the bicentennial anniversary of the constitutional foundation for patent and copyright laws.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 227

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABDNOR) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 227, a joint resolution designating the week beginning November 11, 1984, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 230

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABDNOR), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. BOSCHWITZ), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBURGER), the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Florida (Mrs. HAWKINS), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. JEPSEN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTEN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MITCHELL), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. TSONGAS) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 230, a joint resolution to designate the week of October 7 through October 13, 1984, as "National Bird of Prey Conservation Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 231

At the request of Mr. DODD, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. SIMPSON) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 231, a joint resolution to provide for the awarding of a gold medal to Elie Wiesel in recognition of his humanitarian efforts and outstanding contributions to world literature and human rights.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 236

At the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 236, a joint resolution relating to cooperative East-West ventures in space as an alternative to a space arms race.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 244

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 244, a joint resolution designating the week beginning on May 6, 1984, as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 253

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 253, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate September 16, 1984 as "Ethnic American Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 258

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HECHT) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 258, a joint resolution to designate the week of June 24 through June 30, 1984, as "National Safety in the Workplace Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 265

At the request of Mrs. HAWKINS, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. DENTON) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 265, a joint resolution designating the week of April 29 through May 5, 1984, as "National Week of the Ocean."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 270

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABDNOR), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. BOSCHWITZ) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 270, a joint resolution designating the week of July 1 through July 8, 1984, as "National Duck Stamp Week" and 1984 as the "Golden Anniversary Year of the Duck Stamp."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. JEPSEN), and the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 84, a concurrent resolution to encourage State and local governments to focus on the problems of child custody, child support, and related domestic issues.

SENATE RESOLUTION 122

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 122, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should reduce imports of apparel so that imported apparel comprises no more than 25 percent of the American apparel market.

SENATE RESOLUTION 283

At the request of Mr. COHEN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 283, a resolution relating to chemical weapons.

SENATE RESOLUTION 329

At the request of Mr. NUNN, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mrs. KASSEBAUM), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 329, a resolution expressing the support of the Senate for the expansion of confidence-building measures between the United States and the U.S.S.R., including the establishment of nuclear-risk-reduction centers, in Washington and in Moscow, with modern communications linking the centers.

SENATE RESOLUTION 358

At the request of Mr. CHILES, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABDNOR) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 358, a resolution commending the Government of Colombia for its major achievement in seizing large amounts of cocaine, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 107—AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL TO BE USED FOR THE UNKNOWN AMERICAN OF THE VIETNAM ERA TO LIE IN STATE

Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. BYRD) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 107

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Rotunda of the United States Capitol may be used from May 25, 1984, through May 28, 1984, both dates inclusive, for the remains of the unknown American of the Vietnam era to lie in state, and for appropriate proceedings and ceremonies in connection therewith.

SENATE RESOLUTION 372—RELATING TO EXPOSURE TO DIOXIN BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. BAKER, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. DOLE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

S. RES. 372

Whereas, veterans who served in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam conflict and veterans who participated in atmospheric nuclear tests or the occupation of Hiroshima or Nagasaki are deeply concerned about possible long-term health effects of exposure to ionizing radiation or to herbicides containing dioxins;

Whereas, there is scientific and medical uncertainty regarding the health effects occasioned by such exposures;

Whereas, the Congress has responded to such uncertainty by authorizing high priority medical care at all Veterans' Administration medical facilities (including approximately one million incidents of such care to date) for any veteran who may have been so exposed and is suffering from any disorder conceivably resulting from such exposure, even though there is insufficient medical evidence to associate such disability with such exposure;

Whereas, the Congress has further responded to such medical and scientific uncertainty by legislatively mandating the conduct of thorough epidemiological studies of the health effects experienced by veterans in connection with exposure to both radiation and herbicides containing dioxin, and by mandating the development of radioepidemiological tables, currently projected for completion in mid-1984, setting forth the probabilities of causation between various cancers and exposure to radiation;

Whereas, there are a total of sixty-six federally sponsored research projects currently being conducted relating to herbicides containing dioxin, at a cost to the Federal Government in excess of $130,000,000;

Whereas, the results of one such project—an epidemiological study, conducted by the United States Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine, of the health status of the "Ranch Hand" veterans who carried out the actual loading and aerial spraying of herbicides containing dioxin in Vietnam and in the process came into direct skin contact with such herbicides in their most concentrated liquid form—were recently released, on February 24, 1984, with the conclusion that there is insufficient evidence that this group of veterans is suffering adverse health effects related to their herbicide exposure;

Whereas, the medical and scientific communities have reached a consensus that—

(1) there is an increased risk of many types of leukemia associated with certain levels of radiation exposure; and

(2) there is a connection between exposure to herbicides containing dioxin and the diseases of chloracne and porphyria cutanea tarda;

Whereas, the "film badges" which were originally issued to members of the Armed Forces of the United States in connection with the nuclear testing program have previously constituted the primary source of dose information for veterans filing claims for Veterans' Administration disability compensation in connection with their exposure to radiation;

Whereas, such film badges are likely to provide an incomplete measure of radiation exposure, since such badges were not capable of recording inhaled, ingested, or neutron dose, were not issued to all participants, and were worn only for limited periods during and after each nuclear blast;

Whereas, standards governing the reporting of dose estimates in connection with radiation-related claims for Veterans' Administration disability compensation vary among the several branches of the Armed Forces, and no uniform minimum standards exist;

Whereas, the Veterans' Administration has not promulgated permanent regulatory guidelines setting forth the specific procedures for the adjudication of claims for Veterans' Administration disability compensation based on exposure to radiation or herbicides containing dioxin; and

Whereas, such claims present adjudicatory issues which are significantly different from issues presented in claims based upon more traditional types of injuries, particularly with respect to the difficulty of determining a connection between certain disabilities (frequently those involving long latency periods and ambiguities of causation) arising subsequent to military service, and exposure during service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that

(1) it should always be the defined policy of the United States to provide Veterans' Administration disability compensation as authorized by chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, to veterans for all disabilities arising subsequent to military service which are recognized, by a reasonable medical consensus, as having a connection to exposure during military service to ionizing radiation from atmospheric nuclear tests or the occupation of Hiroshima or Nagasaki, Japan, or to a herbicide containing dioxin;

(2) the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs should promptly—

(A) establish guidelines for the approval of the findings of epidemiological and clinical studies relating to the possible relationship between the latent manifestation of adverse health effects and exposure to radiation or herbicides containing dioxin, when such studies contain findings that are statistically significant or otherwise valid, are capable of replication, and withstand peer review, as determined in consultation with an advisory committee, to be established by the Administrator, consisting of individuals who are recognized authorities in epidemiology and other pertinent scientific disciplines;

(B) prescribe regulations, through a public review and comment process in accordance with the provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code—

(i) establishing clear guidelines, and, where appropriate, standards and criteria (to include provisions for the use of study findings approved pursuant to the guidelines established under subparagraph (A)), for the resolution of each claim for Veterans' Administration disability compensation based on a veteran's exposure either (I) to ionizing radiation from the detonation of a nuclear device in connection with the veteran's participation in an atmospheric nuclear test or with the occupation of Hiroshima or Nagasaki, Japan, by the Armed Forces of the United States prior to July 1, 1946, or (II) to a herbicide containing dioxin during service in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era; and

(ii) ensuring that if, after consideration of all the evidence of record with respect to such a claim, there is an approximate balance of positive and negative evidence regarding an issue material to the claim, the benefit of the doubt in resolving such issue shall be given to the claimant;

(C) add chloracne and, subject to the continued existence of medical consensus, porphyria cutanea tarda, pursuant to the Administrator's authority under section 301(3) of title 38, United States Code, to the list of chronic diseases presumed to be service-connected under section 312(a)(1) of such title, for particular application in the case of any veteran who served in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era and who, during such service, was exposed to a herbicide containing dioxin; and

(D) develop a plan, through a public review and comment process (to include publication in the Federal Register), to ensure that, in the adjudication of claims for Veterans' Administration disability compensation based on leukemia or other forms of cancer suffered by veterans exposed to ionizing radiation during military service, consideration is given to estimates of attributable risk derived from the radioepidemiological tables as issued by the Secretary of Health and Human Services;

(3) it has historically been and should be the function of the Congress, in exercising its legislative and oversight functions, to authorize compensation to veterans for disabilities resulting from every disease which is shown, by a reasonable medical consensus, as determined in the course of appropriate medical and scientific study, to have a connection to exposure during military service to ionizing radiation or to a herbicide containing dioxin;

(4) The Director of the Defense Nuclear Agency should, as Department of Defense executive agent for the Nuclear Test Personnel Review Program, prescribe guidelines through a public review and comment process (to include publication in the Federal Register)—

(A) specifying the minimum standards governing the preparation of radiation dose estimates in connection with claims for Veterans' Administration disability compensation;

(B) making such standards uniformly applicable to the several branches of the Armed Forces; and

(C) requiring that each such estimate furnished to the Veterans' Administration and to any veteran include comprehensive information regarding all material aspects of the radiation environment to which the veteran was exposed and which form the basis of the veteran's claim, including inhaled, ingested, and neutron dose;

(5) in connection with the duties of the Director of the Defense Nuclear Agency relating to the preparation of radiation dose estimates with regard to claims for Veterans' Administration disability compensation, the Director should—

(A) conduct a review of the current state of the art with respect to scientific and technical devices and techniques such as "whole body counters" which may be useful in determining previous radiation exposure;

(B) submit a report to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, not later than December 1, 1984, regarding the results of such review, including information concerning the availability of such devices and techniques, the categories of cases in which use of such devices and techniques may be appropriate, and the reliability and accuracy of dose estimates which may be derived from such devices and techniques; and

(C) enter into an interagency agreement with the Administrator for the purpose of (i) assisting the Administrator in identifying agencies or other entities capable of furnishing services involving such devices and techniques, and (ii) facilitating arrangements for the use of such devices and techniques; and

(6) the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in resolving material defferences between a competent radiation dose estimate submitted by a veteran and a radiation dose estimate prepared and transmitted by the Director of the Defense Nuclear Agency, should furnish such competent estimate to the Director together with a request that the Director provide for the preparation of a radiation dose estimate by an independent expert not affiliated with the Defense Nuclear Agency and, further, should provide for the consideration of such independent estimate in connection with the adjudication of the veteran's claim for Veterans' Administration disability compensation.

SEC. 2. (a) This resolution may be cited as the "Veterans' Dioxin and Radiation Exposure Initiative of 1984".

(b) The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I am very pleased to submit today, for myself and Senators MATHIAS, THURMOND, BAKER, TOWER, and DOLE, the proposed Veterans' Dioxin and Radiation Exposure Initiative of 1984, relating to the exposure of veterans to herbicides such as agent orange and to radiation in connection with atmospheric nuclear tests or the occupation of Hiroshima or Nagasaki.

This measure is the result of extensive and painstaking negotiations with administration officials from the Veterans' Administration, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Defense Nuclear Agency. In the process of pursuing the full administration cooperation which is essential to the effective implementation of the initiative, I have obtained explicit written commitments of full compliance and implementation from each agency affected. This level of cooperation, premised simply upon Senate passage, has rendered reliance on a bill format unnecessary, and has permitted use of a Senate resolution format which—by not being subject to House consideration or a lengthy conference process or formal Presidential approval—will guarantee significantly expedited, if not immediate, implementation. Thus, this is considerably more than the ordinary "sense of the Senate" resolution: It will have the effect of a legislative mandate.

The resolution would provide for a number of major substantive and procedural improvements in the handling of veterans' claims for disability compensation based upon exposure either to herbicides or to radiation from an atomic weapon. It would provide for the immediate establishment of a presumption of service connection for two diseases presently known to be related to agent orange—chloracne and a liver disease known as porphyria cutanea tarda—PCT. It would direct the VA to promptly develop and publish a plan for the adjudication of all radiation-related claims for leukemia and all other cancers in accordance with the radioepidemiological tables mandated by Congress in last year's Orphan Drug Act and due to be completed sometime this summer. It would direct the VA to develop and publish new guidelines for approving or rejecting the findings of scientific studies relating to dioxin or radiation, and to establish an advisory committee composed of recognized scientific experts to implement those guidelines—thus imposing some order on, and letting some "sunshine" into, a process which has previously not been open to public scrutiny. It would direct the Administrator to provide for the use of such approved study findings in the adjudication of claims for VA benefits. It would direct the VA to establish additional guidelines, standards, and criteria—in a manner similar to the core provisions of legislation (S. 1651) proposed by my good friend from California, AL CRANSTON—for use specifically in the adjudication of radiation and agent orange claims.

These provisions would be explicitly premised upon two key principles: First, that it is imperative that VA compensation be paid whenever there is a consensus of medical opinion linking a disease to agent orange or radiation exposure; and second, that it is and must remain the role of the Congress to decide in what way the VA compensation system should be adjusted or expanded to appropriately reflect the presently known and yet-to-be-learned health effects of agent orange and radiation exposure.

In addition, the initiative would provide for a number of improvements affecting the accuracy of the radiation dose estimates which are prepared by the Defense Nuclear Agency and which the VA relies upon in adjudicating claims based upon radiation exposure. It would direct DNA to develop and implement for the first time clear minimum standards for the preparation of dose estimates, uniformly applicable to all branches of the Armed Forces. It would direct DNA to include in all dose estimates furnished to the VA comprehensive information on all types of dose relevant to a veteran's claim, including inhaled and ingested dose—the present practice is generally to include only certain types of external dose. It would direct DNA to inquire into the usefulness of various medical and scientific techniques and devices such as "whole body counters"—which are capable of detecting small amounts of radiation which can remain in certain parts of the human body for many years after exposure—and to work with the VA in making such techniques and devices available for use in the preparation of DNA dose estimates.

Finally, it would provide for the preparation and use, in the case of a discrepancy between a DNA radiation dose estimate and in expert estimate submitted by a veteran, of a third estimate by an independent expert in order to help resolve the discrepancy.

Mr. President, several of the key provisions do deserve some additional comment. For example, with regard to the provision in clause (1) which would direct the VA to pay compensation whenever there is a consensus of medical opinion linking a disease to agent orange or radiation exposure, the term "reasonable medical consensus" was carefully chosen to reflect the VA's current policy—a policy which is applied whenever in the adjudication of a compensation claim there is an approximate balance of evidence for and against the claim—or resolving any "reasonable doubt" in favor of the claimant. I would emphasize that this standard is not intended to require unanimity of medical opinion regarding actual causation. It would be my intention that this standard would be met whenever it can be said that there is general agreement among 50 percent or more of the medical community linking a specific disease—or, in the language of epidemiology, establishing a significantly increased risk, or incidence, of such a disease—with exposure to dioxin or radiation.

With regard to the membership of the scientific advisory committee which would be established under clause (2)(A), it is my understanding with VA officials that the committee would be composed of a broad range of recognized scientific experts from

both within and without the Government, and that the committee's meetings and records would be open to lay individuals representing, for example, all interested veteran and consumer groups. In addition, it would be my recommendation that the VA Administrator, in selecting the members of the committee, consult with all such interested groups and solicit their suggestions regarding the selection of committee members.

With regard to the statement of congressional responsibility in clause (3), this provision is designed to affirm that the task of identifying and adding specific diseases to the list of diseases presumed to be service connected for purposes of VA compensation, more properly falls to the Congress than to the administration, in keeping with Congress responsibility to coordinate, oversee, and legislate entitlement programs. Most assuredly, there is no intention of mine to suggest that cost considerations should drive the Government's rightful response on agent orange and radiation compensation issues, but simply to emphasize that whatever is to be done by way of expansion of any entitlement type of program, must be clearly authorized or otherwise directed or approved by Congress.

With regard to the requirement that the VA develop a plan for the use of the HHS radioepidemiological tables in the adjudication of all radiation-related claims for cancer, it would be my recommendation that, because these tables have not yet been published in final form, the plan which is developed by the VA should reflect this fact by including elements such as a provision for review by objective and independent scientific experts to determine the validity and usefulness of the tables specifically in the context of the adjudication of veterans' claims, and a provision allowing modification of or amendment to the tables in accordance with recommendations made by the scientific advisory committee as it carries out its task of reviewing and approving the findings of scientific studies regarding the adverse health effects of exposure to radiation.

Finally, it would be my recommendation that the VA, in developing its guidelines, standards, and criteria under clause (2)(B)(i) for the resolution of agent orange and radiation claims, should bear in mind and give particular attention to the types of adjudicatory problems which are likely to arise in connection with claims based upon not only those diseases which are specified in the measure I am proposing today, but also those diseases which are specified in other legislative initiatives before this Congress—and which have thus generated particular concern among veterans and their families—including soft tissue sarcoma in connection with agent orange claims, and polycythemia vera and hypothyroidism or a thyroid nodule in connecton with radiation exposure.

Mr. President, I strongly recommend the Veterans' Dioxin and Radiation Exposure Initiative of 1984 to my colleagues as being the best and strongest approach—consistent with sound policy, scientific evidence, and preserving the continued integrity of the VA service-connected disability compensation system—for addressing the controversies surrounding the agent orange and radiation issues. It is designed to honor our clear and unarguable obligation to all veterans who have suffered disability in connection with their military service while recognizing the need for scientific and medical evidence in order to establish any such connection, and while recognizing also that, particularly with regard to agent orange, the evidence-gathering process is still under way, on a massive scale and at great expense I might add, and that this vital and complex process does not lend itself to easy duplication—and it is not likely to be improved upon—through a quick fix and decidedly complex administrative rulemaking proceeding. It is indeed worth emphasizing that when we speak of "gathering evidence" on agent orange, the reference is not only to the massive and highly publicized CDC epidemiological study due to be completed sometime in 1987 or 1988—for which the Congress appropriated $54 million just last year—but it is also to the dozens of other federally sponsored studies and numerous other independent and foreign studies the results of which have been coming in, and will be coming in in a constant stream over the next several years. All of these studies, as well as the great mass of important radiation studies past, present, and future, would, under the requirements of the initiative, be reviewed and approved or rejected in accordance with a comprehensive system of administrative guidelines which would be implemented in the glare of public scrutiny by an objective, expert scientific advisory committee.

Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation to the remarkably effective and spirited VA Administrator Harry Walters, DNA Director Lt. Gen. Richard Saxer, and my friend, OMB Director Dave Stockman, and their excellent and conscientious staffs, for working with me and my staff and for their receptiveness to my concerns and proposed improvements. Their patience and cooperation in this endeavor have reflected their great dedication to insuring that all possible responsible actions are taken for protecting the legitimate interests and concerns of veterans who may have been exposed to radiation or agent orange.

I would additionally wish to express my deeply felt thanks to Anthony Principi, the new and very capable majority chief counsel and staff director, and to general counsel Scott Wallace—both of whom have been working tirelessly in pursuit of solutions to the many and thorny issues surrounding agent orange and radiation exposure. Their dedication is apparent in the quality of this measure I present today.

This brings me to the regrettable fact that today I bid a special farewell to Scott Wallace who has been an invaluable member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee staff. During Scott's 3-year tenure with the committee, his talents have been utilized in a wide variety of legislation and oversight matters including agent orange and radiation, legislation establishing a right of judicial review for claimants for VA benefits, a recent bill to provide interim solvency for the VA's housing loan guaranty program, veterans' education issues, compensation and employment matters, budget and appropriations concerns, as well as Public Law 98-77, the Veterans' Emergency Job Training Act. Scott has served the committee in a most diligent and thoroughly professional manner. He is a thoughtful and sincere man and his warm personality is blended with a fine legal and problem-solving capability, and he surely will be missed. Our loss, however, is Senator SPECTER's gain—for next week Scott will be a fine addition to my esteemed colleague's staff for the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Juvenile Justice. Scott, I do wish you the very best.

Mr. President, the measure that I am introducing today, in addition to having the support of the administration, is supported by AMVETS and the Paralyzed Veterans of America. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important initiative for the benefit of all veterans, and the families of all veterans, who may have been exposed to agent orange or ionizing radiation during their military service.

Mr. President, I would ask that at the conclusion of my remarks, there be printed the letter of support and commitment from VA Administrator Harry Walters, the letter from me to the Director of the Defense Nuclear Agency and his responsing letter—which contains his commitment to carry out the initiative—two letters of support from the Paralyzed Veterans of America and AMVETS, and finally, two excellent newspaper editorials on agent orange, one from the Washington Post and one from the Chicago Tribune.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, April 12, 1984.

Hon. ALAN K. SIMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I support your proposed resolution addressing veterans' concerns about exposure to Agent Orange in Vietnam or to ionizing radiation during the atmospheric nuclear weapons tests or occupations of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan.

Your resolution is far preferable to S. 1651. You are to be commended for fashioning a well-reasoned alterantive, and, if passed by the Senate, I agree to carry out its provisions for various VA administrative improvements.

Advice has been received from the Office of Management and Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this letter and that it is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

HARRY N. WALTERS,
Administrator.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, January 13, 1984.

Lt. Gen. RICHARD K. SAXER,
Director, Defense Nuclear Agency, Hybla Valley Federal Building, Alexandria, VA.

DEAR GENERAL SAXER: I am writing with regard to the radiation dose reports prepared by DNA and used by the VA in processing radiation-related claims for VA benefits (see 32 C.F.R. Part 218; 38 C.F.R. Part 3, § 3.311). This is a process to which I have given some considerable attention, and I would like to share with you some of my thoughts on the subject. I trust that you will find them helpful.

As you know, the health effects of exposure to low-level ionizing radiation have been studied very extensively over the years, and the further scientific study provided for under title VI of the recently enacted Veterans' Health-Care Programs Improvements Act of 1983, Public Law 98-160, is still in the planning stage and is of uncertain scope at this time. I am mindful, however, that the utility of the existing body of knowledge for purposes of claims for VA benefits is dependent upon the accuracy and thoroughness of the underlying dose information compiled in each individual veteran's case. In this regard, I am aware of the limitations of the badge data gathered during the various tests, and of DNA's and VA's principal reliance on these data. It is this awareness which leads to my greatest concern in this area: that we do all in our power to ensure that the dose information relied upon by the VA reflects the complete radiation environment to which a veteran may have been exposed in connection with that veteran's participation in the nuclear testing program or in the occupation of Hiroshima or Nagasaki. And as is so well recognized in DNA regulations containing current dose reconstruction methodology (32 C.F.R. § 218.3), the complete radiation environment has numerous separate component parts, spanning both initial and residual radiation, and external and internal dose.

In considering the various aspects of the complete radiological environment, and in incorporating them into the dose reconstruction process, there is one important constant which must be borne in mind: the central core of the necessary data—the size and nature of the blast, meteorological conditions, extent and scope of participation of troops—is predominantly, if not solely (in the case of certain still-classified material) within the control of the Federal Government. The burden thus lies heavily on DNA and related agencies to make the fullest possible use of those data, and to avoid any need for the claimant to produce through secondary sources information which is readily available or may feasibly be extrapolated from the Government data base.

All this leads to my central recommendation to DNA: that a dose estimate encompassing the complete radiological environment, and based on the most reliable and up-to-date methodology and assumptions, be furnished in every case where the VA requests dose information from DNA. Under current practice, as I understand it, DNA need only furnish a bare estimate of gamma dose (whether by direct badge reading or indirect badge "reconstruction") while a calculation of initial and internal dose would be performed only where such dose is "identified as a meaningful contribution to the total dose" (32 C.F.R. § 218.2(l)). It is also my understanding that as a matter of practice, such calculations are performed quite infrequently. My recommendation would recognize that, in keeping with the long-standing adjudicatory policy of giving VA claimants the benefit of the doubt on factual issues, it would be appropriate to implement a presumption that initial dose, internal dose, and the various aspects of residual radiation dose have all made a "meaningful contribution to the total dose"—in the absence of affirmative evidence to the contrary. This would mean that in the great bulk of cases where there is no specific affirmative evidence either confirming or refuting such a "meaningful contribution", a comprehensive dose reconstruction would nevertheless be performed, as a matter of course, so that determinations regarding the relative significance of the various possible dose components might be based on facts rather than presumptions. To do otherwise effectively imposes upon the VA claimant the very difficult burden of coming forward (see 38 C.F.R. § 3.311(c)(4)) with evidence which, as I have noted, is less accessible to the claimant than to DNA.

If DNA were to develop computer models of each individual nuclear event (including Hiroshima and Nagasaki) in which U.S. servicemembers participated, applying appropriate methodology, and taking into account individual variables such as location, protection, particpation in post-shot activities, food sources, etc., the result might be a series of dose figures, graphs or tables, available for ready correlation with the circumstances of an individual veteran's case. I note that a comparable, and quite comprehensive, radiological survey has been performed with respect to residents of the Marshall islands, and has resulted in the publication of both scientific and lay reference volumes. These volumes provide sufficiently detailed exposure information so that a claims-adjudicating body (i.e., the tribunal which would be established under the pending U.S.-Marshall Islands agreement) will be able to determine most individuals' approximate aggregate dose from all sources without the need for further scientific inquiry or processing of data. I recognize that this exposure information itself may not be applicable to American nuclear test personnel, inasmuch as its focus is on very long-term exposure—i.e., the 30 years that have followed the Marshall Islands testing—with a particular emphasis on long-term internal dose through the indigenous food chain. However, it seems to me that the two situations differ more in degree than in kind. I would single out two aspects of the Marshall Islands experience which may be instructive with regard to this country's own veteran population. The first is the format of the Marshall Islands survey: it consists of a series of tables for residents of each individual island in the various atolls, each reflecting a different group of assumptions regarding variable elements (such as whether the individual ate food only from that individual's own island, visited other islands, ate some imported food, or gathered coconuts on another island). And second—and most importantly—the fact that such exposure information has been assembled with respect to the civilian, non-U.S.-citizen residents of the Marshall Islands whose lives have been affected by U.S. atomic testing, leads inescapably to the conclusion that we can and must do no less for this country's own veterans.

I would greatly appreciate having the benefit of DNA's views on the issues I have raised—not only on the feasibility of implementation, but also on related issues such as 1) the mechanics of implementation—that is, whether volumes of finished dose information should be prepared and transmitted to the VA in advance of individual dose requests being made to DNA, or whether a two-stage process should be utilized, first developing all the necessary computer models, and only later programming in individual variables on an ad hoc basis; 2) the amount of time necessary for implementation (including revision of applicable regulations and VA/DNA interagency agreements); 3) all associated cost ramifications; and 4) questions regarding the performance of the requisite computer modeling and data processing functions—how, by whom, how transmitted to the VA, etc. Please do not hesitate to include any recommendations for legislative action.

Please be assured of my very great interest in working with DNA to pursue all workable improvements in this process in order to secure the most thorough and equitable adjudication of radiation-related claims for VA benefits. I do look forward to receiving your reply at your earliest convenience.

My best personal regards to you,

Sincerely,

ALAN K. SIMPSON,
Chairman.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

Hon. ALAN K. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: I am pleased to have this opportunity to respond to your letter of January 13, 1984, regarding radiation dose determinations for Veterans Administration (VA) compensation claims involving atmospheric nuclear test participants. We share your view that the accuracy and thoroughness of the dose information compiled in these cases is absolutely vital to the proper resolution of these claims.

As you are aware, the Defense Nuclear Agency (DNA) has conducted the Nuclear Test Personnel Review (NTPR) Program since 1978. During this time, we have performed scientific and historical research concerning the atmospheric nuclear testing program and developed analytical techniques to assess the potential radiation exposures of the participants. Each military service has its own NTPR team which researches and responds to VA and veterans' inquiries. DNA assists in this effort by pro-

viding radiation dose reconstructions when necessary.

As stated in our published dose reconstruction methodology, all potential exposure pathways should be considered in each case. If the available dosimetry does not include all of the time during which the veteran may have been exposed, or it there were any potential for neutron or meaningful internal exposure, an individual dose reconstruction should be performed. The determination is made by the service concerned with assistance provided by DNA.

Based upon the concerns expressed in your letter, we have reviewed the procedures employed by the various services. Because the potential for neutron or internal exposure was very small for the overwhelming majority of veterans, most of the responses to inquiries by veterans and the Veterans Administration have addressed only external gamma exposures. Therefore, many veterans believe that the information provided to the VA is incomplete and that internal and neutron exposures are not adequately considered. Clearly, to maintain our credibility with the veterans, our procedures must be improved to assure that our responses reflect the fact that we do consider all potential exposure pathways.

We have developed guidelines requiring all Nuclear Test Personnel Review (NTPR) service teams to address these basic issues in responding to Veterans Administration (VA) claims. These guidelines, which will be published in the Federal Register for public information and comment prior to implementation, will require discussion of alternative exposure pathways. A synopsis of these guidelines is enclosed. I must emphasize that the guidelines will establish minimum essential requirements. Any additional information which may be available to the service will also be provided. Any information provided by the veteran will be considered in performing the dose reconstruction unless that information is demonstratively erroneous. A copy of all responses to the VA, along with the incoming VA requests, will be sent to the claimant so that the veteran is aware of what has been furnished and can challenge any portion which he or she believes to be in error.

Your letter suggests that the Defense Nuclear Agency (DNA) provide an internal dose reconstruction for all veterans who are seeking VA compensation on the theory that internal exposure may have made a "meaningful contribution" in those cases. As you may imagine, dose reconstructions are both time consuming and expensive. In the past, reconstructions have averaged $5,000 each. Moreover, internal doses do not "contribute meaningfully" to total dose in the vast majority of cases. Therefore, I propose reconstructing internal exposures for VA cases as follows:

First, DNA will perform individual reconstructions for any claimant whose internal exposure could have exceeded 0.15 rem to the bone in one year. This threshold was selected because it is one percent of the radiation protection guideline for internal doses. (National Council on Radiation Protection (NCRP) Publication 22 recommends a radiation protection guideline for occupational exposure of 15 rem internal dose per year to an individual organ.) While 0.15 rem to the bone is clearly not a meaningful internal dose, it does provide for individual reconstructions for any veteran whose dose could have exceeded one percent of the guideline. In any case in which there is a claim for disability based upon a thyroid problem or any potential exists for neutron exposure, an individual dose reconstruction will be performed.

Second to assist the services in determining whether an individual internal dose reconstruction is required, we plan to prepare a scientific report which specifically identifies those categories of cases in which there was no neutron exposure or internal dose exceeding 0.15 rem to the bone and provides a comprehensive explanation of why the 0.15 rem could not have been exceeded. The cost of this effort is approximately $150,000 and a draft of the report will be completed by the end of 1984. After appropriate scientific peer review, the report will be made available to the Veterans Administration (VA) and to the roughly 700 libraries which receive our historical documentation. Responses to inquiries form the VA and veterans concerning those cases which are identified in the report will include neutron and internal doses in accordance with the report in lieu of an individual internal dose reconstruction.

We have carefully considered your suggestion that the Defense Nuclear Agency (DNA) prepare scientific and lay reference volumes from which individuals and adjudicatory bodies could perform their own dose calculation with respect to each pathway. In a large number of the cases, there was no potential for exposure to neutron radiation or a meaningful internal dose. These cases will be thoroughly reviewed in the scientific study referred to above. In the limited number of cases in which there was increased potential for neutron or internal exposure, the dose is highly dependent upon individual activities. The veterans who participated in the atmospheric nuclear testing program performed a wide variety of duties in differing radiation environments. Some were present a few hours or days while others were present for an extended period of time and participated in many tests. This is in marked contrast to the situation regarding the people of the Marshall Islands alluded to in your letter, since those populations generally spend a lifetime on their residential atolls and their variations in lifestyles and diet have been well documented and readily described. We have, therefore, determined that the universe of veterans activities is too large to encompass within even the most comprehensive set of reference materials and that we can best serve the veteran by continuing to perform individual dose reconstructions in appropriate cases. We will, of course, continue to furnish the VA and the veteran with full explanations of the assumptions and methodologies employed.

The establishment of uniform guidelines, assignment of a quantified value to the term "meaningful internal dose," and preparation of a scientific study documenting the conclusion that the internal exposure commitment could not have exceeded 0.15 rem to the bone in various categories of cases are all substantial improvements to the program. Accordingly, we will review the 2,000 or so doses provided for Veterans Administration (VA) claims that have been processed to date. If this review discloses any cases in which an individual neutron or internal dose calculation should be performed, a reconstructed dose will be prepared and provided to the VA.

We have reviewed the proposed resolution your staff furnished on April 10, 1984 and believe its provisions are sound. Accordingly, if the resolution with no other measure is adopted, the Defense Nuclear Agency (DNA) will comply fully with its provisions.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your interest in our program and your efforts on behalf of America's veterans. Your insights and suggestions have resulted, I believe, in marked improvements to the Nuclear Test Personnel Review Program. I look forward to continuing our cooperative efforts to assure that veterans' claims are fully and fairly considered.

Sincerely,

RICHARD K. SAXER,
Lieutenant General, USAF, Director.

SUMMARY OF GUIDELINES TO BE ADDRESSED IN VA INQUIRY

1. Can it be documented that the veteran was a test participant? If so, what tests did he attend and what were the specifics of these tests (date, time, yield, type, location, etc.)?

2. What unit was the man in? What was the mission and activities of the unit at the test?

3. What was the man's rank, and, if possible, what were his duties at the test?

4. Can you corroborate the specific information provided by the claimant to the Veterans Administration and forwarded to the Department of Defense? What is the impact of these specific activities on the claimant's reconstructed dose?

5. Was there a potential for fallout contamination?

6. Is there any recorded radiation exposure for the individual? Does this recorded exposure cover the full period of test participation?

7. Is a dose reconstruction necessary? What is his reconstructed dose?

8. Is there evidence of significant internal exposure? What is the reconstruction?

PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, April 17, 1984.

Senator ALAN K. SIMPSON,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SIMPSON: On behalf of the members of Paralyzed Veterans of America it is a pleasure to inform you of our support for your resolution addressing the issue of "Agent Orange." Your resolution and the accompanying commitments by the Administrator of Veterans Affairs and the Director of the Defense Nuclear Agency to carry out its provisions offer a positive step in resolving the complexities inherent with "Agent Orange" and simultaneously addressing the need to care for the nation's veterans. While there have been several meaningful legislative proposals introduced during the 98th Congress reflecting the deep concern for veterans who have experienced exposure to herbicides and ionizing radiation, your resolution establishes the most practicable procedures to address the well-being of veterans within the context of existing scientific evidence.

"Agent Orange" is a highly emotional issue for many veterans, has received wide media attention, and for many Americans is synonymous with the entire war in Southeast Asia. PVA, in addressing this issue and viewing the needs of veterans, has given careful consideration to the potential effect of the various pending legislative proposals on existing and future veterans' benefits and programs. We have, in as dispassionate a way as possible, attempted to examine each proposal and determine to what extent the needs of veterans who were exposed to

herbicides and ionizing radiation would be addressed.

The Senate Resolution being offered by you, Mr. Chairman, if passed by the Senate, would not have the force of law. However, the commitments to adhere to its provisions made by Mr. Harry Walters, VA Administrator, and Lieutenant General Richard K. Saxer, Director of the Defense Nuclear Agency, mitigate our concerns and lead us to support the Resolution. This factor coupled with the reasonable approaches contained in the Resolution to have in place mechanisms and procedures to address scientific and medical findings as they become available make the Resolution a viable approach in meeting the needs of veterans who were exposed to herbicides and ionizing radiation.

Additionally, the willingness of you and your staff to reconsider and address the two specific concerns PVA had regarding the Resolution were particularly appreciated. PVA could not support the Resolution while it contained language equating the granting of service-connection to budgetary and entitlement spending considerations. It has long been a cornerstone of PVA's efforts on behalf of veterans that the provision of compensation for service-connected disabilities is part of the continuing cost of our freedom and way of life. The sacrifices of the men and women who have served the nation transcend monetary issues, and compensation is the nation's recognition of the losses and injuries sustained in its defense.

The second issue which we were pleased to see addressed was the constitution of the proposed advisory committee. PVA believes that to allay the concerns of many veterans and to assure impartial and unquestioned independence the committee must be composed of individuals from within and outside the Veterans Administration and must contain consumer members. The advisory committee, so established, would be reflective of all concerned both by the scientific and medical communities, as well as, by individual veterans and their representatives.

Again, Mr. Chairman, PVA is pleased to support this humane and balanced step in addressing "Agent Orange" and ionizing radiation problems of veterans. Believing that your proposal is in the best interest of all veterans we offer our assistance to you on this issue.

Sincerely yours,

R. JACK POWELL,
Executive Director.

AMVETS,
Lanham, MD, April 23, 1984.

Hon. ALAN K. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: Reflecting the legitimate concern of our Vietnam veterans and their families regarding the possible disabling effects of exposure to Agent Orange and the effects of atomic radiation on other veterans, AMVETS has consistently supported legislation and administrative initiative to scientifically define the epidemiological connection, if any, between exposure and various compensable conditions. To encourage the expeditious resolution of questions about this disturbing subject, we supported the essential intent of H.R. 1961, sponsored by Mr. Daschle, even though the scientific issues remain open.

In supporting presumed Agent Orange service connection for chloracne, porphyria cutanea tarda (PCT) and soft tissue sarcoma, pending completion of congressionally mandated CDC studies, AMVETS nevertheless expressed strong reservations about charging the VA with the responsibility of administratively establishing additional presumptive conditions. We believe that it is the responsibility of Congress (as opposed to the Administration) to decide how the VA compensation system should be adjusted or expanded to reflect the health effects of Agent Orange. AMVETS is pleased to note the passage of H.R. 1961 by the House without the provisions for open-ended expansion of conditions presumed to be service connected to Agent Orange or radiation exposure.

AMVETS is grateful for the efforts of Senator Cranston in strongly advocating legislation on this subject to adequately compensate and medically treat those veterans and their dependents who may have suffered disability as a result of exposure to Agent Orange and nuclear radiation. We believe, however, that the scope of the Cranston Bill, S. 1651, is far too broad in the light of the current reasonable medical consensus. AMVETS also believes that Senator Cranston's approach is inconsistent with our views regarding congressional and administrative responsibility in establishing presumptive service connection, and we demur from the provision in S. 1651 for special judicial review which is not made applicable to all VA adjudicative determinations.

Realizing that the effects of radiation exposure may take years to manifest themselves, AMVETS has advocated a 25-year period for presumed service connection for those conditions which, according to accepted epidemiological principles, may result from nuclear exposure.

The Veterans Dioxin and Radiation Exposure Initiative of 1984, formulated by Chairman Simpson of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs intelligently and effectively addresses the issues regarding Agent Orange and radiation exposure. Except for exclusion of soft tissue sarcoma, for which medical evidence of its connection to Agent Orange is questionable at best, Chairman Simpson's proposed resolution is consistent with our position on H.R. 1961 regarding Agent Orange. AMVETS also believes that it provides an honest and scientifically responsible methodology regarding the effects of nuclear radiation and we support it.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. WILBRAHAM,
National Commander.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 1, 1984]

NEW FINDINGS ON AGENT ORANGE

Many Vietnam veterans have, for too many years, been suffering from uncertainty about the health effects of exposure to the herbicide Agent Orange. Now, at last, there is scientific evidence that should offer them some measure of comfort. The Air Force has released findings from a study of heavily exposed veterans that found no evidence of either higher death rates or of diseases most strongly suspected of being linked to the types of dioxin found as contaminants in Agent Orange.

The government has been very slow in providing Vietnam veterans with the evidence to which they are entitled about possible long-term effects of their service. As a result it is right that the Veterans Administration—under congressional direction—has already taken the precaution of providing full health care for all veterans exposed to Agent Orange who suffer any disability not attributable to another cause. And, of course, the government should continue its extensive research program.

It is always possible that further study of the Air Force study participants, or the larger studies of the entire Vietnam veteran population being done by the Centers for Disease Control, will provide evidence of linkages between Agent Orange exposure and certain illnesses. But it is certainly encouraging that comparisons between the so-called Ranch Hands—the pilots and crews continuously involved in the spraying operations—and carefully chosen comparison groups found that, with a few possible exceptions, the Ranch Hands do not seem to have been affected by their exposure.

The Ranch Hands did experience higher rates of non-melanomic skin cancer—the commonest form of cancer among the white population—and certain liver and circulatory disorders. They also reported more minor birth defects, neonatal deaths and physical handicaps among their offspring, although these results have not yet been verified. The Air Force plans further study to determine whether these differences can be explained by exposure to sunlight, cigarette and alcohol consumption and other known causal factors.

Most striking is that the study did not find a single case of soft-tissue sarcoma (a form of cancer), chloracne (a severe skin disorder known to be caused by exposure to heavy doses of dioxin) or porphyria cutanea tarda (a rare liver disorder) among the Ranch Hands. A bill passed by the House last month would entitle Vietnam veterans who suffer from these illnesses to the same monetary compensation they would receive if they had suffered direct injury in battle.

Congress is understandably eager to compensate veterans for service-caused injuries. When slow-developing diseases can be reliably linked to service, compensation is certainly justified. But it would be a mistake to undermine the basis for compensation systems—or for warranted extensions of those systems—by indemnifying illness without adequate scientific basis.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 19, 1984]

LOOKING FOR AGENT ORANGE FACTS

(By Joan Beck)

The Supreme Court has cleared the way for a mass trial to begin in May that will pit thousands of Vietnam veterans claiming to have been harmed by Agent Orange against several manufacturers of the herbicide.

Chances are remote that such a showcase trial will establish a true cause-and-effect connection between Agent Orange and the spectrum of health problems that veterans blame on it. The case will probably hinge on legal technicalities, not medical truth.

Despite thousands of disturbing reports from veterans about their illnesses and those of their children, it will be years before medical science can show with reasonable certainty whether the dioxin in Agent Orange harmed the veterans. If dioxin isn't to blame, proving that to the satisfaction of the veterans will be even more difficult.

At least nine major studies are currently underway in efforts to sort out links between Agent Orange and veterans' health problems. They include four sponsored by the Centers for Disease Control and three by the Veterans Administration. It will be years before all are completed.

Even if the government were to yield to political pressures and reimburse veterans for their medical problems without waiting

for strong evidence against Agent Orange, it's still essential to do all of these studies. That's true, too, no matter who wins the upcoming trial or what the legal arguments.

The danger is that because of political pressures and sympathy for the veterans, dioxin may be wrongly blamed and the real cause of some cancers, birth defects and other disorders may go undetected and unchecked.

Take, for example, the first report just issued by the U.S. Air Force from its Ranch Hand study. The research compared the health of Air Force personnel involved in herbicide spraying in Vietnam with other carefully matched veterans who flew cargo in Vietnam, but had no contact with herbicides. The Ranch Handers were more heavily exposed to Agent Orange than all other American personnel; they worked with the substance up to 10 or 12 hours a day, five or six days a week, for a year or more and were often dusted with it.

So far, the Ranch Hand study is generally reassuring. It found no link between exposure to Agent Orange and health problems. The Ranch Handers had no more neurological, heart, renal, pulmonary or endocrine problems than the comparison veterans. They had no more cancers (except for a few more simple skin cancers, most commonly caused by sunlight). None had chloracne, the first and most diagnostic sign of dioxin damage.

There were no significant differences in fertility and infertility, miscarriages, stillbirths and birth defects (except for Ranch Hander parents' reports of more minor birth marks and rashes) among their children. Ranch Hander parents also reported more deaths of children during the first month of life and more physical handicaps among their offspring, although these data need further checking.

Both groups are actually "faring better" in health than men of similar age in the general population, the report concludes. Follow-up research will continue for 20 years, with further studies where data aren't clear.

But one of the most important findings of the Ranch Hand study has slipped by generally unnoticed. What is strongly linked with birth defects, infant deaths and learning disabilities in both the Ranch Hander families and those of the comparisons is smoking by the mother during pregnancy. Drinking during pregnancy is also strongly associated with physical handicaps in children in both groups.

Such a strong indictment of smoking and drinking during pregnancy—backing up other scientific evidence—should be good news to other prospective parents. It should be comforting to know that they can protect their children from two significant causes of birth defects just by their own actions.

But such information isn't always welcome. A new New York City health regulation now requires all bars, restaurants and liquor stores to post a notice reading, "Warning: Drinking Alcoholic Beverages During Pregnancy Can Cause Birth Defects." Objections have come from bars, the liquor industry, some physicians who aren't convinced total abstinence is necessary—and some women's groups who say the public notice is sex discrimination.

The cause of cancer, birth defects and neurological abnormalities are, of course, multiple and complex. It's tempting to blame them on Agent Orange or EDB, on toxic wastes or nuclear energy, on government or big corporations and to look for solutions in the political, not scientific, process. But in the long run, that won't work. We need all those studies of veterans—and other groups, too. We must look at the results with an open mind and apply the same objective standards to the data, whether they point the blame at corporate irresponsibility or our own personal pleasures.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

FEDERAL BOAT SAFETY ACT AMENDMENTS

HELMS AMENDMENT NO. 3028

Mr. HELMS proposed an amendment to amendment No. 3027 proposed by Mr. BAKER (and others) to the bill (H.R. 2163) to amend the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the amendment, insert the following:

TEN PERCENT REDUCTION IN SPENDING REQUIRED

SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 if such concurrent resolution does not comply with the provisions of this section.

(b)(1) A concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 shall set forth for each of the fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, a total amount of budget authority for discretionary Federal programs which does not exceed an amount equal to the product of the total amount of budget authority provided by law for such programs for fiscal year 1984 multiplied by 90 percent.

(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term "discretionary Federal program" means any Federal program other than—

(A) a program classified under the functional category of National Defense in the budget submitted by the President for the applicable fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code; and

(B) a program for which spending authority (as defined in section 401 (c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) is provided by law.

(c)(1) A concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 shall set forth for each of the fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987, a total amount of budget authority for the payment of obligations under spending authority (as defined in section 401 (c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) provided by law which does not exceed an amount equal to the total amount of budget authority provided for such payments for fiscal year 1984 multiplied by 90 percent.

(2) The requirements of paragraph (1) shall not apply to budget authority provided for payments under spending authority provided by titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act.

(d) To carry out subsection (c), a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 shall contain provisions to require the committees described in clauses (1) through (10) of this subsection to submit, by June 1, 1984, recommendations to the Senate Committee on the Budget in accordance with such clauses. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill, or resolution, or both, carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(1) The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $7,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $8,900,000,000, in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $10,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(2) The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $2,500,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $3,800,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $5,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(3) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $13,500,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $15,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $18,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(4) The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $1,900,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $2,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $2,500,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(5) The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $1,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $1,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $300,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(6) The Senate Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(7) The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $1,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $1,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $1,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(8) The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $400,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $400,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $500,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(9) The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $2,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $2,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $2,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

(10) The Senate Committee on Indian Affairs shall report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of Public Law 93-344, sufficient to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1985; to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; and to reduce budget authority by $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1987.

CREDIT AND DEBIT CARD COUNTERFEITING AND FRAUD ACT

DOLE AMENDMENT NO. 3029

Mr. BAKER (for Mr. DOLE) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1870) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide penalities for credit and debit card counterfeiting and related fraud; as follows:

On page 4, add the following after the matter which follows line 23:

Sec. 3. As soon as feasible, reliable, and economically viable, all persons who produce, have control or custody of or possess device-making equipment, or systems utilizing payment devices should attempt to establish a system or systems which are capable of positively verifying the holder of such payment device or the transaction in which such device is or has been utilized while minimizing intrusions on personal privacy.

THURMOND AMENDMENT NO. 3030

Mr. BAKER (for Mr. THURMOND) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1870, supra; as follows:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "1983" and insert "1984".

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet on Thursday, April 26, 1984, at 9:30 a.m., in SR-301, Russell Building, to receive testimony on the Federal Election Commission's request for funding for fiscal year 1985, and S. 2556, a bill to authorize appropriations for the American Folklife Center for fiscal years 1985 through 1989.

Representatives of the Federal Election Commission will present testimony on their requested amount of $13,648,000 for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1984.

Dr. Daniel J. Boorstin, the Librarian of Congress, and Dr. Alan Jabbour, director of the American Folklife Center, will testify on S. 2556 which provides for a 5-year reauthorization in the following amounts: $930,000 for fiscal year 1985; $1,021,150 for fiscal year 1986; $1,104,025 for fiscal year 1987; $1,216,525 for fiscal year 1988; and $1,319,550 for fiscal year 1989.

For further information regarding these hearings, please contact Carole Blessington of the Rules Committee staff on 224-0278.

Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet on Tuesday, May 1, 1984, at 9:30 a.m., in SR-301, Russell Building, to consider pending legislative and administrative business.

The following items on the committee's legislative agenda are scheduled for markup: An original bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal Election Commission for fiscal year 1985; S. 2556, to authorize appropriations for the American Folklife Center of the Library of Congress for fiscal years 1985 through 1989; S. 2418, to authorize the construction of the Library of Congress Mass Book Deacidification Facility; an original resolution to authorize the purchase of U.S. Capitol Historical Society "We The People" 1985 calendars; and a number of original resolutions to pay gratuities to survivors of deceased Senate employees.

The committee will consider the following administrative business: Amendments to the mass mail regulations and a contract for the Senate Productivity Award.

A status report on office automation will also be presented.

For further information regarding this business meeting, please contact Carole Blessington of the Rules Committee staff on 224-0278.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND PRODUCTIVITY

Mr. QUAYLE. The Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity will hold hearings on the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) to examine whether the long-term goals of the act can be achieved. At this time, the subcommittee is soliciting requests to testify that address the following kinds of questions:

Does the structure of JTPA promote the ultimate goal of improving training opportunities for the disadvantaged and chronically unemployed that will lead to productive jobs in the private sector?

Do the administrative provisions of JTPA permit adequate flexibility and stability for program operation or are they burdensome?

Does JTPA provide adequate safeguards to insure a reasonable accountability of public funds and measurable returns on our training investment?

The transition from CETA to JTPA has been a national undertaking, occurring in every State and locality involving all levels of government and bringing in new participants from the private sector. Since the enactment of JTPA the focus has been on the details of meeting deadlines and sorting out questions regarding authority. Several studies documents the transition in great detail, enumerating the number and type of service delivery areas, private industry council members, and service deliveries.

Now that the job training plans for the 2-year program period have been developed, the subcommittee would like to shift the focus of attention. Rather than questioning how the transition occurred and decisions that were made, the subcommittee would like to look at the broader, long-term goals of the act and the Federal role in promoting successful program operations.

The subcommittee is soliciting testimony that analyzes the interrelationship of components of JTPA and whether the structure contributes to program success. For example, how will the relationship between the performance standards and the cost limitations affect program participants and administrative decisions? Hearings will focus on whether the requirements of JTPA adequately reflect its underlying philosophy and provide a workable system for movement toward achieving the goals of the act.

Please submit requests to testify along with a written statement or a brief summary of the issues you wish to address to the attention of Renee Coe at the Labor and Human Resources Committee, SD428, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510. Time and locations for the hearings will be announced following a review of the responses received. Staff will also visit selected sites in order to seek further clarification of issues and concerns raised.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 25, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing to consider programs administered by the Food and Nutrition service—food stamps, child nutrition, and commodity distribution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 25, at 10 a.m., to consider the nominations of Chapman Cox to be General Counsel of Defense, and James Webb to be As-

sistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 25, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing on the receipt of the annual report of the Postmaster General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 25, in order to receive testimony concerning the following nominations:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Alicemarie H. Stotler, of California, to be U.S. District Judge for the Central District of California; Lloyd D. George, of Nevada, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 25, to hold an oversight hearing on the Indian Child Welfare Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate at 2 p.m., on Wednesday, April 25, to hold a hearing on strategic defense and antisatellite weapons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE ILLEGALITY OF THE SECRET WAR AGAINST NICARAGUA

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, during the recent debate over funding for the Reagan administration's secret war against Nicaragua, many of us raised serious questions about the administration's willingness to comply with U.S. and international law.

In a recent article in the Los Angeles Times, Mr. David J. Scheffer, an associate of Harvard University's Center for International Affairs, presents a cogent critique of how the administration has bent to its purposes or ignored altogether at least four legal strictures:

The administration has abandoned the purpose of Executive Order No. 12333 in its public admissions of support for the Contras;

The administration has ignored clear congressional intent that covert assistance should not be used to overthrow the Sandinista government;

The administration's support for the Contras violates the U.N. Charter, the Organization of American States Charter, and the Rio Treaty;

Finally, a Federal district judge last November found enough merit in a lawsuit alleging violation of the 1794 Neutrality Act to order the Attorney General to conduct a preliminary investigation into U.S. support for the Contras.

I ask that the full text of this interesting analysis entitled "Law Is at the Breaking Point in CIA Aid to the Contras," be printed in the RECORD.

The analysis follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 3, 1984]

LAW IS AT THE BREAKING POINT IN CIA AID TO THE CONTRAS

(By David J. Scheffer)

This week Congress continues its debate over the Reagan Administration's request to funnel $21 million via the Central Intelligence Agency to rebel forces battling Nicaragua's Sandinista government. The operation, still officially "covert," raises serious questions about the Administration's willingness to comply with U.S. and international law.

In its stated goal to protect "our strategic interests" against the spread of communism in Latin America, the Administration has so far bent at least four legal strictures to its purpose—or ignored them altogether.

First, there is the problematical CIA mandate, which was overhauled in the late 1970s in response to agency excesses. In addition to intelligence-gathering functions the CIA is empowered to conduct "special activities approved by the President" (this under Executive Order No. 12333, signed by President Reagan in 1981). These activities are to be "in support of national foreign-policy objectives abroad which are planned and executed so that the role of the U.S. government is not apparent or acknowledged publicly." But they should not be intended to "influence U.S. political processes, public opinion, policies or media."

In public references to the so-called contras' activities, Administration officials have almost exhausted their lexicon to admit the unadmittable. Reagan speaks in general terms of "supporting" the contras, describing them as democratic elements of the Nicaraguan revolution who have been shut out by the Sandinista government. Off the record, Administration officials confirm that the CIA is training and equipping the contras. Members of Congress routinely give reporters details about the size and type of the aid.

Is there any doubt that CIA support for the contras is both "apparent" and with any reasoned interpretation of Administration admissions, "acknowledged publicly"? Isn't it clear that the effect of the CIA operations is to influence not only Managua, Havana and Moscow but also U.S. public opinion, Congress and, perhaps, the 1984 elections?

The purpose of Executive Order No. 12333 has thus been abandoned.

Second, Congress has been clear in its intent that covert assistance should not be used to overthrow the Sandinista government. Until last December, the law explicitly prohibited use of funds by the CIA or the Department of Defense for that purpose, or for "provoking a military exchange between Nicaragua and Honduras."

Last year the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence labored for months to restrict the CIA operations to interdicting the flow of arms from Nicaragua to guerrillas in El Salvador. The Administration asserted that it would not try to overthrow the Sandinista government, with which it still maintains diplomatic relations. With that understanding, Congress scrapped the legal restrictions on the purposes for which the covert aid could be used. To meet its oversight role, Congress then imposed a limit—$24 million—on 1984 expenditures for "military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua."

Congress was misled; at a minimum it should restore explicit prohibitions on use of aid to overthrow the Nicaraguan government.

The contras' recent attacks on major oil and industrial facilities and their mining of Nicaraguan ports arouses deep suspicions about the actual use of CIA assistance. On Monday an anonymous "well-placed U.S. official" was quoted in this newspaper as predicting that an entire Nicaraguan army unit—3,000 men—would soon join the contra forces. To employ a favorite Reagan buzzword, how does the United States "verify" what the contras are doing? Are they using CIA training and supplies—and risking their lives—exclusively to stop the arms flow to El Salvador, rather than to further their expressed objective of toppling the Sandinista government?

Perhaps it doesn't matter. Regardless of the contras' true intentions and performance, Washington can continue to insist that whatever they do they are thwarting Nicaragua's ability to aid the Salvadoran insurgents.

Even if that somehow could be proved, U.S. participation in Nicaragua's guerrilla war and the U.S.-Honduran army maneuvers have undoubtedly heightened the possibility of a military exchange between Nicaragua and Honduras, where the anti-Sandinista rebels find sanctuary (and, presumably, their CIA advisers).

Third, the 1794 Neutrality Act makes it a criminal offense to furnish money or prepare for a military enterprise against a country at peace with the United States. Last November a federal district judge in San Francisco found enough merit in a lawsuit alleging violation of the Neutrality Act to order the attorney general to conduct a preliminary investigation into U.S. support for the anti-Sandinista rebels. The Justice Department has not commenced that investigation because the judge's ruling is still on appeal.

Finally, CIA support for the contras challenges international law. The charters of the United Nations and the Organization of American States, the Rio Treaty and various U.N. resolutions and declarations make a strong case for prohibiting U.S. military support to guerrila groups seeking to overthrow the legitimate recognized government of a sovereign state.

Of course, Nicaragua also violates international law when it lends military assistance to guerrillas in El Salvador. But the CIA's "covert" operations are doubly unjustifiable, both in terms of international law and

in the spirit of executive and legislative oversight of covert activities.

On both sides of the debate over aid to the contras, senators and members of the House typically argue whether such aid is in the national interest of the United States. They either ignore the legalities or attach them as addenda to their main arguments. Perhaps this year enough members of our legislature will agree that it is in the highest national interest to observe the rule of law.●

VISIT OF ARGENTINE FOREIGN MINISTER DANTE CAPUTO

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago I had the honor to meet with the new Foreign Minister of Argentina, Mr. Dante Caputo, a thoughtful and vigorous advocate of the new democratic government's policies. During this first official visit to Washington, Mr. Caputo delivered an insightful speech to the National Press Club. He discussed basic problems in Latin American relations with the United States stemming from different emphases on security.

Comparing the development of postwar United States-European relations with United States-Latin American relations, Mr. Caputo made an extraordinary point—that our security concerns in Latin America did not have the same link with freedom and prosperity that had been established in Europe.

What meaning can there be in defending the freedom you do not enjoy or protecting a prosperity you do not have? Mr. Caputo asked. Hence, every time the United States tried to preserve its security interest by developing ties with the dominant minorities in Latin America, the result has been conflict and controversy.

Mr. Caputo expressed his concern that United States and Latin American points of view might drift apart to the point of closing off candid dialog. But he also offered the hope that once democracy earns the predominant position in Latin American politics, the United States concern for its security will no longer be seen as an "attempt to exercise hegemony" because democracy will be more than "empty rhetoric."

For all my colleagues who share these concerns and hopes, I strongly commend Mr. Caputo's speech. I submit the full text of his speech for the RECORD.

The text follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY THE FOREIGN MINISTER OF ARGENTINA, DANTE CAPUTO, AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Ladies and Gentlemen: Last year the Argentine people in a free election put an end to half a century of political frustration and tragedy which has had, and still has, serious economic and social consequences. In that election Raul Alfonsin obtained more than half the votes and received a clear mandate to rebuild the economy and to restore democracy, protect freedom, guarantee pluralism, human rights, and the due process of law.

To understand the magnitude of the challenge faced by my government it is perhaps useful to recall briefly, the evolution of our country in the last 50 years.

In 1930 Argentina had one of the largest income per capita in the world.

Though our land was rich, and the nature of our people and our society was such that it promised a future of peace, prosperity, freedom, and justice, that future never came about.

In the last fifty years we have not prospered, but rather we have lived from crisis to crisis. A fact which resulted in poverty and even hunger for many Argentines. Instead of freedom, we were frequently subjected to authoritarian rule. Instead of peace and justice, we suffered violence, intolerance, and inequalities.

Today my government is committed to change these conditions by turning the democratic faith of our people into a living reality.

We do not doubt that these democratic goals are also shared by the people of the United States. Yet, despite this coincidence in values, there have been—and still are—problems between our two countries. I am speaking about the kind of difficulties that are systematically present in the relations between the United States and the majority of the Latin American countries.

These difficulties, so common in the Western Hemisphere relations are the topic of my talk today.

Compare what has happened between the United States and Latin America, with the relations between the United States and Western Europe since the end of the Second World War.

In Western Europe at the end of the Second World War there was a strong commitment to return to democracy. It was obvious that this commitment would never become a reality unless it would be based upon solid economic accomplishments that would restore the economies devastated by war. The Marshall Plan was thus designed as the link between a prosperous economy and democracy which guaranteed the security of the Western world. As the conditions of freedom were achieved, the will to defend them was strengthened. Democracy, economic development, and security became three tightly linked issues that laid the foundations of a stable framework in which the relations between Western Europe and the United States could develop.

The American relationship with Latin America was quite different although we are as much part of the West as Europe.

Security has been the prime concern of the United States in its relationships with Latin American and with Western Europe. For America, security is understood as promoting prosperity, defending freedom and maintaining the status of the United States in the world. We cannot question the legitimate interest of any American citizen to defend his way of life.

But why has this concern with security repeatedly generated conflict in United States relations with Latin America?

If we return to our comparison of United States/Latin relations with United States/European relations, the reason becomes evident. For Europeans, security was linked to freedom and hopes for prosperity. It is a fact that in order to value security, it is necessary to have something to lose, and Europeans had something to lose. But, what meaning can there be in defending the freedom you do not enjoy or protecting a prosperity you do not have?

Therefore, it should not be a surprise that by making security its paramount concern, the United States in Latin America has frequently formed alliances with the few who have had something to protect: the small groups of people that sought to preserve their privileges.

But, by making this choice, the United States has, on several occasions, alienated the goodwill and support of populations who desired freedom and democracy while demanding a prosperity that has been denied to them by the existence of unjust conditions in our societies.

In hemispheric relations security has lacked those links to democracy and economic well-being which can establish a solid and deep consensus between our countries.

Every time the United States tried to preserve its security interest by developing ties with the dominant minorities in Latin America, the result has been conflict and controversy. These ties to privileged minorities paradoxically risk the very security that is a goal of the United States policy, by linking American interests with internal situations of oppression and injustice which lead to turmoil and social unrest. Viewed in this way, security issues facilitate the introduction of the East-West conflict in many of our countries.

Today throughout Latin America, a vigorous desire to recover democracy has become a reality, and we, in Argentina, can testify to the truth of this statement. Authoritarian experiments are being rejected while revolutionary movements end in disappointment.

We are tired of the violence of terrorism and the violence of repression. We need to live together in peace and in democracy to solve our problems.

Latin American democracies are strengthened as they prove themselves capable of solving their problems. With the solution of these problems, the democratic system of government will earn a predominant position in Latin American politics, and the defense of democracy will be something more than empty rhetoric. When this comes about, the United States concern for its security in the continent will not seem—as it has frequently appeared to many Latin Americans—an attempt to exercise hegemony. Security will then have the same meaning for all of our peoples: the defense of tangible and concrete social, political, and economic interests.

Last week President Reagan said that "The American concept of peace is more than absence of war. We favor the flowering of economic growth and individual liberty in a world of peace."

This suggests that we can conceive the relations between security, democracy, and development in the same basic way, despite our different points of view.

As to these differences, there can be no doubt that the United States stresses security in its dealings with Latin America. It is also evident that Latin Americans stress economic development when dealing with the United States.

I believe, and this is one of my central points, that hemispheric relations face a far greater threat than the issues that are probably in the forefront of your minds, such as Central America or the international debt crisis. I am referring to the drifting apart of our two points of view, which could close off the possibility of a frank and essential dialogue between the United States and Latin America.

My concern is not that we will stop talking, for we will always be able to do so. My worry is that little by little we will cease to understand one another.

We need all our imagination to avoid this danger. It is only by means of a frank and comprehensive dialogue, that we can both anticipate problems and avoid creating them.

It would be useful to establish a mechanism that will allow us to harmonize our views about the interdependence between security, development, and democracy. By means of this mechanism, we will be able to address the short and medium-term issues of the Western Hemisphere with a common language and criteria that can contribute to a mutual understanding of our hemispheric problems.

The real challenge for hemispheric relations is to develop a shared frame work that helps us analize priorities and organize cooperative actions based upon mutually accepted criteria.

If we succeed in this enterprise, we will develop truly mature relations and consolidate democracies in the hemisphere.

Thank you very much.●

ARMENIAN MARTYRS DAY

● Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of personal pride that I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating the genocide of approximately 1.5 million Armenians by the Turkish Government just seven decades ago. In doing so we honor the memory of those who tragically and valiantly gave their lives as we pay tribute to the great contributions the Armenian people have made to our Nation.

This particular collective victim, the Armenian peoples, remain convinced that its catastrophic confrontation with the 20th century has never received adequate recognition and understanding, not to mention a solution. The Armenian community, spread out into a worldwide disapora, believes its tragic history to be "a forgotten genocide."

The Armenian incidents were among the more brutal and costly human dislocations that occurred during the First World War in the crumbling Ottoman Empire. In June 1915, a deportation policy was announced to relocate the Armenians of the war zones in less critical areas, namely the desert regions of eastern Syria. From 1915-17 approximately 1 million people were marched from their homes in the eastern provinces and the coastal cities of Cilicia.

There are some explicit accounts of internment camps and resettlement villages in the Syrian desert region, and many allege that the lack of adequate food and water caused many deaths. It has, therefore, been characterized as a deportation to death, with no real provision for a permanent resettlement at the relocation site.

As a survivor of the Jewish Holocaust, I sympathize with the anguish and suffering that these Armenian people experienced and emphathize with the present generation who are frustrated by this grossly inadequate justice.

When Hitler first proposed his final solution, he was told that the world would never permit such a mass murder. Hitler silenced his advisers by asking, "who remembers the Armenians?"

Today, I join my colleagues in answering Hitler by pledging to preserve the truth. We must make it clear to all those who support racial hatred that our great Nation will never forget the persecuted individuals, whether they be Armenians, Jews, or native Indians. Just because of Turkey's strategic role, we must not condone the atrocity perpetrated against the Armenian people.

It is time to stop closing our eyes to man's inhumanity against man. We have witnessed too many barbarous acts in this century. By commemorating the memory of these victims on the 69th anniversary of Armenian Martyrs Day, we can try once again to prevent history from repeating itself. Such dreadful tragedies can only be prevented in the future if they are remembered in the present.●

THE 69TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN MARTYRS DAY

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, today we remember the atrocities done to the Armenian people in Turkey in the early years of this century. The genocide of the Armenians involved the killing of some 1.5 million people in the land of the Ottoman Empire, and the scattering of thousands more. Armenians were forcibly deported across Asia Minor. They were persecuted, banished, and slaughtered while much of Europe was engaged in World War I. The height of the activity occurred in 1915.

At the time, America registered strong protests. U.S. Ambassador to Turkey Henry Morgenthau offered protests to the slaughter he chronicled. America offered its hand of relief to the survivors. The Near East Relief, chartered by Congress, provided some $113 million to the survivors, while thousands of orphans became foster children of American people. And, Mr. President, forever more, America, as a moral nation, must not forget. Just as it must not forget the Holocaust that was to follow less than three decades later.

What is a worse deed than the genocide of a people, is genocide denied. There are those who deny the occurrence of the Armenian genocide. Unfortunately, some would answer the denials with uncertainty. Maybe what happened did not. Fact becomes alleged fact. What the world may have learned is unlearned. Uncertainty leads to indifference. And indifference is the bane of moral nations. We are not willing to stand by unmoved when nations stoop to the depths. We are not willing to forget. For the sake of the future, we must not forget the past.●

NOT JUST ACADEMIC

● Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, the current debate over events and policies in Central America too often ignore thoughtful views from people who actually live in the area.

Through the media, we are treated almost daily to the views of both sides, often presented in a paternalistic manner without much weight given to what the views might be of those who live the reality of the current turmoil in Central America. I would like to share with my colleagues a well-written article which appeared in last Friday's Wall Street Journal by a professor of economics at Francisco Marroquin University in Guatemala City. I believe it is important that my colleagues examine the views from all sides, especially from those who live in that troubled region.

Mr. President, I ask that the article I mentioned appear in the RECORD at this point.

The article referred to follows:

IN CENTRAL AMERICA, TERMINOLOGY IS NOT JUST ACADEMIC

(By Fritz Thomas)

GUATEMALA CITY, GUATEMALA.—Words call to mind images that help shape attitudes. The few choice words associated with the Central American problem should leave any educated opinion feeling underfed. However, public opinion outside Central America is apparently nourished with such terms as "left wing," "right wing," "moderate" and "reform," to name just a few.

Mention the term "guerrilla fighters," and many people conjure up the image of Robin Hood. Those lads are out to topple the oligarchy and the bloodthirsty military. In their crusade to liberate the oppressed people, they roam the countryside, eating wild fruits and berries. They are nice to peasants and children and work without compensation.

Move to "right wing" and there appears the image of violent, recalcitrant people who stand in the way of progress. All death squads, for example, are right wing.

Moderates are the people in the center, away from extremes. They come in all colors.

"Reform" is a mantra: If it is said often enough, nirvana is achieved. Reform is what things are fixed with when they don't work. This commodity is exported by the industrial countries, since they don't consume it themselves.

We Central Americans are a bit more pragmatic in our definitions. Our analyses, no doubt, sound unrefined to eminent scholars in the north, but our definitions are honed by reality. The problems we confront are, after all, at our doorstep. We do not have the luxury of analyzing these problems from the sanctuary of a classroom thousands of miles from the action.

To begin with, the guerrilla organizations operating in El Salvador and Guatemala are decidedly more than left wing. They are

communist. They have said as much and demonstrated as much by their actions. They wage a war of attrition to destroy productive capital by blasting away millions of dollars in infrastructure. Bombing bridges and power supplies, they make their way into the news. Equally important, and just as illuminating about their nature, is the fact that much of their seed money, as well as most "internal sources of funds," is connected with kidnapping, murder and theft.

What is so incredible is that while waging a war of terror, they can organize campus anti-war activities from Paris to Seattle, Wash., to picket in support of their movement. When speaking through these groups, their mask is not even left wing; it is only liberal, thus eligible for support from politicians and church groups, from Strasbourg, France, to Mexico City (not to mention Washington). It isn't likely that a U.S. home-grown revolutionary group that kidnapped North American children and murdered businessmen (while blasting away the Golden Gate Bridge) would get much support on campuses and within U.S. political corridors. However, Central America is at a safe enough distance to indulge one's ideological fantasies.

It's terribly difficult to come up with a working definition of "right wing." Are these the people who live in the twilight of feudalism, or are they the people that believe in a free economy? This brings us to the thin thread that separates the terms "free economy" and "private enterprise." There is a difference, and it is rather basic. Unfortunately, the images seem to be tied together.

There are in Central America business leaders who support ideas concerning freedom in politics and the marketplace and who realize that these ideas do, in the long run, support a good business climate. There are political groups that believe that the government's power of intervention, regulation and monopoly should be curtailed if there is to be any development at all, and that rule by law—rather than rule by a few men—is fundamental. There are institutions and think tanks in Guatemala and El Salvador that conduct research and publish results to demonstrate the superiority of market solutions over government plans. At present there is no proper label for this line of thinking. Rather, it is huddled together into the right wing, where all sorts of images float (including, of course, those of the right-wing death squads).

Until the supporters of a free market can manage to form a consensus in Central America, reform remains a concept proffered only by those on the left. But leftist reform in Central America is more than a concept. We have been the guinea pigs for both revolutionary reform and so-called moderate reform. We can consider the effects of both types of reform based on recent history.

Every country and situation is unique, but the results of the guerrillas coming to power in El Salvador or Guatemala could easily be predicted. Nicaragua provides us with a case study of how revolutionary reform would develop in El Salvador or Guatemala.

The legitimacy of the ruling council in our new revolutionary junta would rest on the objective fact that it was put there by history and the armed will of the people. Thus there is no immediate need for elections, because the people have already voted with guns and there is too much work to do.

By the first anniversary of the revolution, the armed forces have been integrated into the party, followed by party police, party youth, party schools, party sunrise and party sunset. While 92% of those polled agree with everything, the literacy rate shoots up to 95%; now everybody can read the names of the commandants and the tales of their labors in comicbook format and murals. The shortage of goods and the sacrifices that have to be made are due to the fact that the worms (right-wingers) took everything with them to Miami. Any dissent is put out or put away. As the state gobbles up the economy, education and the press, the underlying business climate is governed by the idea that the revolution didn't come all this way so that people could do business and make a profit. Control over the movement of the population tightens, excused by the threat of enemies at the border.

As to moderate reform, we have the example of El Salvador, where change took hold by the graces of the armed forces and an American "proconsul." It meant instituting a "Made in U.S.A." academic exercise: paying with 20-year bonds and seizing by gunpoint decree some of the most efficiently managed farms in Central America. (Before "land reform" was introduced, the average yield per acre on Salvadoran coffee farms was almost twice that of neighboring Guatemala, Honduras or Nicaragua.) Banks and financial institutions were taken over by the government, with the same method and payment. What an intriguing idea. Support the cause of a free society by eliminating private capital markets.

There is a psychyological defeat entangled in misguided reforms. Apparent moderates and liberals have in reality pushed in quieter versions of basic policy elements of the communist political platform. In doing so, they are sending a subliminal message to the population. It would seem hard to win a war while thinking all the time that the enemy has reason on his side.●

SOLIDARITY SUNDAY FOR SOVIET JEWRY

● Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor Senate Resolution 367, legislation expressing the support of the Congress for "Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry."

On May 6, in New York City, thousands of Americans will gather to demonstrate their solidarity with Jews in the Soviet Union. Americans of all faiths are committed to this human rights campaign. It is only fitting that Congress take this opportunity to express its concern about the plight of Soviet Jews, and its solidarity with those Americans who are working tirelessly to secure freedom for Soviet prisoners of conscience.

Now, more than ever, Soviet Jews are depending on their friends in the free world to speak out on their behalf. They depend on us to tell the world that the Soviets are callously ignoring their commitments under the Helsinki Final Act and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Only we can effectively speak out against the continued harrassment of the Jewish community, and the Soviets' insidious efforts to eliminate any vestiges of Jewish culture in the Soviet Union.

Most importantly, Soviet Jews depend on us to reveal the lie in the Soviets' assertion that most of the Jews who wish to emigrate have already done so. That is simply not true. We know that there are at least 400,000 Jews who have officially applied to leave the Soviet Union for the West. Most of them will never know freedom if present trends continue and only 1,000 Jews are allowed to leave per year.

We in the free world have no obligation to speak out against human rights violations wherever they occur. If we say nothing, then nothing will change. But, if we gather together on occasions like "Solidarity Sunday" to express our commitment to the struggle for freedom, we bring some small measure of hope into the lives of people who need hope so desperately.●

GEN. MARK W. CLARK: A SOLDIER'S SOLDIER AND A PATRIOT'S PATRIOT

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the passing of Gen. Mark W. Clark last week took from us one of America's truly great citizens. He was indeed a soldier's soldier and a patriot's patriot. His life had a steadfastness of purpose and a granite integrity the likes of which the Nation seldom see. South Carolina's history is replete with the accomplishments of many distinguished sons and daughters, but few have achieved so much for their country and adopted State as Mark Clark.

It was my honor to serve with General Clark on the Hoover Commission in 1954. General Clark was asked to chair the Hoover Commission's investigation to study and enhance the effectiveness of our intelligence operations. For the better part of a year he and I, as Commission members, traveled each week to Washington. These trips, and our service together, were not only very educational and informative for me, personally rewarding too, because I saw firsthand the intelligence, the integrity, and the grace of this good and gallant man.

We are filled with sadness at this passing—but also filled with pride at what our friend and neighbor contributed to the betterment of all our lives. "He loves his country best who strives to make it best," some one once wrote. That, to me, is the best definition of a patriot—and the best description of Mark Clark.

His many accomplishments and record were hailed in article after article in the South Carolina media. Mr. President, I ask that a few of these articles be printed in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the Charleston (SC) News and Courier, Apr. 18, 1984]

GEN. MARK WAYNE CLARK

Sorrow is best tempered by fond memories. And so it is with our sorrow at the passing of Gen. Mark Wayne Clark, a great and good soldier, and a very old friend of Charleston.

Gen. Clark retired from the Army in 1953 when, the memory of their sacrifice and triumph in the Great War still fresh, military men were revered in this country. Considering the honors bestowed on him by his country, he could have entered civilian life as the president or chairman of a major corporation, a path followed by many great leaders from World War II. Instead of instant wealth, he chose the presidency of The Citadel.

It's doubtful that even Gen. Clark's greatest admirers of 30 years ago realized how lucky this city was in his decision. Why did the general choose Charleston as his home after leaving the Army?

Mark Clark was fond of saying that there is "more patriotism per square inch in Charleston" than any other place in the world. We happen to agree with him.

A modest and unassuming man, Gen. Clark preferred to show, rather than tell, his feelings. His tenure at The Citadel marked a period of great expansion for that institution, growth not measured in brick and mortar alone. He attracted the best faculty and student body in the country, professors and cadets who built on the great reputation The Citadel already enjoyed.

In 1981, Gen. Clark demonstrated his esteem for and commitment to the The Citadel by donating a large part of his personal fortune—$500,000—to the college's Development Foundation.

At his passing, Mark Clark was more than president-emeritus of The Citadel. He exemplified the very spirit of the college and the young men within its walls. He was more than a soldier's soldier. He was an officer that other officers were proud to follow, a great captain for his country in war.

He was an engrossing storyteller, who periodically contributed personal anecdotes which were published on this page under the heading, "An Old Soldier Remembers."

He was a man who held action above words, yet he showed great depths of humor and tenderness.

While the nation mourns a national hero, Charlestonians mourn a friend, a friend who left behind a treasure of memories to soften the grief we all feel at his passing.

[From the Columbia (SC) State, Apr. 20, 1984]

NATION HAS TO HAVE MEN LIKE MARK CLARK

After World War I—"the war to end all wars"—the U.S. military was allowed to go fallow. There were other concerns, chief among them the Great Depression.

But a dedicated group of World War I veterans remained in uniform, suffering low pay and the dislocations of frequent reassignments to train, to stay ready—just in case. Some of them were from military families and knew no other life.

When World War II broke out, the United States was fortunate to have an experienced cadre of officers in place to assume positions of leadership. Poised to take their place in military history, to cite only U.S. Army officers, were true leaders like George C. Marshall, who became the Army Chief of Staff, and such combat commanders as Douglas MacArthur, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Omar Bradley, George Patton—and Mark W. Clark.

General Clark, the last of the great field commanders of that war, died Tuesday in Charleston at 87. But what a life of service to his nation he lived.

He was a valued South Carolinian for the last 30 years. But for all the time before that, the only homes he knew were on Army posts around the country and around the world. The son of an infantry colonel, he was destined for West Point (Class of '17) and a military career.

He saw his first combat in France in World War I and was wounded in action. Shortly after the United States entered World War II, Mark Clark became a major general and immediately received major assignments.

By mid-1942, General Clark was commander of all U.S. ground troops in the European Theater of Operations under General Eisenhower. Up to that point the Allies had been on the run. A tough, hardnosed, demanding soldier, General Clark was blunt about the mission of American troops in England: "We are not here to sit on our backsides and be on the defensive. We are here on the offensive. They talk about a Second Front. All I can say is, the sooner the better."

The first offensive, however, was not in Europe but in French North Africa. As the chief Eisenhower deputy, General Clark paved the way for it by slipping into Algeria by submarine and intriguing with French officers. Later "Ike" credited the dangerous and sensitive Clark mission with reducing resistance and casualties.

General Clark led the 5th Army on the tough, nasty invasion of Italy and was criticized for taking heavy casualties. But after hard fighting, he captured Rome and received the surrender of the Italian government. Pushing northward as commander of the 15th Army Group, he forced the surrender of the German army and ended the war in Italy.

Seven years later, he followed Douglas MacArthur and Matthew Ridgeway as commander of all United Nations forces in the Korean war and conducted the difficult negotiations that resulted in the 1953 armistice that still holds.

That same year he retired from the Army, but he didn't leave the military. Instead he accepted the presidency of The Citadel, headed the S.C. military college for 12 years, and loved it for the rest of his days. "It is a little oasis of honor, duty and enlightened discipline," he said. "I see so much Americanism here."

Those were the qualities that meant so much to Mark Clark. Those were the qualities that made him one of the great soldiers of his time, a time when great soldiers were essential to the survival of the Free World.

South Carolina was enhanced when he chose to render his last service here, and it is so honored that he chose the campus of this "little oasis" of patriotism as his final resting place.

[From the Evening (Charleston, SC) Post, Apr. 17, 1984]

GEN. MARK W. CLARK

(By Thomas R. Waring)

A soldier in three wars, Gen. Mark Wayne Clark served 36 years in the U.S. Army and capped his military career with 11 years as president of the Military College of South Carolina, better known as The Citadel. In those 47 years of service in uniform, Gen. Clark built a formidable reputation as an American patriot and an international figure in a period of upheaval that reshaped the world.

South Carolina was honored when Gen. Clark in 1953 accepted the invitation of Gov. James F. Byrnes to become president of The Citadel on his retirement from the Army. He had been commander in chief of the Far East Command in the Korean War.

"I am determined to dedicate my remaining years of service," Gen. Clark said, "to training the cream of our young manhood to be the kind of leaders we need so desperately for the salvation of our way of life."

That terse statement summed up aims and ideals that guided Gen. Clark throughout his distinguished career. He was born May 1, 1896, to an army family stationed at Madison Barracks, N.Y., and grew up on military posts. Among his early heroes was Douglas MacArthur, whom he first met when Gen. MacArthur was calling on Gen. Clark's sister. Graduating from West Point in April of 1917, he was among those graduated early for duty in World War I. Commissioned a second lieutenant a few days before his 21st birthday, he moved up fast, to first lieutenant in May and captain in June. He went overseas immediately and was wounded in the Vosges mountains in France. Transferred to staff headquarters of the First Army, he took part in the St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne offensives, and later was with the Third Army in Belgium and Germany.

Back in the United States, he served in various assignments, including a year with the Civilian Conservation Corps. By May 1942 he had become chief of staff of the Army Ground Forces and two months later he was chosen to command Army Ground Forces in the European Theater of World War II. In October of 1942, he was appointed deputy commander in chief of allied forces in North Africa. Gen. Clark made the preparations for the landing in North Africa. His personal trip by plane and submarine for a secret rendezvous with leaders of the French Resistance was one of the most sensational stories of high-level daring in World War II.

After the landings, Gen. Clark took custody of Adm. Darlan, commander of French forces in North Africa, and induced him to repudiate the Vichy regime and cease resistance to British and American forces.

In January of 1943, Gen. Clark took command of the Fifth Army and prepared for invasion of Italy. The invasion began in September, and on Oct. 1 Gen. Clark captured Naples. The landings at Anzio and Nettuna followed in January of 1944. He captured Rome that June, the first liberation of an Axis capital. Gen. Clark received the surrender at the Brenner Pass of 230,000 German troops, the first large-scale surrender of a German field command.

In June of 1945 he was named commander of U.S. occupation forces in Austria. As high commissioner to Austria, he snatched that country from Soviet efforts to push it behind the Iron Curtain. Later he went to London and Moscow to negotiate a treaty for Austria.

During this period, Gen. Clark was associated with many world leaders. Tall and slender, with sharp features and military bearing, Gen. Clark was dubbed "the eagle" by Winston Churchill.

After the war, he commanded the Sixth Army at the Presidio in San Francisco, and later was chief of Army Field Forces at Fort Monroe. On April 30, 1952, he was appointed to the Far East Command at a time when

the Korean War was winding down. President Truman had removed Gen. MacArthur and replaced him with Gen. Matthew Ridgeway. Gen. Clark succeeded Gen. Ridgeway, and on July 27, 1953, signed an armistice agreement with North Korea. He requested retirement Oct. 31, 1953, at age 57, and took office March 1, 1954, as president of The Citadel.

Gen. Clark acquired a string of decorations, honorary degrees and other citations. He had a store of anecdotes, both serious and funny, and was a gifted orator. He married Miss Maurine Doran in 1924. They had two children. Their daughter, Mrs. Patricia Ann Clark Oosting, died in California. Their son, Maj. William D. Clark, a retired Army officer, lives in Washington. Mrs. Maurine Clark died in 1966. Gen. Clark later married Mrs. Mary Millard Applegate.

In Charleston, Gen. Clark gave generously of his time and talents to civic affairs. The Mark Clark Expressway, now under construction, was named in his honor. He never lost touch with The Citadel, and chose the campus for his final resting place. His memory provides a perpetual source of admiration and respect. His name is among the best known of our time. His countrymen owe him gratitude and homage as a hero of the Republic.

[From the (Columbia, SC) State, Apr. 18, 1984]

GEN. MARK WAYNE CLARK: OLD SOLDIERS SOMETIMES DIE

(By Ron Wenzell)

Asked several years ago how he wanted to be remembered, Gen. Mark W. Clark replied without hesitation, "For what I am: a military man."

A soldier is all Clark ever wanted to be, and that's how most South Carolinians and national and world leaders will remember the last of the top five field commanders of World War II and president emeritus of the Citadel, who died Tuesday in Charleston.

Clark, 87, who led American efforts in World War II with Gens. Dwight Eisenhower, Douglas MacArthur, George Patton and Omar Bradley, had been in critical condition since Thursday.

He entered Medical University of South Carolina Hospital on March 20 for observation of what hospital authorities said was a variety of conditions associated primarily with his heart.

Funeral services will be Thursday at noon in Summerall Chapel on The Citadel campus. In accordance with his wishes, the general will be buried with full military honors in a plot between Summerall Chapel and Mark Clark Hall, the cadet activities building that was dedicated in 1957.

The epitaph, which he wrote, on his tombstone will read: "Mark Wayne Clark, General, U.S. Army, President of the Citadel, 1954-1965, Born May 1, 1896, Died April 17, 1984."

The funeral cortege will consist of the college's corps of cadets and units of the 82nd Airborne Division. There will be a 17-gun salute.

Clark assumed the presidency of the Citadel in 1954 and held the post for 11 years. He was regarded as a demanding administrator but generally is credited with breathing new life into the Charleston military college.

He was tireless in recruiting top-notch faculty and staff, constructing new campus buildings, instituting an honor code similar to West Point's and beefing up the athletic program.

David E. McCuen of Geenville, who was chairman of the board of visitors during Clark's tenure, called him "a very remarkable man whose service to The Citadel was invaluable."

After his retirement in 1965, Clark founded and headed an advisory committee to the board of visitors, was active in The Citadel Development Foundation and was custodian of the college's fiscal affairs.

He was urged to seek political office after 1965 but declined, saying: "My mission is accomplished."

In 1981, he donated $500,000 to the college. The money was placed in trust until his death. Upon presenting the gift the general said, "I had the money sitting there and thought I might as well donate it now while I can make suggestions on how it should be used."

As a military leader, Clark probably will be remembered longest as the liberator of Rome in World War II and as signer of the Korean armistice.

He has been quoted as calling the liberation of Rome by his Fifth Army the proudest accomplishment of his life.

A photograph of Clark entering the Italian capital in his Army jeep, the gleaming dome of St. Peter's Basilica in the background, hangs in a place of honor in his comfortable home on James Island.

"We had terrible fighting there, terrible," Clark told one historian writing of the Italian campaign.

Recalling the battle for Salerno, he said, "The brillance of the citizen soldier never shone brighter. The great ability of the American officer leadership from the Reserve Training Corps, who had trained many years, often without proper equipment or schooling was truly an amazing feat."

After the conquest of Rome in June 1944, he was elevated to command the 15th Army Group in the Mediterranean. During the last months of the war he achieved a decisive victory and in April 1945 received the surrender of 230,000 German troops in Italy, the Tyrol and Salzburg.

Following the war he became commander of the U.S. occupation force in Austria.

Until his last illnesses, he regularly attended reunions with old comrades in arms from North Africa, Italy and Korea, while maintaining a heavy correspondence with many of the men who served under him.

In an interview with The State three years ago, he expressed surprise that "I still get a letter once a week from one of my men who was in the Italian campaign."

Historians writing about him have portrayed Clark as a tenacious leader with a quick, thorough mind and the ability to rally his troops in the most difficult of circumstances.

The story is told how he once ordered an entire encampment searched for a pair of hard-to-find, small-sized shoes he had promised to a soldier who had lost his shoes fighting. The soldier got the shoes.

Born at a military post in New York state, he graduated from West Point in 1917, following in his father's footsteps. "The only thing I ever wanted to be was a soldier," he told an interviewer in 1978.

Clark served overseas in World War I and was promoted to first lieutenant and captain in the same year. He was wounded by shrapnel while fighting in France and was in Coblenz, Germany, when the war ended. He was promoted to major in 1933, to lieutenant colonel in 1940, to brigadier general in 1942, and to general in 1945.

At the outset of World War II he was commander of U.S. Army ground forces in the European Theatre of Operations under Eisenhower. At about this time he first met Winston Churchill, whom he called "the greatest man I have ever known."

For several months Clark had dinner with the British prime minister and Eisenhower almost every Wednesday as the three planned the invasion of North Africa.

Clark was Eisenhower's deputy during "Operation Torch" and was involved in secret negotiations with French leaders, trying to persuade them to join the allies.

He and a small staff of officers traveled by submarine to the coast of Algiers where they took off silently in rubber boats to keep a rendezvous with French officers. When the police, tipped by Arabs, entered the house where they were meeting, Clark and his party were forced to hide in the basement.

On the return trip to the submarine, the boats capsized in rough seas. Clark managed to save himself but lost his pants and 750,000 francs in gold, the equivalent of about $93,000 in American currency.

His daring mission earned him a promotion to three-star general at age 46, the youngest to hold the rank until that time.

When the landings by American forces took place he became deputy commander of the allied forces in the North African Theater.

From bases established in Africa, Clark's Fifth Army captured Naples and then landed at Anzio and Nettono, beginning the campaign up the boot of Italy.

Clark and his family were guests of Churchill at Chequers after the war, and one of his prize possessions was a wartime letter from the prime minister marked "personal and confidential."

The letter was displayed next to his red-white-and-blue-ribboned Legion of Merit medal, Bronze Star, four Distinguished Service Medals and a Distinguished Service Cross.

Clark was commander in chief of the U.N. Command from 1952 until the end of the Korean War, and he signed the armistice ending the hostilities.

He retired from the Army in 1953 after 36 years and accepted the presidency of The Citadel at the invitation of Gov. James F. Byrnes and with the encouragement of his old World War II boss, President Eisenhower.

He was available only because his nomination by President Harry Truman as U.S. ambassador to the Vatican in 1951 brought a storm of protest and forced Truman to withdraw the nomination. (The United States did not have an ambassador to the Vatican until 1984.)

Clark was not above controversy as a military tactician and later for his views on foreign and domestic affairs.

He was criticized by British Field Marshal Earl Alexander, allied commander in chief in the Mediterranean, for his decision to go straight for Rome—a move that gave the Germans a chance to escape to the north and regroup.

His outspoken patriotism in the 1960s and 1970s was considered unfashionable by some, as was his tough stance against the Soviet Union. He once referred to the communist leaders as "liars, murderers and cheaters who will stoop to anything to gain world domination."

He was outspoken against drug and alcohol problems in today's military, opposed a

volunteer army and couldn't abide female cadets at his beloved West Point.

In later years, a good part of his time was spent compiling information for his biography, which is being written by military historian Martin Blumensen.

"I believe the word integrity best sums him up," Blumensen said in a telephone interview with United Press International from his home in Washington.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Mary Mildred Applegate Clark; a son, retired Army Maj. William Doran Clark, principal deputy assistant secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs; five grandchildren; and three great-grandchildren.

J. Henry Stuhr's Funeral Home of Charleston is in charge of arrangements.

Mrs. Maurine Doran Clark, his first wife, died in 1966, and their daughter, Patricia Ann, died in 1962.

HIGHLIGHTS IN LIFE OF MILITARY MAN

1896: Born at Madison Barracks, New York, May 1.

1917: Graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and commissioned a second lieutenant in the infantry.

1936: Served as deputy chief of staff for the Civilian Conservation Corps, VII Corps area.

1937: Graduated from the Army War College.

1940: Served as instructor at the Army War College; named assistant chief of staff for operations at Army general headquarters.

1942: Named deputy chief of staff of Army ground forces, later promoted to chief of staff; assigned as commanding general of II Corps in England; named commander of Army ground forces in Europe; named deputy commander in chief of allied forces in North Africa; led a successful secret mission to secure information in North Africa before the Allied invasion of that area; awarded the distinguished service medal; promoted to lieutenant general.

1943: Designated commanding general of the Fifth Army and directed the training of the American and French troops that comprised it; established infantry and amphibious bases on African soil and coordinated activities of ground, sea and air forces in planning the surprise landing on the Italian west coast; given command of the 15th Army group.

1945: Appointed commander of U.S. occupation forces in Austria and U.S. high commissioner for Austria; promoted to full general.

1947: Served as deputy to the secretary of state; assumed command of the Sixth Army; appointed chief of Army field forces at Fort Monroe, Va.

1951: Nominated by President Truman to be a diplomatic envoy to the Vatican; asked that his name be withdrawn after controversy over the move surfaced.

1952: Appointed commander in chief, Far East Command; served simultaneously as commander in chief, United Nations Command, commanding general, U.S. Army Forces, Far East.

1953: Signed the military armistice agreement involving the U.N. command and the military commanders of North and South Korea; retired from military service at his own request and accepted the presidency of The Citadel.

1954: Became president of The Citadel; named chairman of a task force to investigate the Central Intelligence Agency and other U.S. intelligence organizations.

1965: Retired as president of The Citadel, named president emeritus.

[From the (Charleston, SC) News & Courier, Apr. 18, 1984]

DETAILS OF FINAL RITES FOR GENERAL CLARK OUTLINED

(By Edward D. Murphy)

A eulogy penned by the Rev. Billy Graham will be read before hundreds expected to gather near the tree-lined gravesite of retired Army Gen. Mark W. Clark on The Citadel campus Thursday.

Clark, a retired four-star general, president of The Citadel from 1954 to 1965, and later president emeritus, died Tuesday at the age of 87.

The commander of the 5th Army forces in Italy during World War II, post-war occupation forces in Austria and U.S. forces in the Korean War was described Tuesday as a "true American hero" by President Reagan.

The public may pay respects to Clark tonight from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m. at Stuhr's downtown chapel on Calhoun Street. A private memorial service will be held for Citadel cadets on the campus tonight.

Praise for the liberator of Rome poured in from national leaders Tuesday, including Reagan, who said, "Gen. Clark proudly wore the uniform of an American soldier—with courage, dignity, integrity and, above all, honor.

"Gen. Clark's memory will live forever in the hearts of his countrymen," Reagan said "we are free because of men like him. His professionalism and dedication will be the standard of every soldier who takes the oath to defend our nation. Nancy and I extend to Gen. Clark's family our deepest sympathies."

Meanwhile, flags at all federal buildings in the state were lowered to half-staff at the request of Sen. Ernest F. Hollings, D-S.C., who called Clark a "soldier's soldier and a patriot's patriot."

"Our nation has lost one of its most courageous and dedicated soldiers—a man who pledged his entire life to serving our country and the military," Sen. Strom Thurmond, R-S.C., remarked. "General Clark was a personal friend, so his death is a great loss for me, as well as for the nation I am deeply saddened by his passing. However, his accomplishments—both in the Army and at The Citadel, where he served with distinction as its president—will certainly live on."

Clark was "one of America's last, truly great heroes," Rep. Thomas F. Hartnett, R-S.C., said.

"He felt such a real deep love for this country and the way of life he had fought to preserve," Hartnett said. "He was one who really wanted to take the cream of America's youth and help mold them into the leaders we needed in the future."

Rep. Butler Derrick, D-S.C., mentioned the summer camps Clark established for youths at The Citadel. Clark made a "tremendous contribution" to South Carolina as president of The Citadel, he said.

"The nation suffered a great loss," Derrick said. Clark "will go down in history as one of the great warriors of our time, together with Gens. (Dwight D.) Eisenhower, (Omar N.) Bradley, (George S.) Patton and others, as World War II heroes."

"General Clark will long be remembered as a great patriot and a great leader both on the battlefield and as president of The Citadel," Gov. Richard W. Riley added. "He had an enduring love of country throughout his life and a later love for South Carolina, which he made his adopted state after his retirement from the military.

"He endeared himself to all South Carolinians as an outstanding general and war hero and as an inspiring leader of young men at The Citadel who came under his guiding hand," Riley said.

Charleston Mayor Joseph P. Riley, Jr., who graduated from The Citadel during Clark's presidency, said the city and nation have "lost a very special citizen.

"It was Charleston's great fortune that after Gen. Clark's extraordinary military career . . . we enjoyed 30 years of his leadership at The Citadel and in our community," Mayor Riley said. "Gen. Clark was active in our community up until just the last few months. He would not miss a community function if it was physically possible, also he was interested in his neighborhood and I would frequently hear from him in that regard."

North Charleston Mayor John E. Bourne Jr., said Clark's death marked "the passing of an era," and the state's adjutant general, Maj. Gen. T. Eston Marchant, said Clark was "one of the most respected and admired Americans in our country's history."

Citadel Board of Visitors Chairman George C. James, contacted in Sumter, said Clark "was the kind of fellow who really wouldn't have wanted too many flowery things said about his passing." But, he said, "It's a sad occasion for the country and the world to lose a man like that."

Retired Gen. William C. Westmoreland, who had served under Clark in the Korean War, remembered Clark as a man who treated him as a son.

Clark did a magnificient job heading The Citadel, Westmoreland said. "They were kind of made for each other. It was a perfect fit."

The burial site between Mark Clark Hall and Summerall Chapel, in front of the bell tower, was chosen by Clark.

A hearse will carry the casket to The Citadel's main gate shortly before noon Thursday, where it will be met by six honorary pallbearers chosen by Clark and eight cadets who will be the active pallbearers.

Clark chose four classmates from his days at West Point—Gen. J. Walton Collins, Maj. Gen. Charles H. Gerhardt, Maj. Gen. William C. McMahon and Gen Matthew B. Ridgeway—to act as honorary pallbearers, along with current Citadel President Maj. Gen. James A. Grimsley Jr. and Maj. Gen. Charles E. Saltzman, a friend and member of The Citadel"s Board of Visitors Advisory Committee, spokesmen said.

Four units of 66 cadets will be assembled on the school's parade ground, and the funeral cortege, headed by the honorary pallbearers, will move down the Avenue of Rememberance to Summerall Chapel, where a brief funeral service is scheduled to begin at noon.

The funeral service will be conducted by Col. Sidney R. Crumpton, who was chaplain of The Citadel from 1962 to 1974 and 1976 to 1977. He will be assisted by Chaplain Gordon E. Garthe, chaplain to the Corps of Cadets.

There will be about 250 seats available for the public in the chapel, and a public address system will be set up outside for those who are not able to find seating.

Following the service, the cadet pallbearers will take the casket to the gravesite through a column formed by the 82nd Airborne Division Honor Guard from Fort Bragg, N.C. The cadets gathered on the parade grounds will present arms when the

casket is moved, and "Ruffles and Flourishes" will be played by The Citadel Band.

The eulogy written by Graham will be read by Crumpton at the gravesite. Graham is in Europe on an evangelical crusade.

During the burial, three volleys will be fired and a cadet bugler will play "Taps." After the casket is lowered into the grave, a flag draping the coffin will be folded and presented to a member of the family.

Pentagon officials said Tuesday the official delegation to the funeral is expected to include Army Vice Chief of Staff Gen. Maxwell R. Thurman and several World War II dignitaries.

Citadel spokesmen said they expected to know today which other dignitaries would be attending the funeral.

[From the (Charleston, SC) Evening Post, Apr. 19, 1984]

GEN. MARK CLARK LAID TO REST ON CAMPUS OF SCHOOL HE LOVED

(By Edward D. Murphy)

Retired Army Gen. Mark Wayne Clark was buried today beside the building that bears his name on the campus of The Citadel, where he served as president for more than 11 years.

Clark, who died early Tuesday at the age of 87, selected the tree-lined gravesite between Summerall Chapel and Mark Clark Hall. Present-day cadets, past graduates, military leaders, politicians and foreign representatives were on hand to see his casket lowered into the grave.

The funeral procession came through Lesesne gates on Moultrie Avenue about noon, and was led by the Citadel Bagpipers playing "Gen. Clark, Liberator of Rome," as they moved along the Avenue of Remembrance to Summerall Chapel.

Following the bagpipers were 10 honorary pallbearers, then the hearse that carried the body of Clark, one of the leading generals of World War II who commanded the 5th Army forces in Italy that opened the first front on the European continent and liberated Rome.

Military men and women snapped to attention as the hearse, preceded by the American flag and flanked by eight Citadel cadets, slowly moved along the avenue. As the hearse stopped at the chapel, the Citadel Band played "Onward Christian Soldiers."

A large crowd had gathered near the entrance to the chapel and paid silent respects to Clark.

Clark, the general who liberated Rome in World War II and who later signed the armistice that ended the Korean War, wanted to be remembered not as a war hero, but as a soldier and the president of the college he loved. So the headstone on his grave identifies him simply as an Army general and president of the military school.

After he retired from active duty, Clark became president of The Citadel in 1954. He stayed in that post until his retirement in 1965, and was then named the school's only president emeritus.

Honorary pallbearers included one of Clark's classmates from his days at West Point—Gen. William C. McMahon.

Other honorary pallbearers were Citadel President Maj. Gen. James A. Grimsley Jr.; Maj. Gen. Charles E. Saltzman; Gen. Bernard Rogers, the supreme allied commander in Europe; Gen. Calvin G. Ryan; Gen. Lyman Lemni zer; Gen. William C. Westmoreland; Army Vice Chief of Staff Gen. Max Thurman; Adm. Jerauld Wright and Gen. C.V.R. Schuyler.

Leading the official delegation to the funeral was Secretary of the Army John Marsh, representing President Reagan.

Others expected to attend the funeral were retired Army Gen. Maxwell Taylor.

Both of South Carolina's U.S. Senators—Republican Strom Thurmond and Democrat Ernest F. Hollings—were there, along with Gov. Richard W. Riley, U.S. Rep. Thomas F. Harttnett, R-S.C., and Mayors Joseph P. Riley Jr. of Charleston and John E. Bourne, Jr., of North Charleston.

The funeral began shortly after noon in the chapel, with a brief service highlighted by the reading of a homily composed for the funeral by the Rev. Billy Graham. The evangelist was in Europe and could not attend the funeral.

Former Citadel chaplain Col. Sidney R. Crumpton read the homily, then later the eulogy, which was delivered at graveside.

Following the service, pallbearers took the casket from the chapel to the grave through a column formed by the 82nd Airborne Division Honor Guard from Ft. Bragg, N.C.

A 17-gun salute was fired during the burial and a cadet bugler played Taps. Four cadet units were on the parade grounds facing the chapel during the funeral procession, the service and the burial.

Clark was buried in his uniform with his cap and gloves.

Wednesday night, hundreds were at Stuhr's downtown funeral chapel to pay respects to Clark.

The guest book was sprinkled with military titles, and one man noted that he was in Florence, Italy, when the Clark's forces liberated the city during World War II.

There were wreaths from the Citadel, the Association of Citadel Men and The Citadel Class of 1958, which was the first class to spend a complete four years under Clark's presidency at the institution.

Other wreaths came from various military units and organizations, and one from the Indiana National Guard, where Clark was an instructor from 1929 to 1933.

Wreaths were also sent from Austria, where Clark commanded postwar occupation forces. One wreath was from the city of Linz and had a banner attached that read, "We Didn't Forget."

[From the (Charleston, SC) Evening Post, Apr. 19, 1984]

THE HOMILY

The following is the homily written by the Rev. Billy Graham for use at Gen. Mark W. Clark's funeral today:

We are gathered here today to pay our respects to Gen. Mark Wayne Clark.

Gen. Clark was much more than a soldier—he was a soldier/statesman; a man who saw the big picture. He had all the qualities that would have made him a great president of the United States.

It was my privilege to know him first in the winter of 1952. I was in Tokyo, Japan, on my way to Korea near Christmas to speak to missionaries and Christians in Korea, when totally unexpectedly I was asked to come to his office. I did not know that he had ever heard of me. I went, and after a rather long chat he turned to me and said, "Mr. Graham, I would like for you to go to Korea and preach to the troops at Christmas. Everyone will cooperate and it will be a great encouragement to our troops." I was overwhelmed, and immediately answered that I would. I wrote a book about my experiences.

When his time was finished in the Far East, it was my privilege to be with him on a number of occasions. He honored me by giving me an honorary degree at The Citadel, and he invited me to speak here on a number of occasions. I had talks with him a number of times and from his lips I heard some of the most thrilling stories about World War II, the Korean War, politics and religion as we sat for hours at a time either alone, or with friends.

There are many lessons we can learn from his life. But today I would like to briefly mention four.

First, Mark Clark was a man who was concerned with quality not quantity. He believed that a well-trained, well-disciplined, courageous fighting unit could overcome an enemy that was numerically superior. And he proved it during the long and bitter Italian campaign of World War II.

His writings and speeches show that he returned from Europe convinced that every man in the Army should be trained first as an infantryman before going on to other specialized training. When the situation demanded it, he wanted every man in the Army—cook, driver, typist, mechanic, everyone—to be trained and able to pick up a rifle and take his place on the fighting line.

As Chief of Army Field Forces from 1949-52, he put his ideas into practice and today's training still reflects his influence.

In his emphasis on quality rather than quantity, he mirrors the experience of one of the great military commanders in the Bible—a man named Gideon.

Second, Mark Clark demonstrated his belief in commitment, not convenience. His four decades of military service were punctuated by long and painful separations from his family. He was unable to attend his daughter's wedding and almost missed his son's because of his commitment to this country and to duty.

Service of any kind—military, political, or spiritual—has never been a matter of convenience and it never will. Somehow, in our modern age, we have allowed ourselves to become captives to set periods of time. We want to know just exactly how long everything is going to last, and when the time is up, we're ready to pack up and go home.

But the people who have left their mark on history have been those who committed themselves to a task with no thought of quitting until it was finished. I believe we need to recapture that spirit in America today.

Gen. Clark once closed a speech commemorating the anniversary of the Chaplains Corps by quoting these lines:

There are people who carry life's burdens,
Their own and others beside:
There are people who stand in their places,
And who stand there whatever betide.
There are two kinds of people—you know
them.
As you journey along life's track,
The people who take your strength from
you,
And the others who put it all back.

As he observed the world picture at the end of the Korean War, Mark Clark considered the global struggle and wrote something we should recall today:

"Perhaps, both sides, with the frightening instruments of total destruction in their hands, may decide that these terrible weapons must never be used. I pray fervently that this be true, not only because of the lives that would be saved, but also because I know America can reap a richer harvest from peace than can her enemies." ("Calculated Risk," p. 330)

But he also had a conviction that peace will be granted us only if we are strong. He believed that peace, like life itself, was a matter of commitment, not convenience. Mark Clark, lover of peace, believed that there are certain things for which a man must be willing to lay down his life.

Thirdly, Mark Clark believed in character, not compromise. He was always concerned about the spiritual lives of those under his command.

While serving as Chief of Army Field Forces, he was observing a live ammunition training exercise in which recruits crawled on their bellies under barbed wire while machine gun bullets were being fired over their heads.

He noticed a group of chaplains standing nearby, also observing, and asked one of them if he had been through this training exercise. When the chaplain said, "No," Gen. Clark said, "Don't you think it would be a good idea if you shared the hardships and the dangers of the men and went through these exercises?"

From that time on, he officially urged chaplains to share as many of the trainees' hardships and dangers as they could. By making the long marches and crawling through the mud with the soldiers, the chaplains gained the respect and confidence of the men. The result was a marked increase in the rapport between the chaplains and the soldiers, and increased chapel attendance, not just in training, but also in combat areas.

He once told of receiving a letter from a woman who said she hoped he would make a man out of her son who had just enlisted in the Army. She hoped that the Army would develop her son's character.

Mark Clark wrote her back, saying that he would do his best to see that her son's military service would help him. But, he said, the Army would have her son for only 18 months. She had had him for 18 years. He closed by reminding her, and all of us today, that the job of developing character in our youth is primarily the responsibility of the home, the churches, and the schools. Mark Clark believed in character.

And finally, Mark Clark was a man who believed in Christ. His belief was more than just an intellectual assent or lip service to Christian ideals, but a personal faith in Christ as his own Lord and Savior.

In 1953, he concluded an Easter message to all those serving in Korea by saying:

"Easter, commemorating the resurrection of Jesus Christ, is a time of renewed conviction in the triumph of life over death, of good over evil, of the spiritual over the material. That conviction will carry us through whatever lies ahead."

As we honor Gen. Mark Clark today, his life and his memory challenge us to live lives of quality, of commitment, and of character.

Today we do not say goodbye to Mark Clark. We say, as the French would say, "Au revoir!" "Till we meet again."●

A PEACE ACADEMY IN OUR TIME?

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, it can be very difficult to oppose the Peace Academy, if for no other reason than its name. But I honestly fear that the academy, if approved, would give peace a bad name.

The fundamental idea of the Academy is to foster conflict resolution between the superpowers; and if the United States and the Soviet Union, in their great struggle over values, resembled disgruntled spouses in need of a marriage counselor. A former and distinguished colleague of ours, Senator S. I. "Sam" Hayakawa, recently paid a visit to my office to discuss this flawed foundation of the Peace Academy proposal.

In his eloquent way, Sam highlighted the serious weakness of the plan, which he called hopelessly Utopian.

First of all, those advancing the Academy concept are seeking a moral balance, a moral equivalency that just does not exist in the real world. Senator Hayakawa and I find it absolutely appalling that American taxpayers could be asked to underwrite a scholarly dogmatism that belittles American values, while glossing over the defects of the Soviet system. The Academy charter, which has a distinct emphasis on peace over liberty and freedom, blurs the distinctions between the democratic West and the totalitarian East.

Second, assuming that this is a worthy idea, why seek public financing, instead of private-sector support for the Academy? After all, the American taxpayer is already supporting the State Department and the United Nations. If the professional diplomats in these institutions cannot bring us peace, can a Peace Academy do the job?

Third, the Academy, as proposed, has a mandate to facilitate "justice," be it economic or political "justice." This grants the Academy the right to lobby for a world in its own ideological image.

Finally, in the context of the Soviet Union, the Peace Academy is toothless. The Academy's reports or "findings" are hardly going to induce the Soviets to withdraw from Afghanistan or cause them to alter their stated course of world domination. I do not believe that a dictatorship capable of scattering boobytrapped toys around Afghan villages is likely to quake at the prospect of a pedantic scolding from the Peace Academy. You would do better to hit them with pillows.

The superpower that has built up imperial garrisons in Cuba and Nicaragua, subsidized and fostered international terrorism and murdered innocent airline passengers, is hardly going to recognize the efficacy of constructive dialog and "workshops" on hostility. It would be an obscenity to equate the genocide of the Cambodian people with a breakdown in communications.

As columnist George Will noted:

The idea of a Peace Academy flows from many premises, all mistaken. One is that mankind's "natural" condition is peace, the breakdown of which results from remedial "mistakes" and "misunderstandings." Another premise is that peace can be taught as a discrete subject, like dentistry.

Mr. President, a Peace Academy would be as effective and as relevant to preventing war as the Kellogg-Briand Pact, which outlawed the Second World War. I ask that an article by Jeffrey Salmon and Richard DiEugenio in the fall 1983 edition of the Journal of Contemporary Studies be printed in the RECORD.

The article referred to follows:

A. U.S. PEACE ACADEMY?

(By Jeffrey Salmon and Richard DiEugenio)

The United States government is on the verge of creating a wholly new kind of institution of higher learning called a "U.S. Academy for Peace." This is, we are told, "an idea whose time has come." The academy would be a federally funded national university dedicated to the search for peace—designed, in columnist Jack Anderson's words, to "train young Americans to promote peace, just as the three military academies prepare young Americans to fight when war breaks out."

As currently envisioned in legislation with good prospects of passage in both the House and the Senate, the academy would be established at an estimated cost of $23.5 million or perhaps even lower—far less, as proponents are fond of pointing out, than the price of many a tank or airplane that may not even work. Specifically, its mandate would be to conduct research on peace and conflict resolution; provide degree-granting peace education and research programs at the graduate and postgraduate levels; publish scholarly works; establish a clearinghouse for disseminating information from the field of peace learning to the public and to governmental personnel; and make grants to support and promote peace studies to "educate the Nation about this field."

Activities such as collecting information on past successful and unsuccessful peace negotiations seem wholesome enough, and the idea's almost universal popularity among Republicans and Democrats alike is not surprising. Support has come even from such normally conservative senators as Jepsen (R-Iowa), Simpson (R-Wyo.), and Cochran (R-Miss.). After all, senators and congressmen, like most Americans, are disposed to do what they can to advance the cause of peace, and in any case, peace makes good politics. Why not go ahead with the experiment? Who indeed would want to stand up in opposition to peace?

LEARNING PEACE

Proponents argue that regardless of substantive impact, the Peace Academy would be *symbolically* invaluable as a tangible sign of America's commitment to a more peaceful world. The United States spends vast sums on its military establishment and it is morally disgraceful, in this view, that there has never been any concomitant national effort to foster peace. We need, then, "an official arm of our U.S. Government committed first of all to peace."

While this symbolic importance is stressed, it is also, and more fundamentally, argued that a U.S. Academy for Peace (USAP) would greatly enhance the development of a new discipline of potentially critical human importance, "peace learning." As Senator Jennings Randolph (D-W.Va.) explained: Conflict resolution, or management skills, is an emerging social science. It has so much to gain from so many fields, and there is a desperate need to pull together, collect

and correlate the work already being done in those fields. Somehow we must work to find ways to incorporate all this immense, diverse growing fund of human knowledge into a workable new science of peace learning and then we must transmit it to others.

Legislation for the academy resulted directly from recommendations of a blue-ribbon governmental study commission, the "U.S. Commission on Proposals for the National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution." The commission report stressed that the USAP would have great practical utility for the U.S. government because it would "amplify the field of peace learning and extend peacemaking expertise. . . ." The report cites approvingly the testimony of one witness that "peace studies and conflict research are pointless . . . if they are without practical application in the real world."

Exactly how, then, is the Peace Academy going to further peace? Here one might justly become a little vague—after all, the academy is presumably set up partly to answer this very question. However, many proponents have been quite clear about their vision of the general outline, if not all the details, and at this point it is worthwhile to delve into some of their deeper analyses. One authoritative source is a statement of support by a prestigious organization called the Center for Information in America, whose editorial advisory board comprises, among others, such notable public figures as Professor Henry S. Commager; Richard Cortright of the National Education Association; Sister Sarah Fasenmyer, dean, School of Education, Catholic University; and Philip Handler, president of the National Academy of Sciences. This group's argument makes apparent a certain kind of commitment to social change: Experience has shown that only the legitimating structure of a formal institution can provide the necessary impetus of [positive] change. Institutions serve a vital regulatory function. They channel human action and provide procedures for guiding human conduct in accord with the desires of society. But, the nature of this relationship is such that, not infrequently, the desires of society manifest themselves and find clear articulation only after an institution is born. In other words, society sometimes must be shown (usually by a few courageous visionaries) what it ultimately wants but is unable or unwilling to achieve.

It is clear enough that in this view our current leadership, and indeed the American "establishment" generally, fails to articulate society's true inner desires. It is only upon being taken over by these nonestablishment visionaries that society will discover its real desires, in terms of a number of truths that the publication asserts repeatedly. These include the notions that American foreign policy and policymakers are hopelessly ethnocentric and inculcated with a zero-sum mentality in which "every situation must produce a winner and a loser; the idea that situations can be manipulated so that all parties emerge victorious is anathema." A false division of the world into crude "us-them," "good-bad" categories is assumed to underlie U.S. participation in global politics.

The Center for Information excoriates the institutions of our national Government: Government of, by, and for the people has become government from, without, and against the people. Disinterest has bred abuse; trust, cynicism; and ignorance, manipulation. Where once there was (or so we like to think) confidence, pride, and allegiance, now there is timidity, selfloathing, and egoism.

These are serious charges—so serious, indeed, as to cast into doubt the apparent moderation of the proposed remedy. We are told that as U.S. citizens we must counterbalance our government's "negative approach to peace" by taking "positive measures . . . we must look to the creation of new institutions that hold that attainment of peace to be their raison d'être." The solution is before us. "Unknown to most Americans, a unique opportunity to make up for this institutional shortcoming has presented itself: a proposed National Academy of Peace."

It is quite possible that the more expansive visions of the Peace Academy's role in American life will not prevail, but in any case its basic design has become clear. It is to be an activist institution in the service of major social change. And most importantly, its activity is to be defined by an essentially novel if quite popular academic discipline, "peace studies."

PEACE STUDIES

Thus whether or not the idea for a national peace academy is benign turns to a large extent on the nature, goals, and methods of "peace studies" learning and political action. Indeed, it is fair to view the proposed academy as only the most recent and conspicuous manifestation of what is unquestionably a burgeoning national movement for peace studies.

Peace studies programs, which are also taught under the rubric of world order studies, are proliferating at both the undergraduate and graduate levels all over the country. Prior to 1967, Vermont's Manchester College had the nation's only peace studies program. Then campus turmoil over the American involvement in Vietnam gave the world order approach its first substantial inroads into academia, and by 1971 some fifty colleges and universities maintained such programs. After this brief period of great popularity, interest in peace studies declined as memories of the war faded during the decade of the 1970s—although almost all the courses and programs, which by then had been institutionalized, survived intact. This apathy toward the field lingered into the early 1980s, when enthusiasm and programs picked up as the nuclear freeze movement gained popularity. The Spring 1983 edition of "World Policy Forum" published by the World Policy Institute (formerly the Institute for World Order) reported "a tremendous growth in the development of peace and social justice courses and, more narrowly defined, nuclear war education." The Forum added that it simply could not count the number of new courses and programs that were springing up.

Thus we are in the midst of what has been called a "virtual explosion" of interest in the field: according to even the most conservative estimates, full peace studies programs are now in place in at least eighty-nine colleges and universities. The movement seems at this point quite likely to become a powerful force in American education. Especially if it succeeds in gaining the federal government's seal of approval in the form of the national Peace Academy, the peace studies approach may well dominate our nation's political education in the 1980s.

IDEOLOGICAL UNDERPINNINGS

In order to judge the import of this success, it is necessary to understand that peace, or, as they are sometimes known, "world order" studies represent a radical break with the traditional or classic "power politics" approach to the study of international relations. According to the world order school, the concept of balance of power, with its nearly exclusive focus on the activities of nation-states, is incapable of explaining the myriad changes and new actors that have emerged in world politics since the end of World War II. As one recent publication on peace and world order puts it, "the balance of power framework that has guided U.S. foreign policy for more than three decades no longer provides a reliable map for thought and action in an increasingly interdependent world." Due to the advent of nuclear weapons, the growing economic interdependence of states, and threats to the planet's ecosystem resulting from overpopulation, pollution, and resource depletion, the traditional "self-help" or state-of-nature system that once drove world politics must, world order advocates say, give way to common efforts for global preservation and peace. Safety can no longer be the handmaiden of brute force because the narrow self-interested pursuit of power can only lead, in this world of megatonnage overkill, to global destruction. Consequently, a new school of international politics that takes a global perspective—that rises above mere national interest—must replace the anachronistic and indeed humanity-threatening approach that regards state interests as prior to planetary concerns. Since it espouses the view that unless revolutionary new ways are found to cope with our planetary woes, the earth faces nearly inevitable destruction, the global perspective asserts not only an analytical superiority to balance-of-power approaches but an ethical superiority as well.

Organized around the potent central themes of the failure of power politics to bring about world peace and the danger of nuclear armageddon, peace studies programs have thus expanded in scope to include the entire "new agenda" of international politics. Among the key assumptions common to much of the literature on peace learning and to many of the programs are that the "Soviet threat" is vastly overrated; that the United States is somehow the principal threat to world peace; that "power politics" is evil and dangerous, the product of an increasingly obsolete nation-state system; that no legitimate purpose could ever be furthered by using even one nuclear weapon; and that even the mere possession of nuclear weapons poses unacceptable risks.

The ultimate purposes of the world order agenda are clearly articulated in one of the seminal works of the peace studies literature, Peace and World Order Systems: Teaching and Research, by Paul Wehr and Michael Washburn. The authors argue that while the war in Vietnam failed to have any lasting beneficial influence on elite attitudes towards world politics, the vast expansion of the study of peace and future world orders in academia since that war is very encouraging because "peace researchers and teachers are increasingly determined to play a more active role in public education and policy formation." Wehr and Washburn's claims for the potential influence of these academic activists are, from this point of view, optimistic indeed. They consider the university the critical focus for effective world order thinking and eventual global transformation. In an effort to give peace studies what they term "its own theoretical rationale," Wehr and Washburn argue that

"the model for a viable future global system must first emerge within the university itself if that community is to train the shapers of the global community." And that model will come not from traditional political science or international relations classes, but from the study of peace.

Table 1 delineates the overall scope of the world order discipline as drawn up by Richard Falk, a key spokesman for the peace studies movement. Clearly the discipline is designed to encompass a startling variety of subjects. Indeed, even the most cursory review reveals that world order courses span an enormous quantity of subject matter. Curriculum proposals from such organizations as the Consortium on Peace Research Education and Development (COPRED) and the World Policy Institute, as well as actual peace programs, reveal peace-related courses in nearly every conceivable discipline.

TABLE 1.—SCOPE OF WORLD ORDER INQUIRY

Level and perspective	Unit of analysis	Explanatory focus
I—Religion	Civilization	Beliefs, symbols.
Culture		Myths, values.
		Consciousness.
II—History	Nation-State	Events.
	Region	Patterns, "laws".
	World	Narrative line.
III—Politics	Polity-State	Power, authority.
	State system	Influence.
		Leadership.
IV—Economics	Society	Wealth, trade.
	Market	Ownership.
	Class	Productive process.
		Capital.
		Accumulation.
		Process.
V—Psychology	Person	"Inner man".
	Group	Motivation.
	Species	Behavioral patterns.
VI—Biology	Species	Evolutionary patterns.
VII—Anthropology	Tribe	Alternative societal forms.
	Species	
VIII—Ecology	Ecosystem	Nature.
	Biosphere	Ecological principles.
IX—Astrophysics	Stars, planets	Physical laws and relations.
	Solar systems	
	Galaxies	
	Universe	

Source: Richard A. Falk, "Contending Approaches to World Order," in Peace and World Order Studies: A Curriculum Guide (New York: Institute for World Order, 1981), 3rd ed., p. 49.

Yet despite this comprehensive scope the field in the end is narrowly circumscribed, for it seeks to confine thinking and research to a well-defined political perspective. This is easily illustrated by glancing at the formal course titles for peace studies programs. For example, in the Winter 1981 edition of the International Peace Studies Newsletter, Theodore Herman of Colgate University presented a total of 133 different course titles that were being taught. A representative sampling of these includes "Modern American Violence," "Alternative Life Styles," "Socio-Cultural Futures," "Toward a Human Economics," "Introduction to Global Poverty," "Peace Conversion," "Cooperative Global Living," "Philosophy of Social Change," "Intellectual History of Nonviolence," "Women's Liberation and Ethics," "The Anti-War Novel," "Self, Society and Conflict," "Biology of Human Behavior," and "Game Theory, Stimulation and Conflict Analysis." Yet among these 133 actual courses, and indeed among the fifty or so syllabi examined in the course of research for this article, there was not one course even remotely related to Soviet politics, culture, or foreign policy—an astounding omission. While such topics no doubt are being treated in some peace studies programs, it is nonetheless significant that none of them merits reference in the major literature on curriculum development.

Peace studies has always expressly been a multidisciplinary or transdisciplinary field of research and teaching, and very few, if any, current programs are isolated within a single department; rather, they may span the disciplines from political science to history, from sociology to astrophysics. This multidisciplinary focus is considered important because it breaks out of the intellectually crippling confines of the traditional separation of learning into arbitrary fields, enabling the student to see problems as an interrelated whole and, consequently, to figure our how to solve them. The intention of such an approach, as one world order advocate puts it, is that "rather than function as the central intelligence agencies for the status quo, our educational systems must become servants of genuinely progressive social change."

This perspective accurately characterizes proponents' overall approach to the study of politics: the purpose is not so much to learn about the world as to change it. The program is, it is eminently fair to say, ideological—and most peace studies advocates openly avow their intent. One prominent spokesman, Roy Preiswerk, goes so far as to argue that the solution to the problem of today's dehumanized, irrelevant, and dangerous educational system is a new social science with an explicitly egalitarian ideological grounding. "There is no science without ideology," Preiswerk contends, and this new social science "must be committed to the reduction of social inequality." Scholarship, in short, is to be in the service of politics, or more exactly, in the service of a particular political purpose and program.

Such overt calls for an ideological discipline within the university are to be found throughout the peace studies literature. Education is considered simply as a tool to be used to enhance the possibility of political and social transformations. It is typical of such an approach to politics that the ends to be sought through political activism are generally agreed upon; it is only the means that demand study and debate. Thus Wehr and Washburn note that one major peace studies effort, the World Order Models Project, "has projected alternative global normative systems, an essential step in identifying a set of survival values that the global community can embrace." For these experts the difficulty lies "not so much, perhaps, in identifying the ends the world's populations should be striving for as in defining the means by which we can realize them." In peace studies, the "ought" is given.

The problematic aspects of proposing to transform American education to the ideology of peace studies and to institutionalize this ideology in a national university are perhaps most evident when we examine the values students are to inherit with their B.A.'s in peace. As we have seen, the adoption of a "planetary" or global perspective is intended to create a body of student and eventually professional activists bent on radical transformations of domestic and international "governance" structures; and their activities are to be encouraged by institutional means such as, most notably, formal "internship" programs. Wehr and Washburn insist that providing internship programs for active engagement in the peace and conflict process is "in many ways the most essential ingredient of peace and world order studies." Jerry Folk, writing in the journal Peace and Change, contends that a peace studies program is clearly "incomplete" without a "peace action" component. "Moreover, this component must be seen not as a mere formal requirement, or a tail on the donkey, but as an important, even indispensable part of a well-balanced peace studies program.

These internships are designed to take place in urban environments, though some will occur in an international setting. Curiously, however, it is not the international possibilities for "experiential learning" that attract Wehr and Washburn; there is no detailed account, for instance, of how one hires on for a semester or two with UNESCO or the like. What proponents of world order studies discuss and promote is active intervention in the struggles for equality occurring in America's cities. This field work must not only provide a ground for testing the theories of conflict resolution learned in the classroom against the actual practice of community service, but also must be designed to exert a genuine influence on some current urban crisis.

Some problems, however, are not amenable to solution through negotiation or conflict resolution techniques; one must turn in these cases to the "peace-building skill" known as "creative conflict." As defined by Wehr and Washburn, creative conflict is a catalytic process by which latent conflict symptomatic of unjust relationships is transformed into overt conflict. Once out in the open, it can then be regulated to create more just and harmonious relationships between antagonists. Such conflicts are sometimes called empowerment struggles.

One wants to avoid unfair exaggeration. Not all peace studies programs are set up to train and graduate a core of activists ready to invade our cities and smash the system. The various programs are diverse in their requirements, and there is good reason to believe that only a minority offer anything modeled on these creative conflict internships. However, the peace studies literature makes clear that this lack is to be considered a great defect, for without proper "hands-on" experience in creative conflict and peace action, students will be ill-equipped for real-world application of their knowledge.

Returning to the authoritative views of Wehr and Washburn, it becomes evident that central to this peace studies ideology is the conviction that the great powers are equally degenerate: "The political and moral bankruptcy of the two superpowers' policies produced Vietnam, Czechosolvakia and Watergate." And again, "In the USSR, the Military Industrial Commission is the counterpart of the state managerial administration in the United States." Or, as Preiswerk puts it more generally, the United States and the Soviet Union are equally "supermonsters." Such moral myopia naturally seeps into the way in which books are read and interpreted, and can extend to quite absurd lengths. In discussing U.S. institutional failures and corruption during Vietnam, Wehr and Washburn offers the following analogy: "Solzhenitzyn chronicles *the same institutional concentration of power* in the Soviet governmental institutions [as in the United States] in his *Gulag Archipelago.*" Thus the discipline that seeks to replace ethically neutral social science with a value-oriented approach cannot distinguish between the ethics of Communism and the ethics of liberalism. This is not surprising, given that the peace studies advocates' elevation of "peace" above all other goals necessarily blurs the distinction between the different political, moral, and ethical phi-

losophies of the United States and Soviet Union.

We have seen, moreover, that peace itself rests on the creation of universal justice defined in terms of equality. So long as individuals are denied access to power sufficient to satisfy their various needs and desires, "Empowerment struggles" will be justified, with conflict the natural and indeed proper result. Paradoxically, the quest for a lasting peace may well require the advocacy of war, or "creative conflict" in the softer words of the champions of peace studies.

Now what this would mean for a U.S. Peace Academy remains obscure, though we are given sobering hints by its proponents. With a mandate to further peace, the academy could not be arbitrarily limited in scope. For example, one of the members of the commission on proposals for the academy, William Lincoln, has testified during Senate hearings that it would be impossible to limit the activities of a Peace Academy to the realm of foreign affairs or international conflict: "In the interests of intra- and international security, justice is the goal, justice is the mission." The argument is that since much of the world's conflict—domestic as well as international—results from the unequal distribution of wealth, the denial of basic human rights, and a wretched standard of living, a Peace Academy must reflect this reality and include domestic as well as international conflict within the scope of its research and teaching. In fact, during one Senate hearing it was especially noted that even though there is no explicit reference to a domestic focus for the academy, nothing in the legislation as currently drafted would preclude such activity.

Thus the current legislation is certain to be interpreted by some to expand vastly the scope and mandate of the Peace Academy's activities—far beyond the bounds anticipated by many of its cosponsors. Given the activist nature of the peace studies movement, the likelihood that a USAP would eventually take an interest in domestic politics is far from remote. Indeed, such political activism would appear to be a natural outcome of any successful peace academy.

A PERNICIOUS IDEA

It is true that at first blush, the growth of peace studies and the creation of a U.S. Academy for Peace appear unobjectionable. Much of modern education lacks a concern with ethics and so seems impotent and irrelevant to young minds aching for a better world. Moreover, who can question the need for greater study of conflict resolution in a geopolitical situation ripe for conflagration? Finally, why take issue with such a relatively inexpensive national commitment to peace and conflict resolution as the USAP?

Yet despite this allure, peace studies and the federally funded academy reveal themselves as, in essence, an ideological assault on traditional education. Rather than expand our ability to understand the world around us, peace studies, with its fearful unwillingness to distinguish between totalitarianism and liberty, distorts reality by making all differences of principle seem unimportant and hence subject to easy compromise. This perception so warps the simple truths of politics (e.g., that there is a considerable difference between the Gulag and American involvement in Vietnam) that peace studies graduates will end up utterly incapable of comprehending world politics, let alone bringing about peace.

In setting forth the intellectual roots of the USAP we have tried to deepen the debate over this institution. Quite clearly the Peace Academy represents an "easy vote," for in the politically charged atmosphere created by the nuclear freeze movement no congressman wishes to have to explain a vote against "peace." But in resisting a political stampede for a national peace university, Congress would save the public more than money. We would all be spared the institutionalization of an ideology that threatens our ability to educate the young and distorts sober reflection on American foreign policy.●

SUPER COP—WILLIAM H. WEBSTER

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the April 1984 issue of the Washingtonian includes an excellent article entitled "Super Cop" by Blaine Harden. The "Super Cop" is our distinguished Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Honorable William H. Webster.

As the former chairman, and now ranking minority member of the Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Subcommittee that controls the funding of the FBI, I have more than the usual interest in the Bureau's activities. For more than 13 years—longer than any other Senator—I have served on the subcommittee.

In 1972, I managed the bill while our former colleague, the late, distinguished Senator from Arkansas, John McClellan, campaigned for reelection, and held the last hearing that J. Edgar Hoover attended. Those were the days of closed hearings with much discussion off the record, a fact I regret as I have struggled to rebuild the record of that historic hearing.

For example, Director Hoover told us that day that he did not want the FBI Building then under construction named after him. Shortly after his death, Congress did approve naming the building the J. Edgar Hoover Building. Unfortunately, it was impossible to document that it was against Mr. Hoover's wishes as that remark was apparently made off the record.

Over the succeeding years I have known Mr. Hoover's successors, the short-termed L. Patrick Gray III, and the even shorter termed William D. Ruckelshaus, Clarence M. Kelly, and, since 1978, Judge Webster.

Over the intervening years we have opened up our hearings and have markups in the sunshine. At the same time, Judge Webster has restored the FBI. Together we have worked to expand the Bureau into its new activities in drug law enforcement. Each day seemingly brings new results of that effort that has successfully linked the Bureau and the Drug Enforcement Administration. At the same time, we have maintained the priority for foreign counterintelligence, terrorism, white collar crime, and the other vital crime-fighting activities of the FBI.

Mr. President, I commend this article to my colleagues and ask that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. It is no secret that I am a great admirer of Judge Webster. He has restored the great respect that the Bureau has always enjoyed with the American people. The article describes several instances where the Director has withstood political pressures in maintaining the FBI integrity as the Nation's preeminent law enforcement agency.

In my opinion, if President Reagan had nominated Judge Webster to be Attorney General, he would have avoided the current difficulties. I daresay that he would have been confirmed unanimously.

The article follows:

SUPER COP

(By Blaine Harden)

For J. Edgar Hoover, the moment would have been delicious. The forum was a hearing before a friendly, almost fawning Senate subcommittee. The star witness was the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The senators were asking hanging-curve-ball questions—the kind any self-respecting small-town police chief, let along America's top cop, could hit out of the ballpark.

Senator John P. East, the conservative Republican from North Carolina, threw the fastest pitch of all. He asked if the balance in law enforcement in the United States had tipped "against society and in favor of the criminal element."

Had Hoover been asked such a question, the Director would have rounded up his usual suspects for the decline of Western Civilization. They included, in Hoover's words, "theorists, pseudocriminologists, hypersentimentalists, criminal coddlers, convict lovers, and fiddle-faced reformers." Crooks were "rats," those who kept them out of jail were "yammerheads," and that, in Hoover's cosmology of criminal jurisprudence, was that.

The FBI director, however, who had to answer Senator East's question was William H. Webster. And Webster, ignoring the senator's invitation to law-and-order demagoguery, responded with a 700-word lecture on justice in America. First, he stroked East's ego by assuring the senator that this question was intelligent. Then the director (only Hoover, dead twelve years, is the Director) acknowledged "serious problems" in the criminal-justice system. He said legal technicalities should not protect those who are clearly guilty of crime. But he added that police must always understand and honor those technicalities, no matter how complicated. Webster closed by saying that he felt the rights of society and of accused lawbreakers were in a near "state of balance."

It was all so smooth, so measured, so unquotable, so utterly unlike anything J. Edgar Hoover said in his 48-year reign over the FBI. Indeed, a couple of Webster's remarks made him sound suspiciously like a "theorist" or even a "yammerhead." Webster had refused to play ball with East's lock-up-the-vermin biases. He had gently chastised the senator for paying more attention to appearance than to fact. But he was so blandly polite about it that the senator did not seem to notice.

That answer stands as a near-perfect example of what William Hedgcock Webster has done at the FBI. The former federal judge from St. Louis—who has run the FBI

for more than six years, longer than anyone except Hoover—has radically changed the mission, image, and techniques of America's only national police force. Yet "the judge," as he like to be called, has been so polite, so studiedly colorless that few Americans seem to have noticed either the magnitude of the changes or the man who effected them. The judge has presided over an anomalous era at the FBI, an era in which the Bureau has become both bigger and less publicized, more powerful and less feared, more capable of violating the civil liberties of Americans and less disposed to do so.

The FBI's Webster era, however, may soon end. The judge does not plan to complete his ten-year term as director, a non-renewable term that expires in 1988. He has told friends that he has accomplished what he set out to do when he moved to Washington in 1978 and that he will probably leave the FBI in August when he becomes eligible for a government pension.

William Webster's departure raises the possibility that the FBI again could become what it was for much of the 1960s and '70s—a highly politicized, often out-of-control secret police. In 1973, William Ruckleshaus, during his tumultous 70-day tenure as acting FBI director, warned that the Bureau has "enormous power and thus can be a force for evil as well as good. . . . The FBI does not exist aside from the people in it. More particularly, it owes much of its force, effectiveness, and tone to its director."

Civil libertarians, fearful of the past repeating itself and already exorcised by Ronald Reagan's nomination of Edwin Meese III as attorney general, are afraid that Webster's successor will be neither as non-ideological nor as independent as the judge. They fear that, unlike Webster, a new FBI director will be unwilling to stand up to his boss in the Justice Department. Meese, a law-and-order activist who is known in the White House as "Officer Ed," made no secret of his distaste for legal technicalities that interfere with criminal prosecutions or for judges who meddle in social issues.

"If and when Webster leaves and we get somebody Reagan selects, we can only expect real problems," worries Representative Don Edwards, once an FBI agent and now a liberal California Democrat who chairs the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights.

The FBI director who succeeds Webster will take control of a 20,000-member police force that, said Webster in an interview, "is not like any traditional bureaucratic organization. . . . It wants to respond to leadership." Those who worry about a replay of the bad old days at the FBI would do well to understand what sort of man Webster is and how he has so quietly expanded the power of a paramilitary bureaucracy where the three most powerful words in the English language continue to be "The director wants. . . ."

As an appointee of Jimmy Carter's, Webster came to Washington to salvage an agency whose reputation had taken a precipitous fall. Under Hoover, the Bureau had insinuated itself into American mythology as the epitome of right-thinking, clean-shaven, crook-catching professionalism. That myth was soiled in the 1970s by Senate investigations and news reports exposing the FBI's seamy side. Between 1965 and 1975, according to Gallup pollsters, the percentage of Americans who gave the FBI a "highly favorable" rating fell from 84 to 37 percent.

FBI agents, in the public mind, were no longer fearless, upstanding G-men. Some appeared as black-bag thugs for whom illegal break-ins, blackmail, and bedroom buggings were all part of a crusade called COINTELPRO. That counter-intelligence crusade was supposed to protect "right-thinking" Americans from those who, in Hoover's words, were "subversive force[s] dedicated to the complete destruction of our traditional democratic values."

Webster, according to civil libertarians who had been most critical of the Bureau, quickly convinced his agents that no one would get ahead in his FBI by tromping on the civil rights of any American. In a characteristically quiet, evenhanded decision, he fired or disciplined FBI supervisors who had ordered illegal surveillance of relatives and friends of the Weather Underground fugitives. He refused to punish, and won the allegiance of, agents who had simply followed orders. Webster demanded more legal training for FBI agents and made sure they were apprised within 48 hours of changes in federal law related to their investigative authority.

"Whatever maverick FBI agents there are out there around the country, if they stray away from the legal path, they know they will not get support in Washington," says Frank J. Donner, a civil-liberties lawyer and author of The Age of Surveillance. "The perception of risk [for renegade agents] is greater under Webster than it has ever been before."

Webster also has given the FBI the independence to dare disagree with public statements by the President—something that Hoover, for all his vaunted power, almost never did. Webster's independence survived Carter's defeat and has been asserted repeatedly, if diplomatically, under Ronald Reagan. In the fall of 1982, Reagan said there was "plenty of evidence" that the Soviet Union had "inspired" and was "manipulating" the US nuclear-freeze movement. Last August, Webster flatly, but quietly, said Reagan was wrong. In a written reply to a question from Senator Orrin G. Hatch of Utah. Webster stated, "There is no evidence . . . that the Soviets or the organizations they control have a dominant role in the US peace movement."

While tidying up the FBI's image, Webster has—again, quietly—expanded his power. His FBI has won sharp increases in spending on law-enforcement hardware and personnel, as well as far-reaching increases in investigative authority.

Since Webster took over in 1978, the FBI's budget has more than doubled to just over $1 billion a year. With an 8.8 percent increase in the 1985 budget request, a request that is usually sacrosanct in Congress, the Bureau is one of the fastest-growing parts of the federal government.

The number of FBI agents is at an all-time high of 8,488 (with a record 11,580 clerical and technical employees). By the end of next year, the Bureau will have spent more than $430 million for a computer-network and communications system that will permit almost instantaneous access in 59 field offices to the FBI's huge criminal and investigative data bank.

In the wake of Abscam—Webster's most publicized and, for the most part, applauded investigation—the FBI has made an unprecedented plunge into undercover operations that rely on bribe money, underworld informants, electronic bugs, and concealed cameras. These undercover operations target individuals who, in Webster's words, "smell" suspicious. In the past six years, the annual number of these investigations has increased sixfold, from 56 to more than 315. Undercover spending on bribe money and equipment, not counting salaries, has increased ninefold.

Building on changes initiated by his predecessor, Clarence M. Kelley, Webster has backed the FBI away from its obsession with bank robbery and car theft and aimed it at investigations of white-collar and organized crime, espionage, and terrorism. When the Reagan administration pressured Webster to do more about violent crime, he moved the Bureau into drug enforcement, a move that Hoover had long resisted for fear his agents would be corrupted. In one of the smoothest bureaucratic takeovers ever seen in Washington, Webster two years ago gained control of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), with its 2,200 agents and $290 million budget. He appointed his loyal friend and former FBI executive Francis M. (Bud) Mullen to run the agency. On a hot-line telephone, Webster calls Mullen's office nearly every day.

The cap on Webster's empire-building is a new set of guidelines expanding the FBI's authority to investigate and infiltrate domestic political groups. The guidelines replace more restrictive rules handed down in 1976 by former attorney general Edward H. Levi, rules that were intended to prevent a recurrence of past FBI abuses. The new guidelines, issued last year by Attorney General William French Smith, allow the FBI to launch a full-scale investigation based entirely on "advocacy" of crime, particularly violent crime. They also allow the FBI to amass dossiers, using public information, on any domestic group. Finally, the new guidelines allow preliminary investigations—using informers and undercover agents—to begin solely on the basis of an "allegation or information indicating the possibility of criminal activity."

Webster has built a law-enforcement empire that is more powerful than anything Hoover ever had. Yet the judge says he will not allow the FBI to run roughshod again over the constitutional rights of Americans. And many of the FBI's most severe critics believe him.

"On civil liberties, it is the difference between night and day in Hoover's era and Webster's FBI," says Jerry J. Berman, legislative council for the American Civil Liberties Union.

"Webster is not ideological. Without question he has changed the style of the FBI. He is not deceptive," says Victor Navasky, editor of *The Nation*, a liberal journal that for decades was shelved in the FBI's New York field office alongside Communist-produced publications.

Judge Webster, quite simply, is an easy man to trust. It begins with his looks. Good looks, often underestimated as a part of leadership, are especially important in the FBI. Back in the early 1960s, when 40 million Americans tuned in to The FBI television show every week, Efrem Zimbalist Jr. epitomized the perfect G-man. He was handsome, polite, smart, patriotic and neatly attired. Hoover admired Zimbalist so much that, according to one of his publicists, the Director demanded that FBI recruiters look for new agents who conformed to the "Zimmy image." Webster does. If anything, the judge is better looking and better dressed than Zimmy.

Webster's eyes are blue, his jaw is square, and his waist is trim. He has what one friend calls a "pixie" smile. When he gets

angry, associates say, his blue eyes turn cold, his soft voice grows even softer. Webster's dark-brown hair is always crisply parted, and his hairline is as resolutely nonreceding as Reagan's (Webster's hair is trimmed regularly at FBI headquarters by Ray Cabacar, a former Navy steward who is also the chief cook in the FBI executive dining room.)

A Christian Scientist, Webster rarely drinks and never smokes. The drink in his hand at official Washington gatherings is usually 7-Up.

Griffin B. Bell, the former attorney general who has said Webster's selection to run the FBI was Carter's best appointment, says the judge was chosen because "he was intelligent, had unusual balance, was a straight-arrow type, and had a patrician approach. He is quiet and he moves in quiet ways."

Webster invariably dresses in dark suits, usually pin-striped, with cuffed pants, button-down shirts, and prep ties. At the age of 60 with gray beginning to frost his temples, he has the look of a well-born, well-compensated executive who keeps in shape at the country club.

Tennis is Webster's passion. Friends say he is a sound player, more driven to win than skilled. He plays several times a week at St. Albans Tennis Club against members of the Washington establishment, including members of Congress and prominent journalists such as synidicated columnist Carl Rowan and Fred Graham of CBS News. "He has a funny-looking serve," says Graham, who often reports on the FBI. "But he beats players you wouldn't think he could." Graham says there is "some truth" to the notion that Webster's friendship with selected Washington journalists has helped diffuse the mutual hostility between the FBI and the media in the 1970s.

The son of a prosperous St. Louis businessman who owned and operated a number of small firms, including the St. Louis Ear Mold Laboratory, Webster grew up wanting to be a laywer. He attended Amherst College, a highly regarded liberal-arts college in Massachusetts where a midwesterner can make career contacts and acquire a bit of eastern sophistication. Former CIA director Stansfield Turner, a college classmate and friend, says Webster was a serious student "but not a stick-in-the-mud." He headed the debating club, belonged to a fraternity and two honor societies, and went to church regularly. At Amherst, Webster established a pattern for professional probity and highbrow social involvement that he has maintained throughout his life.

After serving in the Navy in both World War II and the Korean War and graduating from Washington University Law School in St. Louis, Webster built a $120,000-a-year corporate-law practice in his hometown. (His net worth when he was confirmed as FBI director in February 1978 was $880,296.) He and his wife, Drusilla, belonged to several exclusive clubs in St. Louis, and one of their daughters was a debutante at the Veiled Prophet Ball, an event sponsored by that city's oldest, most powerful families.

Since coming to Washington, Webster and his wife have become regulars at black-tie social events and diplomatic parties. Friends say the judge enjoys and is good at social hobnobbing. He is past president of the Alfalfa Club, an exclusive organization of powerful Washington men. But unlike many of his high-powered peers. Webster does little official entertaining at home. He usually invites only close friends, many of them from St. Louis, to his $358,000 house in Bethesda. (The house, on a wooded lot with a swimming pool, is not guarded by the FBI. A driver takes the director to and from work in a government sedan. A close friend says Webster insists on sitting beside the driver in the front seat.)

In St. Louis, Webster was active in Republican politics and served two years as a US attorney. President Nixon chose Webster in 1971 to be a US district court judge, and he accepted the $40,000-a-year job, although it meant a big cut in pay. He took the job, he says, when the country "was going through the riots, the burning of ROTC buildings and so forth. I was convinced that the next generation would question whether the system works. Some of us could prove maybe that it did work."

In 1973, Nixon elevated Webster to the 8th US Circuit Court of Appeals, where he compiled a generally conservative record. He was unwilling to let police procedural errors interfere with criminal convictions, but he often stood up for the constitutional rights of minorities. He was labeled a "do-gooder" by the warden at the St. Louis City Jail after he ordered sweeping reforms to correct what he termed "inhumane" conditions.

Webster was one of six people whose backgrounds were checked when a vacancy opened up on the US Supreme Court in 1975. For much of his life, friends say, Webster has coveted a seat on the high court. He lunches several times a year with his friends Chief Justice Warren Burger and Associate Justice Harry Blackmun, usually in the Supreme Court dining room.

When Webster learned he was being considered for the FBI job, he went to a St. Louis public library and took out several books on the Bureau. He had never wanted to be an FBI agent, had never considered running the national police force. He decided to take the job, he says, for the same reason that he became a judge: He is a patriot, and his country needed him. Weeks before he moved to Washington, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch carried a profile of the local-boy-turned-number-one-G-man. The story, quoting an unnamed long-time friend of Webster's, assessed his character this way:

"If a pie is on the table and everybody's got a knife and fork, Bill is not going to take a back seat. He will be polite, of course, but he will get his share of the pie."

Webster quickly proved he was capable of getting his share of the pie here. He rebuilt the FBI far more successfully than had his predecessors in the 1970s—Clarence Kelley, William Ruckelshaus, and L. Partick Gray III. (Gray was indicted for approving illegal break-ins when he was acting director in 1972-73. Charges were later dropped for lack of evidence.)

Unlike Hoover, Webster did not rebuild the FBI by playing to a national audience. The judge avoided the theatrics that had prompted former senator George Norris of Nebraska to brand Hoover "the greatest publicity hound on the American continent."

Beginning in the late 1930s, Hoover put together a public-relations machine that made certain that all of the FBI's successes were attributed to the Director's personal vigilance. Hoover led carefully staged raids on the hideouts of gangsters and racketeers. He developed a friendly stable of writers who fed FBI-approved stories to magazines, movies, radio shows, even comic books. An official FBI photograph of Hoover in 1944 carried this caption: "Tough and looks it, is Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. . . . This stockily built chief has a sensational record for bringing public enemies of all kinds . . . to justice. Mr. Hoover is the hero of all American schoolboys."

When Webster came to Washington, he chose not to be a hero. "There was a conscious effort on Webster's part to keep the FBI publicity mechanism from deifying him," recalls Russell J. Bruemmer, a law clerk to Webster in St. Louis who came to the FBI as a special assistant to the director. Webster warned the FBI press office not to tell reporters that his favorite dessert was apple pie. (Hoover had publicized his taste for Key-lime pie.)

Webster changed the time-honored FBI practice of using an Autopen to sign the director's signature to thousands of routine documents. He delegated authority like a corporate chief executive officer, giving power to three executive assistant directors who operate as group vice presidents for administration, law enforcement, and investigation. Although he is far more accessible to Congress and the press than Hoover ever was, Webster never speaks out of school. He talks slowly seeming to examine the implications of each word. His public statements are invariably balanced, often boring.

Webster's only venture into big-time image-making, the FBI-sanctioned ABC television show Today's FBI, was as balanced and boring as the director's speeches. In G-Men, a recent book about the FBI, social historian Richard Gid Powers says the agents of Today's FBI were "careful to explain, justify, and apologize for every move they made, as though there were a posse of ACLU lawyers, PTA fuss-budgets, and the editorial board of The Nation lurking just out of camera range, ready to push the 'abort' button the first time an agent bumped into the Bill of Rights." The show was canceled after one season because of low ratings.

Webster has attained his goal of not becoming a national celebrity. His FBI, according to Powers, has an image in the popular culture that has evolved beyond Hoover's G-men and the black-bag thugs of the '70s. That new image, says Powers, "is a washed-out nothing."

Webster told me that a lower profile for the FBI "is consistent with a long-term approach to doing our best work. A pattern had developed over 48 years of focusing on the director. . . . I think there is more potential for the director to damage the FBI by his own public actions than there is for him to enhance it.

"When I sit down with you, I'd like to think I've earned the right to be believed. You are not sitting there saying, 'Is he lying to me?' I don't think hero-making, in the long run, will serve that purpose."

The director's emergence as a non-hero may have washed the color out of the FBI's public image, but it has not kept Webster from building and consolidating power. Herbert Kaufman, a former senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and author of a study of the administrative behavior of federal bureau chiefs, says strong connections in Washington are far more important in running a bureaucracy than is a national constituency. "The visibility thing," says Kaufman, "is somewhat overdone."

On a level that is usually invisible, Webster has proved himself a master at the bureaucratic game. Taking advantage of a mandatory 55-and-out retirement rule that forced 800 agents to leave the FBI the

month he arrived. Webster began installing younger agents in high-level positions. Within a few years, nearly every senior official in Bureau headquarters and in the 59 field offices was a Webster appointee whose loyalty was to the current director, not to the past.

Unlike his friend Stansfield Turner, who bloodily cut 154 senior employees out of the CIA and precipitated a much-publicized collapse in spy morale, Webster was careful not to arouse the ire of the career agents who make the FBI one of the federal government's most insular bureaucracies. Webster did not demote older agents, and, according to his former special assistant Bruemmer, he never denigrated them, even among intimates. The judge simply waited for them to retire—as about 43 percent of them have.

In the meantime, Webster enthusiastically paid homage to the FBI's sacred cows. He never misses the annual meeting of the 8,000-member Society of Former Special Agents. Last year at their meeting in Denver, he gave the retired agents, many of whom have important contacts with law-enforcement and political leaders around the country, a glowing report on what he called "our FBI family." Like Hoover, Webster attends quarterly graduation ceremonies at the FBI National Academy at Quantico, Virginia, where each year 1,000 police officers from around the country are taught how to fight crime the FBI way. Webster often tours FBI field offices; in Washington, he poses for pictures with visiting field agents. He attends funerals of agents killed in the line of duty and personally comforts their widows.

Outside the FBI bureaucracy, Webster has been equally diligent in touching all the power bases. He repeatedly has referred to the attorney general as his boss, something Hoover was loath to do. Webster makes a point of inviting FBI critics to lunch. Navasky, the editor of The Nation, has lunched with Webster, as has Jerry Berman of the ACLU. After Abscam, when the National Association of Arab Americans objected to FBI undercover agents posing as Arab sheiks. Webster invited members of the group to voice their complaints in his office.

The site of most of his bridge-building is the FBI executive dining room, located about 30 feet down the hall from Webster's imposingly large office on the seventh floor of the FBI building. After arriving at work at 8:30 am, Webster breakfasts there nearly every morning. He lunches there about three times a week. About half of the meals are given over to "outsiders"; the rest are briefing sessions with FBI executives.

Most important, Webster has developed a rapport with members of Congress who have come to trust his judgment and believe his words. Unlike Hoover, who usually made one Capitol Hill appearance a year (before a doting House Appropriations subcommittee that served up puffball questions), Webster testifies before Congress at least eight times a year, and the questions are often critical.

"When Hoover was alive, you got nothing. There were no hearings, and everybody [in Congress] was afraid of him," says Representative Edwards. "Webster has been forthright, an honest administrator . . . a cool head."

The judge came to Washington determined to be believable. "What I brought with me, I think, was the benefit of the doubt," says Webster. "From then on, it was up to me to never do anything to cause people to wonder." According to Russell Bruemmer, the director's former aide and close friend, "Webster sensed that his credibility and integrity before Congress were the two things that could buy him time to prove he could run the Bureau."

Five months after Webster came to Washington, his signature was affixed, with an Autopen, to a letter that was glaringly false. That letter was sent to then-representative Paul McCloskey, a liberal Republican from California. McCloskey had asked Webster if a former Black Panther leader named Elmer "Geronimo" Pratt had been the target of the FBI's Counterintelligence Program (COINTELPRO) at the time of a 1968 murder in Santa Monica, a killing for which Pratt had been convicted and was serving life in prison. Webster's letter said flatly, "You may be assured that Pratt was never a target of the FBI's COINTELPRO."

FBI documents proved otherwise. The documents, obtained by Pratt's lawyers under the Freedom of Information Act, said the Bureau had a plan to publicize Pratt's "illicit sexual activities" and to "attack, expose, and ridicule the image of [Pratt] amongst current and past membership" of the Black Panthers.

McCloskey, having seen these documents, wrote back to the director, cited evidence that the earlier Webster letter had ignored, and accused the FBI of "acting defensively." McCloskey, who now practices law in Palo Alto, recalls he was astonished at Webster's reaction.

"By God, he called me back in 24 hours. He ordered an immediate investigation. Within a week, I was invited to a meeting with Webster and his staff," says McCloskey. "Any leader is not going to say, 'My staff has lied to me'. But it was quite clear from the way he gave instructions in the meeting that he knew they had not told him the truth. They came back with a much more detailed report, conceding they had targeted Pratt."

Recalling the incident, Webster says he was angry at his subordinates for not doing their "homework." He feared the error would damage the credibility on which he hoped to rebuild the FBI. Webster often invokes the Pratt affair, aides say, to demand that documents prepared for his signature be checked for accuracy. "Being a straight arrow," says former FBI special assistant Steve Andrews, "is very important to the judge."

To remain a straight arrow at an agency that has sullied the reputation of previous directors, Webster has relied on his experience as a judge. For more than six years, he has hired temporary "special assistants"—young lawyers, most of them former clerks to federal judges—to sniff around the Bureau. Reporting only to him, they annotate sources for speeches, review applications for wiretaps, and assess progress of undercover investigations. While they are resented by FBI career bureaucrats, they have been useful. It was a special assistant, for example, who handled the Pratt foul-up.

Even his critics say Webster thinks like a judge. He monitors federal court rulings around the country and orders FBI agents to modify their behavior according to the most recent decisions. "He is a judge in a bureaucrat's role, a balancer who tries to weigh conflicting interests," says Jerry Berman of the ACLU. "He is politically tuned to both the right and left, and he manages to walk a very bright white line down the middle of the road."

For all his judicial finickiness. Webster's tenure at the FBI has been marked by several errors of judgment and major investigative failures. These failings, according to congressional staffers who keep tabs on the FBI, have occurred, in part, because Webster is too much the judge and not enough of an expert on how to control undercover operations.

In Abscam, in which undercover agents offered bribes to lawmakers in exchange for favors, a Senate select committee found that the FBI kept sloppy records of tapes and phone conversations, had poor reporting from the field to headquarters on what was going on, and gave convicted con man and middleman Mel Weinberg too much latitude in directing the operation. While appeals courts have upheld all seven convictions of congressmen who accepted Abscam bribes, Webster has admitted that the FBI could have done a better job. "I wish now we had more documentation," he said in 1982. "But [we] always improve on the next operation."

Not always. Two years after Abscam, the collapse of an undercover operation in Cleveland showed that the FBI under Webster can be farcically incompetent. In "Operation Corkscrew," the idea was to uncover corrupt judges in Cleveland's municipal court. The investigation was built around a middleman named Marvin Bray, a court bailiff who was supposed to be offering FBI bribe money to judges but was instead pocketing the money and taking the Bureau for a ride.

The FBI made it easy for Bray. Cleveland agents working with the bailiff failed to make a routine computer check to see if he had a criminal record. He did, for burglary. An FBI undercover agent, who met with two "judges" whom Bray claimed to have bribed, did not check to see if they were, in fact, judges. They were not. One was a bailiff, the other a housewife. To spot the ringers, the agent would only have to walk into the courtrooms of the real judges and look at them.

Throughout Corkscrew, the FBI demonstrated a stubborn refusal to believe that Bray was a liar. Even after the FBI figured out that Bray had forged signatures and staged a taped conversation—with Bray playing the roles of both briber and judge—he was sent out to bribe another judge. The only indictments to come out of Corkscrew were against Bray and his make-believe judges.

Webster says that the problem with the operation "was simply this: A young agent failed to do what he was instructed to do. . . . Corkscrew is unfortunate, but it doesn't represent something wrong with undercover work.

Operation Corkscrew does represent something wrong with the way the Bureau supervises undercover operations, according to Representative Edwards, whose Judiciary subcommittee reviewed the entire 28,000-page FBI file. "The Bureau didn't have the proper safeguards in place. They thought they were supervising, but they weren't," says Edwards. The subcommittee found that the FBI's undercover review committee (which Webster points to as a centerpiece of the Bureau's ability to control undercover operations) had almost no role in controlling Corkscrew. The review committee gave six-month approval for the operation in late 1979 but did not meet to discuss the operation again for a year. The subcommittee found no documents suggesting that the FBI supervisor in Washington, who was responsible for Corkscrew, had criticized the operation.

"It was a case of Abscamitis. There never was any solid evidence indicating the judges were corrupt," says one senior congressional staffer who is familiar with Corkscrew. "Webster believes that the undercover review committee has an important role. He thinks that because he has guidelines and procedures, everything will be all right. But in Corkscrew, it didn't filter down."

Webster himself is partially to blame for the Cleveland fiasco, Edwards asserts, because the director "did not go beneath the surface on what the facts were."

Inside the FBI, those who have worked closely with Webster say he is quick to spot fuzzy thinking in subordinates, but he is limited by his lack of law-enforcement experience and his corporate management style.

These aides say it was incompetence, not bad faith, that caused the FBI to withhold information from a Senate committee in its review of the nomination of Raymond J. Donovan as Secretary of Labor. The Donovan affair provoked the bluntest criticism of the FBI since Webster became director. A report of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources said, "The FBI's inaccuracies, lack of clarity, and untimely production [of information on alleged ties between Donovan and organized crime] compromised the Senate's ability to inform itself."

A former FBI official says foul-ups like Corkscrew and the Donovan case are inevitable in the Bureau under Webster: "The risk is, every once in a while one of these things is going to get a little out of hand before the operational guys tell the director what is going on."

It would be shortsighted to make too much of Webster's blind spots. They are the inevitable result of placing a judge and an outsider in charge of an inbred police force. No one suggests that Webster covers up these foul-ups once he finds out about them.

Far more significant than his mistakes is the revolution Webster has wrought in how the Bureau goes about defending the nation from crimes and criminals that have aroused widespread public anxiety. The dimensions of this little-noticed revolution can only be understood by looking back at how deftly the Bureau—before Webster—exploited nationwide paranoia.

From its creation in 1908 through the early 1970s, the Bureau expanded its power and widened its domain by plugging into a series of national menaces. In 1910, the menace was "white slavery. "There was widespread, and mostly unfounded, hysteria that white women were being spirited off to houses of prostitution. Stanley W. Finch, head of the Bureau of Investigation (as the FBI was then called), told Congress that "unless a girl was actually confined in a room and guarded . . . there was no girl, regardless of her station in life, who was altogether safe." The upshot of Finch's testimony was passage of the Mann Act, which resulted in significant expansion of the Bureau's authority.

Similarly, the Bureau shrewdly plugged into the menaces of "the radical element" during World War I, kidnapping and gangsters in the '30s, Communists in the '40s and '50s, black activists and assorted "radicals" in the '60s. In G-Men, Richard Powers writes, "Each time, the Bureau was the effective means whereby the law could be mobilized in a pageant of popular politics: Through highly publicized dragnets, the Bureau sought to demonstrate the government's opposition to unpopular behavior or opinions."

In the 1980s the great new menace is terrorism. There is widespread public fear of terrorist attacks in the United States. The White House, Capitol, and State Department are now fortified to ward off suicide bombers of the kind that last year killed 241 American servicemen in Beirut. Reagan-administration officials, especially former Secretary of State Alexander Haig, have claimed Soviet influence over terrorism worldwide, including inside the US. Fear of terrorism pushed the Justice Department last year to relax guidelines for opening domestic-security investigations.

Through it all, Webster—in a historic departure from the behavior of past FBI directors—has refused to exploit public anxiety over terrorism in a way that might endear him to the President or enhance the power of the FBI. Dissatisfied with the FBI's ability to gather and analyze information on terrorism, Webster ordered new personnel to look at the issue. "He felt his own people were giving him rhetoric, not enough substance," says Bud Mullen, formerly one of the FBI's top three executives. "He wanted to be sure the FBI was not hyping the numbers."

The director shot down Soviet-conspiracy theories in 1981, saying in a television interview, "Within the US, we seem at this point to be free of any type of direct deliberate Soviet domination or control or instigation of terrorist activity." He told a House subcommittee in February that while terrorism was a major concern of the FBI, there had been a decrease in the number of terrorist incidents in the US. He said there were 31 such incidents in 1983, down by 40 percent from the previous year. In that hearing, Webster volunteered that he had "never felt that the US was very fertile ground for development of virulent terrorist groups."

While refusing to exaggerate this new menace, Webster has taken the FBI into law-enforcement areas that are less likely than terrorism to capture the public imagination. The average man, George Orwell wrote, "wants the current struggles of the world to be transformed into a simple story about individuals." Hoover instinctively understood this. The Director found individual enemies for the average man: John Dellinger, Baby Face Nelson, and the Ten Most Wanted. Webster does not seem to worry about the average man's hunger for a simple story. His FBI investigates commodity-option swindles, suspected fraud in the failure of the Penn Square Bank in Oklahoma, and organized crime control of trash collection in the Bronx.

"The greatest damage is done not by individuals, but by groups," Webster says. "We still respond to every bank robbery, but we don't ring the firebell and empty the office."

Webster has led the FBI into areas where it is unlikely to get the quick, clean results Hoover insisted upon. In the last two years, the FBI has devoted about one-eighth of its manpower to organized-crime involvement in drug trafficking. Despite the investment, there has been little change in the availability of illicit drugs in the U.S. The purity and supply of cocaine have increased sharply in the past two years, as prices have gone down. According to Russell Bruemmer, Webster's former special assistant, "It doesn't bother the judge to take the FBI into areas where you are not going to get impressive crime-solving statistics and where public understanding is not well defined."

Webster has been able to force these far-reaching changes in the 76-year-old habits of the FBI because of the changes he has chosen not to make. The judge has carefully preserved the paramilitary structure of the Bureau. As it was under Hoover, the FBI is rigidly hierarchical, highly disciplined. Its employees are exempt from civil-service protections. "Which means I can fire people," says Webster. "I can transfer as appropriate. We do have discipline, and we accept it."

"Webster's FBI has hired many female and minority agents. Most are hired in their early twenties and plan to remain in the Bureau their entire career. Management positions are nearly always filled from within. "Sure, they are hiring women and blacks, but they still take these young people when they are not fully formed," says one Hill staffer who has watched the FBI for a decade. "They turn them all into G-men—make that G-persons."

The FBI also remains obsessed with secrecy. FBI "raw files" are still all but unavailable to outside review. Bureaucrats outside the FBI "family" are still regarded with suspicion. Webster has pushed Congress to exempt the FBI from certain disclosure requirements of the Freedom of Information Act. Since the FBI took over the Drug Enforcement Administration, the General Accounting Office—the investigative arm of Congress—reports it access to DEA investigative files has dried up. "It is far easier to get secret information from the Pentagon about weapons than it is to get anything from the FBI," says Representative Edwards.

As William Webster says, the FBI "wants to respond to leadership." The nationwide resources of the Bureau—its growing computerized information network, its broad authority to initiate undercover operations and domestic surveillance, its highly disciplined agents—are all at the disposal of the director. This was true under Webster, and after his retirement, it will be true under whoever replaces him. The FBI remains a loaded gun.

By exercising his power judiciously, Webster de-fanged the FBI's critics in the press and in Congress, reducing public scrutiny of the Bureau while making it even more powerful.

The choice of the next director, which Reagan will probably have to make in the late summer of 1984, is an appointment with Orwellian implications.

In nominating Webster, President Carter put aside partisan considerations. The Democratic President—sensing the need for an FBI director of unimpeachable integrity—picked a Republican, a patrician, a judge clearly more conservative than he. In selecting Webster's successor, Reagan also would be well advised to downplay politics in favor of character. Considering its shadowy past, its newfound strength, and the abiding power of the director, the FBI more than ever needs a director who understands and is devoted to the Bill of Rights.

Echoing the concerns of several former special assistants to Webster, Russell Bruemmer warns, "The FBI still attracts people who respond to the director's determination of what the law should be."●

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

● Mr. GARN. Mr. President, last year I supported Senate action approving the United States' portion of an in-

crease in the funding of the International Monetary Fund for two primary reasons. First, it protected U.S. exports and U.S. jobs. Without the funding increase, debtor nations would have been forced to drastically cut their imports from the United States and elsewhere. The sudden loss of these markets would have resulted in widespread unemployment in U.S. agriculture and industry.

The second key reason for my support of increased IMF funding was that it enabled the Fund to continue working with debtor countries to help them help themselves. The IMF loans that were funded did not constitute a "bailout" for either the debtor countries or the banks. To the contrary, as preconditions to the IMF loans, the debtor countries were required to adopt sound economic policies and the banks were required to contribute to the workout by increasing their own lending.

An "Outlook" column in the April 23, 1984, edition of the Wall Street Journal discusses recent events in Mexico. The tremendous strides that country has made toward solving its debt problems are the result of new policies developed through joint efforts by the Government of Mexico and the IMF.

Such a success story supports the wisdom of the Senate in acting last year to enable the IMF to continue this important work.

I ask that the Wall Street Journal column be reprinted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 23, 1984]

WORLD DEBT PROBLEMS EASE—AT LEAST FOR NOW

(By Art Pine)

WASHINGTON.—At the height of the global debt crisis last February, Citicorp banker George J. Clark outraged members of the House Banking Committee by arguing at a hearing that Mexico would bail itself out of the worst of its problems more quickly than most people thought.

Although things admittedly looked bleak, Mr. Clark predicted, "We will see a very rapid turnaround" in Mexico "within 18 months." At one point he even ventured that, with a little bit of luck, people soon would be pointing to Mexico as a model of how a country can pull itself out of the mess.

Disbelieving lawmakers all but sneered at Mr. Clark's ebullience, but so far if anything he has proved to be too conservative. It took only eight or nine months—not 18—for Mexico to begin showing improvement. After an initial slash in imports, Mexico's trade balance is in surplus, and its exports have begun growing again. The country is meeting its borrowing needs without serious difficulty. There is even speculation now that in a year or two Mexico may be able to resume borrowing at market rates. Its belt-tightening efforts have become the envy of other Third World governments.

The vignette may not exonerate bankers for their past overoptimism, but it does illustrate a point: In the past 18 months, both creditors and debtors have done a lot to adjust to the debt problem. Like any long-overdue adjustment, this process has had it uncertainties and confrontations. But there has been gradual improvement. So far, the world has been able to muddle through.

There's a parallel, up to a point, with the oil crisis of the 1970s: When oil prices quadrupled in 1974, global hand-wringing quickly reached a frenzy. The financial system would be strained to the point of rupture. The Arabs would use their new-found billions for political blackmail. The oil cartel would be unbreakable. Developing countries would be unable to withstand the pain. Most ominous, there was the dreaded "recycling" problem: The oil price jump would give the Persian Gulf states billions of dollars in new revenues; if the world economy were to keep functioning, the money would have to be channeled back to the oil-consuming countries. Would commercial banks be able to handle the flow?

In reality, however, the world struggled through, with a few fits and starts: Floating exchange rates helped ease the financial strains. The Arabs kept their investments free of politics. The oil cartel began to weaken as soon as the U.S. decontrolled its petroleum prices. The West proved able to cut its oil consumption far more than had seemed imaginable. Developing countries survived. And the banks accomplished the "recycling" *too* well: Excessive lending to developing countries helped bring on the current debt crisis.

There were similarly dire predictions at the start of the current debt crisis: Borrowing countries would be unable to squeeze their economies enough to stay float. The financial system would be strained to the point of rupture. Borrowers would unite to form a "debtors' cartel" that would hold the banks hostage and repudiate outstanding debt. Austerity programs imposed from outside would rend the social fabric of the borrowing countries. Political instability and even revolution would result.

But these forecasts, too, have proved excessively pessimistic—so far. Industrial nations moved in with financial-rescue packages more efficiently than anyone expected. Borrowing countries have proved far more resilient than had been supposed. The austerity programs have pushed debtor countries to make long-overdue changes designed to streamline their economies. And debtor countries haven't formed a cartel.

The analogy to the oil crisis has its limits, of course. Most analysts agree the debt problem will be far more protracted than the oil crisis was, lingering on through the end of the present decade. And its resolution hinges on a broader and more complex set of developments—continuation of the recovery in the industrial world, a pickup in trade, an easing in the value of the dollar, a rise in commodity prices and moderation in interest rates—over which the lenders and borrowers have little control.

By common agreement, the biggest threat at the moment is the specter of rising interest rates. A sharp increase in debt-service costs quickly could undo any progress that's been achieved—a prospect "far more worrying than the doomsday predictions of 1982," an international official concedes.

Mounting protectionism also poses a danger: Trade restrictions by the industrial countries already are impeding the borrowing countries' efforts to sell their exports. Debt burdens still are growing. And there's increasing uncertainty about how long the debtor countries will be able to continue their austerity programs. Ironically, one problem is that the belt-tightening comes at a time when the Latin American debtor countries, at least, are moving toward a resumption of democracy; the more responsive a government must be, the more difficult it is to keep an austerity program in force.

Karl Otto Poehl, president of West Germany's Bundesbank, suggests the next steps in the "adjustment process" should be up to the banks-to offer debtors many concessions permitting easier repayment terms.

But there has been scant movement on this front. So the turmoil now seems likely to continue for the next several years-requiring a confrontation here and there to get movement on specific issues. The trick for all sides will be to manage that turmoil skillfully enough so the debt problem can be weathered.●

BILL GIANELLI RETIRES

● Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, at the end of next week, William R. Gianelli will step down as Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works). Mr. Gianelli and his wife will be returning to California to what he describes as retirement; personally, I hope he will be able to resist that urge. We need Bill Gianelli's continued help in solving this Nation's water resources development challenge.

Those of us who have worked with Bill Gianelli will miss him greatly. He is a man of warmth, intelligence, decency and thoughtfulness.

While I am certain that he often felt frustrated during his 3 years in office, Bill Gianelli brought great tenacity and imagination to a very difficult job—the job of building support for our Federal water resources programs, particularly the work of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

We must work to modernize the management of our water resources. Bill Gianelli realizes that. And in providing the leadership and vision, Bill Gianelli leaves having established himself as a great Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Before he came to Washington, Bill Gianelli had a long and distinguished career in water management. After taking an engineering degree at the University of California, he joined the California State Engineer's Office and the Department of Water Resources, serving in a variety of capacities. Following 7 years in a private engineering practice, Mr. Gianelli returned to State government as Gov. Ronald Reagan's director of the California Department of Water Resources.

While in that important job, he directed the completion of the initial features of the $2.5 billion California water project, much of which was financed with money from direct beneficiaries.

He also served, during that period, as a member of the National Commission on Water Quality, headed by the late Vice President Nelson Rockefeller.

From 1973 until the time he became Assistant Secretary in June 1981, Bill Gianelli again worked as a consulting engineer, specializing of water supply, water rights, and related problems.

It has been during the past 3 years that Bill Gianelli brought these experiences together to reshape our national water agenda. He forced us to examine a number of important and controversial issues, the most significant of which is the way project costs are shared and financed.

He clearly demonstrated the feasibility of increased non-Federal financing of Federal water projects when he was able to secure voluntary non-Federal commitments for higher levels of project funding on 16 new construction starts.

He instituted a process for two-step feasibility studies as a way to eliminate corps studies that were unlikely to produce practical project.

He developed major changes in the repayment policies of the Corps of Engineers for municipal and industrial water supply, increasing the recovery of Federal investments.

Mr. President, the members of the Committee on Environment and Public Works who have had the pleasure to work with Bill Gianelli will miss him, as will all proponents of sound water resources development policy.

Good luck, Bill, and thanks.●

LAWRENCE (LONNIE) HEINER

● Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to congratulate Lawrence E. (Lonnie) Heiner, president of NERCO Minerals Co., for being chosen as the Business Leader of the Year by the Associated Students of Business at the University of Alaska in Fairbanks. This award is just one of many recently bestowed upon Lonnie. He has also received the Distinguished Alumnus Award from the university and the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical & Petroleum Engineers. In addition, he was recently recognized by the Alaska State Legislature for his "deep commitment to the People of Alaska and to the future of Interior Alaska." Lonnie's personal efforts on behalf of the business and civic improvements in the Fairbanks area are well known and appreciated.

I ask that an editorial which appeared in the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner on April 7, 1984, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The editorial follows:

[From the Daily News-Miner, Fairbanks, AK, Apr. 7, 1984]

RECOGNIZING A COMMITMENT

Our congratulations to Lawrence E. "Lonnie" Heiner, who will be honored tonight by the Associated Students of Business as business leader of the year.

Heiner, president of NERCO Minerals Co., has shown a commitment to Interior Alaska that reminds us continuously of the vast potential of our area.

A graduate of the University of Alaska, Heiner in 1971 organized Resource Associates of Alaska. Over the years, the business grew from its small beginnings; its investments in Alaska minerals exploration now total more than $36 million.

After the business was acquired by NERCO Inc., an Oregon-based company, in 1981. Heiner remained as its president and then president of NERCO Minerals Co. At that level, he continued his commitment to Fairbanks, choosing to locate company headquarters here in a new office building that will bear NERCO's name.

Tonight, members of the business community will join the University of Alaska-Fairbanks students to pay tribute to Mr. Heiner for his contributions to our community. The honor is well-deserved.●

TRIBUTE TO ANSEL ADAMS

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to take just a moment to pay tribute here in the Senate to the memory of Ansel Adams, who died this past Sunday.

Though he is now gone, this great photographer of the American West has left a rich legacy—the thousands of beautiful pictures he took over this long and prolific lifetime.

Adams was able to a remarkable degree to produce visual poetry with his camera. Through the eye of his lens he captured forever the greatest natural monuments of the West in all of their majesty and their many moods. Who can forget Adams' Yosemite, or his Kings Canyon, or his magnificent Moonrise, Hernandez, NM, perhaps his greatest work. That last photograph alone has made his work forever memorable in my eyes.

He left us not only a treasure of monumental images, but also with the memory of a passion for the preservation of the landscapes he photographed. He was an active and effective champion of the wild landscapes he photographed. It is said that his photographs of California's Kings Canyon, which he carried to Washington in the 1930's, were instrumental in helping create that great national park.

It is difficult to measure the influence his photographs must have had in creating within the American people the desire and the drive to preserve other wild and beautiful natural regions of this country.

Adams ranks as one of the finest of American artists. Few have captured Western landscape images with more reliability or believability than he. I have read that he sought in his art a "spiritual resonance as moving and profound as great music." I think his photographs demonstrate that he succeeded to a very great extent.

Mr. President, we own much to this master craftsman who had the eye of the poet and the soul of the musician, and who combined both in the magnificent visual images he has left as his legacy to us all.●

CATHOLIC BISHOPS SEE ABORTION-ERA CONNECTION

● Mr. GARN. Mr. President, I have just learned that the National Conference of Catholic Bishops has announced that it will have no alternative but to oppose the equal rights amendment unless ERA is amended to make it neutral with regard to abortion and abortion funding. The bishops have taken this position because of the serious moral problems that would be presented by ratification of the equal rights amendment as now written. The bishops have also taken note of certain other implications of the proposed ERA, such as its effect on private schools and other charitable organizations.

I oppose the equal rights amendment, and I have taken this floor on several occasions to explain that one of the reasons for my opposition is the ERA-abortion connection. This past year has been especially enlightening: The country has been treated to hearings in both the Senate and the House on the meaning of the equal rights amendment. The Senate hearings, conducted by my colleague from Utah (ORRIN HATCH), have been especially informative since they featured the testimony of Hon. HENRY HYDE, one of this country's great defenders of life, and the colloquy between Prof. John Noonan and Prof. Ann Freedman. The House hearings were enlightening in their own way, and they were sufficient to persuade formerly undecided Members such as Hon. MICHAEL DEWINE of the ERA-abortion connection. The House hearings also convinced Hon. JAMES SENSENBRENNER to offer his abortion neutral amendment in the committee and subcommittee markups. The failure of the Sensenbrenner amendment in committee, and the refusal of the House leadership to allow a floor vote on the Sensenbrenner amendment, convinced many more people of the ERA-abortion connection. Pro-life groups were active in the fight for a vote on the Sensenbrenner amendment, and because of the refusal to have a vote on the Sensenbrenner amendment I suppose that there is not a pro-life group in America that now fails to recognize the ERA-abortion connection.

Also during the past year we have had an important study produced by Karen Lewis of the Congressional Research Service and we have had the Pennsylvania ERA-abortion case, Fischer against Dept. of Public Welfare. The major developments I have listed, together with a thousand other influences on thousands of people, have helped to outline, more completely than ever before, the reality and enormity of the ERA-abortion connection.

I ask that a press release of the National Catholic News Service and an

article from the Baltimore Catholic Review be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

BISHOPS SAY THEY WILL OPPOSE ERA WITHOUT ANTIABORTION AMENDMENT (570)

WASHINGTON.—The National Conference of Catholic Bishops announced April 19 it will "have no alternative but to oppose" the Equal Rights Amendment if a clause is not added excluding abortion and abortion funding from its scope.

In a news release the NCCB said its Administrative Committee in March approved a resolution stating the new position on ERA "because of the serious moral problems" that would be presented by an ERA without the inclusion of an anti-abortion clause.

The NCCB also announced establishment of an ad hoc interdisciplinary committee to study implications of the ERA. The committee is chaired by Archbishop John L. May of St. Louis, NCCB vice president.

Msgr. Daniel F. Hoye, NCCB general secretary, said the Administrative Committee at its March meeting had noted recent developments in Congress and the courts which he said raise questions about ERA's implications not only for abortion but for private educational institutions, the tax-exempt status of charitable organizations, religious exemptions in federal grant statutes and government aid programs.

"In general, it seems fair to say that the potential gravity of the amendment's implications is the product not so much of its own terms as originally understood by sponsors and supporters, as it is of an ambiguous congressional record and the interaction among ERA, legislative enactments and other legal principles," Msgr. Hoye said in a statement.

The ad hoc committee studying the implications of the ERA will present its findings and recommendations to the Administrative Committee in September, the NCCB said.

Previously the bishops have taken no position on the ERA itself. Last fall, without changing its basic neutrality, the bishops' conference announced support for a proposed amendment to the ERA sponsored by Rep. F. James Sensenbrenner, R-Wis., which supporters say would make ERA "abortion neutral."

Major supporters of the ERA, such as the National Organization for Women, want Congress to resubmit the proposal to the states for ratification without amendment.

The NCCB statement said that at the March Administrative Committee meeting a joint report on the issue was presented by the NCCB Committee on Pro-Life Activities, chaired by Cardinal Joseph Bernardin of Chicago, and by Wilfred Caron, NCCB general counsel.

The statement said the Administrative Committee also discussed a March 9 ruling in which the Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania used that state's ERA to strike down Pennsylvania's prohibitions on public funding of abortions. Pro-life groups have argued that a federal ERA similarly could affect federal abortion restrictions.

Msgr. Hoye said the Administrative Committee in its discussion reaffirmed the bishops' commitment to women's rights.

"The discussion made clear the committee's concern that there be no doubt about the conference's fundamental commitment to civil rights and the dignity of the person, and its support of governmental and private efforts to promote fair treatment of all people and prevent all forms of wrongful discrimination between the sexes," he said.

The Administrative Committee is a panel of some 40 bishops which conducts the business of the NCCB between annual general meetings.

The proposed federal ERA states, "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex."

In a column in the National Catholic Register March 11, Russell Shaw, U.S. bishops' secretary for public affairs, said that Catholics could not support the ERA without an anti-abortion clause because courts would interpret the amendment as guaranteeing a "right" to abortion.

[From the (Baltimore) Catholic Review, Mar. 16, 1984]

SAYS ERA NEEDS ANTIABORTION PROVISO

LOS ANGELES.—Russell Shaw, the U.S. bishops' secretary for public affairs, said in a newspaper column published here that Catholics could not support the Equal Rights Amendment today without an anti-abortion clause attached.

"A Catholic cannot support a law which would mandate or encourage what is immoral," Shaw wrote in a new weekly question-and-answer column in the National Catholic Register, a Los Angeles-based Catholic weekly.

He wrote that "evidence is persuasive" that the ERA today, without such an anti-abortion clause, "would be interpreted by the courts as guaranteeing a 'right' to abortion and public funding" of abortion.

Shaw is public affairs secretary for the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and U.S. Catholic Conference. He writes his column in a personal capacity, however, and not as an official reflection of NCCB-USCC policy.

Almost two dozen bishops individually endorsed the ERA before it failed in 1982 to gain ratification by the necessary 38 states. The U.S. bishops as a body have taken no position on the proposal.

But in 1983, as Congress considered sending the ERA back to the states for another attempt at ratification, the USCC, public policy arm of the bishops, endorsed a proposed "abortion neutralizing" addition to the ERA sponsored by Rep. F. James Sensenbrenner Jr., R-Wis.

Shaw's column focused on the new legislative history of the ERA developing because of Sensenbrenner's proposed amendment, which says that "nothing in (the ERA) shall be construed to grant or secure any right relating to abortion or the funding thereof."

Sensenbrenner's amendment has been rejected by a House Judiciary subcommittee and by the full House Committee, but has not come to a vote on either the House or Senate floor.

"Legislative history," wrote Shaw, "is important to courts in interpreting the meaning of a law or a constitutional amendment. As congressional consideration of ERA proceeds, however, a substantial legislative history is building in support of the proposition that it would lock abortion and abortion funding into the Constitution."

He added, "If the Sensenbrenner amendment fails to pass, it's hard to see how a Catholic who opposed abortion and public funding of abortion could support the unamended ERA."

Asked by NC News if his column reflected a judgment against the 23 bishops who had endorsed the ERA, Shaw said that the position adopted by bishops or others "several months or even several years ago would not necessarily be 'as rem' (to the point) now."

The reason, he said, is that the introduction of the Sensenbrenner amendment has changed the legislative history of the ERA since its first time around.

The approval or rejection of such anti-abortion language by Congress would place the legislative intent of the ERA directly on one side or the other of the abortion question, he said, while this was not true of the legislative history of ERA when it was first sent to the states in 1972.

Two bishops who had backed ERA in 1982 told NC News that they would have to look at it anew to decide whether they could back it now.

The two—Bishops Maurice Dingman of Des Moines, Iowa, and Raymond Lucker of New Ulm, Minn.—said they favored the Sensenbrenner amendment.

"I came to the conclusion a couple of years ago that it (ERA) would not include abortion," said Bishop Lucker.

"It's a risk, but it was a good risk" at that time, Bishop Dingman said.

Both agreed with Shaw that if an anti-abortion amendment to ERA fails, a good argument can be made that it would be used to promote access to abortion, but each bishop said he had not been following recent developments closely enough to judge the situation yet.

"I'm concerned that in all of this the equal rights of women are going to fall" victim to the abortion question, Bishop Lucker said. "The Equal Rights Amendment as worded is just too simple, just too bare * * * We don't know what they (the courts) are going to do with it."

In his column Shaw wrote that "some Catholic feminist groups have taken the position that the ERA and abortion are 'separate and distinct issues.'"

He said that pro-abortion groups take a different position, however. He cited "the National Organization for Women, which says it will oppose ERA if it is amended to exclude abortion and abortion funding."

The question which prompted Shaw's column noted that Catholics have both supported and opposed the ERA, "and both sides cite Catholic principles in favor of their positions.

"Can a Catholic support the ERA?" the question concluded.

When the ERA came to a House vote Nov. 15 under rules permitting only limited debate and no amendments from the floor, it failed because the 278-147 vote in favor was six short of the two-thirds necessary for passage.●

RELOCATION OF PROFESSIONAL SPORTS FRANCHISES

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, on March 29 of this year, the city of Baltimore was robbed. It was robbed of a most treasured asset, the Baltimore Colts. On that day, I introduced legislation which would insure that cities such as Baltimore are no longer helpless to prevent such acts of desertion by major league sports team owners.

Although I have a great deal of sympathy for the people of Baltimore, my reason for introducing this legislation was largely parochial. Seattle, too, was once the victim of owner whim. The Seattle Pilots came to Seattle in 1969, stayed just long enough to generate a significant commitment by the com-

munity to invest in a new stadium, now known as the Kingdome, and left town in 1970. I do not want Seattle to be abandoned like that again.

In 1982, Mr. President, Pete Rozelle while testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee noted that there were seven teams in the NFL whose stadium leases would expire by 1988. It is not in the best interests of our cities to permit these other franchises to follow the sad example of Mr. Irsay. This bill is an attempt to bring the substantial interests of our cities into the determination of when franchise relocation is appropriate.

Since the introduction of S. 2505, I have received valuable feedback from many interested parties. As a result, I am placing in the RECORD today a new draft of the bill which I intend to be the vehicle for discussion in the Commerce Committee. I ask that a copy of that draft be printed in the RECORD.

The draft follows:

S. 2505

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Professional Sports Team Community Protection Act".

FINDINGS AND POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) professional sports teams achieve a strong local identity with the people of the territory and metropolitan location where they play, and provide a source of pride and entertainment to their supporters;

(2) professional sports teams are invested with a strong public interest;

(3) the public, through a municipal stadium authority (which is typically a city or county agency or a municipal corporation), generally authorizes capital construction bonds to finance the construction of the stadium in which a professional sports team plays;

(4) normally, the lease or use agreement between the municipal stadium authority and the professional sports team sets rent to defray only the operating costs of the stadium, and does not reimburse the public for the costs of constructing the stadium; and

(5) despite the close association with and support from the people in the territory and metropolitan location where it plays, a professional sports team may be enticed from time to time to relocate to a new geographical location without regard to important interests and considerations which may be thought to be inconsistent with immediate financial gain for the owner of such a team.

(b) It is the policy of the Congress in this Act to discourage relocation of any professional sports team which is receiving adequate support from people in the territory and metropolitan location where such team plays, unless such relocation is necessary to prevent severe financial hardship.

PURPOSE

SEC. 3. It is the purpose of this Act to provide people in the territory and metropolitan location where a professional sports team plays the right of first refusal when, with the approval of the relevant league, the owner of such a team intends to relocate the team, or when a bona fide offer to purchase and relocate such a team or the acceptance of an offer to sell such a team has been received.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Board" means the Professional Sports Team Arbitration Board established in section 7 of this Act;

(2) "broadcasting" means all broadcasting over the airwaves (whether by radio, television, cable television, any form of pay or toll television, or otherwise) of any contest or exhibition engaged in by any professional sports team subject to the provisions of this Act;

(3) "league" means an association composed of two or more professional sports teams which, by agreement, have adopted, accepted or put into effect rules for the conduct of professional sports teams which are members of that association and the regulation of contests and exhibitions in which such teams regularly engage;

(4) "proposed relocation" means, as the context requires, a proposal to relocate a team by the owner of such team who intends to retain ownership, or either the acceptance of an offer of sale of a team by the owner or the offering to purchase a team by any person, as a result of which such team will not continue to be located in the metropolitan area in which it then plays;

(5) "offer of retention" means any offer made by a person to purchase a professional sports team and to continue to locate such team in the metropolitan area in which it then plays, or to provide terms not involving a transfer of ownership which will ensure that such team continues to be located in the metropolitan area in which it then plays;

(6) "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, or any unincorporated association, or any combination or association thereof, or any political subdivision;

(7) "professional sports team" or "team" means any group of professional athletes organized to play major league baseball, basketball, football, hockey or soccer which has been engaged in competition in such sport for more than 5 years;

(8) "stadium" means the physical facility within which a professional sports team regularly plays; and

(9) "territory" means the geographic area within which a professional sports team has agreed to operate.

AUTHORITY FOR RELOCATION

SEC. 5. (a) Any person or league seeking to change the metropolitan location or territory of any professional sports team must—

(1) prior to furnishing notice under section 6 of this Act, receive the approval of the relevant league, if such league has a rule regarding the relocation of teams which are members of that league; and

(2) receive the approval of the Board pursuant to the provisions of section 7 of this Act.

(b) The provisions of this section shall apply to any professional sports team, notwithstanding any filing by such team of a petition for relief pursuant to chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code. The judge presiding over a proceeding involving any such petition shall perform the functions of the Board specified in section 7 of this Act, except that the judge may, by order, shorten the time periods specified in such section if the judge determines that such action is necessary or desirable and if such action is consistent with the provisions of this Act and title 11, United States Code.

NOTICES

SEC. 6. (a)(1) Any person or league wishing to relocate a professional sports team to a territory or metropolitan location other than the territory or location in which it is then playing shall furnish notice of such proposed relocation at least eight months before the proposed date for such relocation.

(2) Such notice shall be furnished to the municipality where the team plays, and shall—

(A) be in writing;

(B) be delivered through certified mail or be personally delivered;

(C) contain a statement of intention to relocate, the new location, reasons for such relocation, documentation supporting a claim of financial hardship (in accordance with section 7(d) of this Act), and the date on which such relocation is scheduled to occur; and

(D) a certified copy of approval by the relevant league of such proposed relocation.

(b)(1) When any owner of a professional sports team receives a bona fide offer of purchase or a bona fide acceptance of an offer of sale of such team, and the acceptance of such offer of purchase or such acceptance could result in the relocation of such team, the owner shall, either before accepting such offer or as a condition of accepting such offer, furnish notice of offer to purchase and intent to sell the team or acceptance of such offer of sale by the owner at least eight months before the date of any sale.

(2) Such notice shall be furnished to the municipality where the team plays, and shall—

(A) be in writing;

(B) be delivered through certified mail or be personally delivered;

(C) contain a statement that, but for the terms of this Act, the owner would execute a contract of sale;

(D) contain a statement of intention to sell, any potential location for relocation of the team, any documentation available to the owner supporting a claim of financial hardship (in accordance with section 7(d) of this Act), the date on which the sale of the team is scheduled to occur, and any estimated date for relocation after the sale of the team has occurred (if the owner is aware of such date);

(E) contain all terms and conditions of such offer, including a written copy of such offer, signed by the maker of such offer; and

(F) a certified copy of approval by the relevant league of such proposed relocation.

(c)(1) Within five months after the establishment of the Board, any person wishing to make an offer of retention under this Act shall make such offer and furnish notice of such offer in accordance with the provisions of this subsection.

(2) Such notice shall be furnished to the relevant league, to the municipality where the team plays, and to the Board. Such notice shall—

(A) be in writing;

(B) be delivered through certified mail or be personally delivered; and

(C) contain a statement of intention to purchase such team and to continue thereafter to locate the team in the metropolitan area in which it then plays or to provide terms not involving a transfer of ownership which are more favorable to such team than the terms currently in effect.

ARBITRATION BOARD

SEC. 7. (a) There shall from time to time be established a Professional Sports Team Arbitration Board to carry out the activities

of this section. The Board shall be composed of three members, who shall be appointed as follows:

(1) One member shall be appointed by the relevant league.

(2) One member shall be appointed by the governmental authority of the metropolitan location in which is located the stadium in which the involved professional sports team regularly plays.

(3) One member shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce.

(b) The Board shall be appointed within 30 days after notice is delivered pursuant to section 6 of this Act, and shall terminate when the Board has approved a proposed relocation of offer of retention in accordance with the provisions of this section. The members shall select a chairman from among its members. Any member of the Board who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for grade GS-18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including traveltime) during which the member is engaged in the actual performance of the duties of the Board. No individual may serve on the Board if such individual has (or as a result or relocation or sale of such team, might have) a financial or other pecuniary interest in any professional sports team which engages in—

(1) the same sport as the professional sports team involved in the proposed relocation; or

(2) any other sport regularly played in the same territory where the team then plays or in the territory of proposed relocation.

(c) All information required by section 6 (a) and (b) of this Act shall also be furnished promptly to the Board. Any person who makes an offer to purchase a team or accepts an offer which would result in the relocation of a team, and any owner transmitting any notice under this Act, shall, upon request of the Board, provide access to all relevant financial records necessary to allow the Board to make the determination required in subsection (d) of this section.

(d)(1) During the period between the fifth and sixth months after the establishment of the Board, the Board shall conduct a formal hearing on the record to—

(A) consider whether, in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection, a claim of financial hardship is warranted;

(B) consider testimony regarding the estimated value of any such proposed relocation or offer of retention; and

(C) take evidence regarding any such proposed relocation or offer of retention.

During such period, the Board shall make a finding as to whether such claim is warranted.

(2) A claim of financial hardship is considered to be warranted under this Act if the Board determines that the involved team has incurred net operating losses, exclusive of deductions for depreciation and amortization, to an extent that poses significant danger to the continued existence of the team, or that the team has filed or soon will file a petition for reorganization pursuant to chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code.

(e) The Board shall, during the period between the sixth and seventh months after the establishment of the Board, determine whether any offer of retention is equal to or greater in value than the proposed relocation. The Board shall, to the extent provided in advance by appropriation Acts, contract with an independent actuary for all such valuations. In making any such valuation, projected revenues arising out of broadcasting in either the current or future location of the team shall not be considered, unless the Board has made a finding of financial hardship, in accordance with subsection (d) of this section. In addition, in any case where the team has been playing in a stadium which is owned by the owner of such team, neither the value to the owner of the stadium (and improvements to the stadium) nor the value to the owner of any stadium in which the team would play in any other territory shall be considered in making such valuation.

(f) If the Board determines under subsection (e) of this section that it has received an offer of retention which is equal to or greater in value than a proposed relocation, it shall not approve any proposed relocation. If the Board receives no offer of retention which is equal to or greater in value than the proposed relocation, the Board shall, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, approve the proposed relocation.

(g)(1) If more than one offer of retention has been made and the Board determines under subsection (e) of this section that each such offer is of a value equal to or greater than the value of any proposed relocation, the owner of the team may, if the owner chooses, accept the offer of the owner's choice. The Board shall have no jurisdiction with respect to any other terms of the sale of such team.

(2) Any offer of retention involving the sale of a team which is accepted by an owner must contain a commitment, enforceable through specific performance, that such team will continue to be located in the metropolitan area in which it then plays.

(h) All determinations of the Board shall be final and binding on all parties involved in such arbitration.

(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, if any person makes an offer of retention which is accepted by the owner of such team, the owner shall immediately notify the Board of such acceptance. The Board shall approve such offer if, where the offer involves a transfer of ownership, it also contains a written commitment, enforceable through specific performance, from any purchaser to continue to locate such team in the metropolitan area in which it then plays. Upon such approval, the Board shall dismiss any other pending proceedings under this section.

(j) The provisions of this section shall not apply to a proposed relocation regarding any professional sports team if, within 6 months after the establishment of the Board, the Board has not received any offer of retention.

(k) The Board shall not carry out the provisions of this section in any situation in which a judge is performing the functions of the Board, as specified in section 5(b) of this Act.

CIVIL ACTIONS

SEC. 8. Any governmental entity in a metropolitan area from which a professional sports team relocates or any person adversely affected by any such relocation may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court for damages and relief, including injunctive relief, on the grounds that such relocation did not comply with the provisions of this Act, including the grounds that any owner or other party did not comply with the arbitration procedures or any decision issued pursuant to section 7 of this Act.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce, for purposes of section 7 of this Act, such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1985. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

APPLICABILITY

SEC. 10. This Act shall apply to any proposed relocation of any professional sports team located in the United States which occurs or is intended to occur after January 1, 1984, or relocation of any professional sports team located in the United States with respect to which an eminent domain proceeding was pending on such date.

SEVERABILITY

SEC. 11. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those with respect to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected by such invalidation.●

A TRIBUTE TO DR. BENJAMIN MAYS, A GREAT TEACHER

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, on March 28, 1984, this Nation lost a great teacher, Dr. Benjamin Mays.

Born the son of former slaves in Epworth, SC, he was educated at Bates College and the University of Chicago. He taught at Howard University, South Carolina State, and Morehouse College, where he served as president for 27 years. He became known as the schoolmaster of the civil rights movement. And was recognized by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., as his spiritual mentor. He served as president of the Atlanta Board of Education for 12 years.

Benjamin Elijah Mays throughout his distinguished career of more than half a century as an educator, theologian, author, and civil rights leader has inspired people of all races throughout the world by his persistent commitment to excellence. Though I only knew him in his later years, he managed to inspire me, as well. But it was those students which provided Dr. Mays with his inspiration.

One student, Michael R. Hollis, now an attorney and founder and chairman of Air Atlanta, shared his special part of the Benjamin Mays story with the readers of the Atlanta Constitution on April 10. I would like to share it with you today. Mr. President, I ask that Mr. Hollis' article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Apr. 10, 1984]

THE DAY A STUDENT AND HIS TEACHER GRADUATED

(By Michael R. Hollis)

My hero, Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, has passed away. As I looked across the sea of sad faces at the Martin Luther King Jr. Chapel at Morehouse College during his memorial services, I realized how much this

great man improved the lives of those around him.

I first met Dr. Mays when I was 15 and a student at Booker T. Washington High School in Atlanta. What I remembered the most during that first meeting was not so much what Dr. Mays said, but how intently he listened. He respected my views and my right to express them despite my youth. I learned early from Dr. Mays that everyone has some insight and wisdom because each of us has a unique pool of experiences from which to synthesize ideas.

By listening to others and keeping an open mind, it is possible to snatch creative thoughts from the unlikeliest of sources.

When it was time for me to go to college, it was Dr. Mays who perhaps best understood my desire to go to Dartmouth. He encouraged me, and stated that I would have to compete academically, and otherwise, at the top. He insisted that I finish with honors.

He came to the Dartmouth campus for the first time, at the age of 77, during my freshman year. He spoke briefly of an earlier yearning to attend what he called "Daniel Webster's college." He began his remarks by saying, "If it takes me as long to make it back, then I shan't return." I was moved, and determined that he would come back one day.

While a sophomore at Dartmouth, Dr. Mays encouraged me to seek the coveted position of student assistant to John G. Kemeny, the president of Dartmough, a position to which I was appointed. I remember Dr. Mays telling me that I had a rare opportunity to be close to and "pick the brain" of Dr. Kemeny, who had been a protege of Albert Einstein. To Dr. Mays, this one-on-one interaction between elder and youth was education in its purest form.

In his book, Born to Rebel, Dr. Mays tells how as a high-school senior he had wanted to go to Dartmouth College but was unable to do so. Hearing his earlier comments during my freshman year, reading his autobiography, having grown up in Atlanta and seeing the results of his years of great work, I took it upon myself to make certain that Dr. Mays would become a member of the Dartmouth family.

Nothing has given me greater honor and sense of pride than to have nominated Dr. Mays for an honorary doctorate degree from Dartmouth, and to witness his degree being conferred at the same commencement where I received my own degree—with honors.

I shall never forget the two days that Dr. Mays and I spent at Daniel Webster's college. In his own way, then and later, he bragged about us being "classmates," and took great pride in being a member of the Class of 1975. It was a great day for both of us, a rare and precious moment.

Dr. Mays set intellectual patterns for his many students, including me. When it was time for me to apply to law school, I did not even have to consult my mentor. I knew his advice would be "don't take the easy way out"—so I applied, was accepted and was graduated from the University of Virginia School of Law.

When I had an idea in 1979 of starting a regional jet airline in Atlanta, I shared my thoughts with Dr. Mays. Just as he had listened to me as a young man years earlier, he listened again. I set out my grand design for him. He smiled and said, "Well, I've always said to reach for the moon, and beyond. I have no doubt your plans will succeed if you persevere, despite the opposition of those who will tell you it cannot be done."

Dr. Mays always said that each man and woman is put on this Earth to do one thing unique or special, and if that person fails to do it—it will not be done. Only during the past two years, have I come to understand fully the significance of what Dr. Mays was saying.

For these reflections are penned as I sit in an airborne Air Atlanta Boeing 727 jet. As I look out on a glorious spring and blue horizon, it occurs to me that my hero, Dr. Benjamin E. Mays is not really gone. The man with the wise eyes and soft smile is watching us from the other side of yonder clouds.●

RESPONSE TO JACK ANDERSON

● Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I submit herewith a copy of Jack Anderson's column from the Washington Post dated March 1984 and my response:

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I am writing in response to your recent article in which you allege that personal gain is my motivation for pushing legislation for the marketing of Alaska natural gas and the export of Alaska crude oil.

Although your allegations may make interesting newspaper copy, they are simply not correct.

First, there is no legislation pending in Congress regarding the marketing of Alaska natural gas in the Pacific Rim; nor have I proposed any. Therefore, it is impossible for me to push any bill on this issue.

Second, you say that the major oil companies stand to gain millions of dollars if a pipeline were built to make North Slope gas available to Pacific Rim nations. If these companies stand to make so much money on the export of Alaska natural gas, then why aren't they supporting the project? At an oversight hearing on the marketing of Alaska natural gas which I held last November at the request of my constituents, Exxon and Sohio representatives failed to voice their support for a project to transport the gas from the North Slope, liquefy and export it.

Finally, I think it is important that you recognize the State of Alaska's position on the export of its natural resources. The Alaska Legislature has passed five pieces of legislation expressing their support for marketing Alaska natural gas. One resolution expressing the State's support for any effort to get the gas to market was passed by the Legislature and was signed by the Governor in March, 1983. As one of the State's representatives in the U.S. Congress, it is my duty to follow the policy dictates of the State of Alaska.

This also applies to my support for the export of Alaska crude oil. Several weeks ago, Alaska Governor Bill Sheffield introduced a resolution passed by the Natural Governors' Association which puts the organization on record against the Alaska oil export ban in its current form. In addition, a resolution which calls for the removal of the ban on the export of Alaska oil has been introduced in the Alaska Legislature.

Outside of Alaska, newspapers including the New York Times, the Los Angeles Times, the Boston Globe and others have published editorials saying that the export of Alaska oil is in the nation's best interest.

Finally, I would like to point out that my personal investment interests in related energy production or exploration concerns were acquired prior to my election to the Senate. They have been fully disclosed each year since that time.

Sincerely,

FRANK H. MURKOWSKI,
U.S. Senator.

SENATORS GET SOME PRAISE AND CRITICISM

(By Jack Anderson)

Today I'd like to present awards to two members of the Senate: kudos for one, a kick for the other.

The kudos goes to Sen. John Melcher (D-Mont.) for his humanitarian efforts to get American rice shipped to thousands of desperately needy families in the Philippines.

The kick goes to Sen. Frank H. Murkowski (R-Alaska) for his efforts to push legislation that would benefit his own oil and gas leases.

Here are the citations that go with the awards:

Melcher: The 59-year-old senator from the Big Sky country spent this past Christmas holiday in the Philippines, and what he saw there has haunted him ever since. He visited the slums of Manila and saw hordes of hungry children whose parents have been unable to find work in the shattered Philippine economy.

Cardinal Jaime Sin, head of the Roman Catholic Church in the Philippines, appealed to Melcher for help in getting an emergency shipment of food for his starving flock. Melcher, who has two grandchildren of his own, was eager to be of service.

So the prelate wrote a letter to President Reagan, asking for 30,000 tons of rice from America's bulging granaries. The rice would fill the shrunken bellies of 100,000 Filipino families, the cardinal wrote. Melcher promised to deliver the letter to the president personally.

But Melcher, a World War II combat infantryman, found the White House's bureaucratic defenses tougher to penetrate than the Siegfried line. In the weeks since he has been back, he has been unable to get an appointment with the president to hand-deliver Cardinal Sin's letter, as he promised he would. The best a White House aide offered was to "send a messenger" to pick up the letter. Melcher refused.

On Jan. 17, the senator pleaded his case with Robert C. McFarlane, the president's national security affairs adviser. He asked that the administration approve Cardinal Sin's appeal for food. Melcher told my associate Lucette Lagnado that McFarlane promised he'd take care of the matter.

So far, he hasn't. Neither has the State Department, the Agency for International Development or the U.S. Embassy in Manila. When U.S. Ambassador Michael Armacost returned to Washington early last month, Melcher collared him and told him of the trouble he'd had trying to deliver the cardinal's letter. Armacost suggested he might have more luck if he enlisted a Republican ally.

Melcher took the suggestion. He wrote a letter to the president, outlining the hunger problem in the Philippines and Cardinal Sin's hopes of alleviating it with American rice. Then he got Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), chairman of the Agriculture Committee, to cosign the letter.

With Helm's clout, Melcher may yet deliver the cardinal's appeal, and the slum kids of Manila won't have to go to bed hungry.

Murkowski: One of Big Oil's best friends on the Energy Committee, he has been en-

thusiastic lately in his support of a new trans-Alaska pipeline that would make North Slope natural gas available for sale to Japan, Taiwan and South Korea. He also proposed an amendment to the Export Administration Act that would legalize sale of Alaskan crude to foreign countries.

The new pipeline, which needs congressional approval before it can be used to ship gas, could make millions for Exxon, ARCO, Sohio and other big oil companies that own most of the gas leases in the region.

It could also be a bonanza for a cooperative venture of which Murkowski owns about 2 percent; its leases are in the Prudhoe Bay area that would be served by the proposed pipeline.●

GEN. MARK W. CLARK

● Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, through a half-century of war and peace, Gen. Mark W. Clark served our Nation with distinction and dedication. We mourn his passing.

General Clark began his military career as a cadet at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He served, and was wounded, during World War I. During World War II, he was the youngest Allied army group commander, charged with the important but difficult Italian campaign. During the Korean conflict, General Clark again was called upon to lead American troops into battle.

Even after his retirement from the armed services in 1953, he continued his life of service as president of the Citadel in South Carolina from 1954 to 1965.

During his distinguished career, his courage, intelligence, and charm won him much-deserved acclaim here and abroad. General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower called him the best organizer, planner, and trainer of troops that I have met. Winston Churchill called him an American eagle. He received the Army's Distinguished Service Cross for his utter disregard for personal safety as he led an infantry assault against German tanks during the Italian campaign.

General Clark's passing ends an era, for he was the last of our great World War II generals left among us. We must insure that the example he set for service to his Nation endures for this generation and generations to come.

We are grateful for his many contributions to the free world, and we will miss him mightily.●

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 A.M.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE RECOGNITION OF CERTAIN SENATORS ON TOMORROW AND DESIGNATING A PERIOD FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, four Senators be recognized under special orders for not to exceed 15 minutes each, in this order: Senators EVANS, PROXMIRE, EAGLETON, and BENTSEN; and that following the execution of the special orders there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business to extend not later than 11:30 a.m. in which Senators may speak for not more than 2 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, on tomorrow the Senate will convene at 10 a.m.

After recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, four Senators will be recognized on special orders of not to exceed 15 minutes, to be followed by a period for the transaction of routine morning business until 11:30 a.m., at which time the Senate will resume consideration of the unfinished business, which is H.R. 2163, the Federal Boat Safety Act as amended. At that time, the pending question will be amendment No. 3027.

Votes are expected throughout the day.

Mr. President, may I also say that it appears that the Senate will likely be in session on Friday of this week, and I urge Senators to schedule their appointments accordingly.

The reason for that is, after both cloakrooms have solicited amendments to the pending amendment and to the underlying bill, so far we have developed the meager total of 46. I have not yet had the courage to add up the total time which was requested but it amounts to several days.

I hope that is not a permanent situation, that some Senators will reconsider their requests and reconsider the necessity for offering such a generous allocation of amendments.

But in any event, if that situation still persists tomorrow, if we are still faced with that workload, I think it would be unconscionable to ask the Senate to be out on Friday.

So I urge Senators to consider that, if by noon tomorrow we still are faced with the same dilemma, they should expect to be in on Friday of this week.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, if no other Senator is seeking recognition, and I see none, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate now stand in recess until the hour of 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, at 6:23 p.m., recessed until Thursday, April 26, 1984, at 10 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, April 25, 1984*

The House met, at 3 p.m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT):

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 24, 1984.

I hereby designate the Honorable THOMAS S. FOLEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on Wednesday, April 25, 1984.

JIM WRIGHT,
Speaker pro tempore,
House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Richard E. Downing, St. James Episcopal Church, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, we praise Thee for all that Thou hast done for the United States of America. Give us Thy grace to deepen the root of our life as a nation in Thy everlasting righteousness, lest Thy blessings be withdrawn. Make us equal to the trust Thou hast placed upon us, reverent in the use of freedom, just in the exercise of power, and generous in the protection of weakness. Inspire the men and women who direct this Nation that they may guide it wisely; give insight, faithfulness, and strength to our legislators; and may our deepest trust always be in Thee, the Lord of Nations and the King of Kings; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

ANSEL ADAMS—THE EARTH HAS LOST A GREAT FRIEND

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, as news reports have confirmed over the last 2 days, this Nation, and my district in particular, have lost one of the world's truly great giants in nature photography by the passing of Ansel Adams.

He died late Sunday at age 82 in the Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula, near the Point Lobos and Big Sur coastlines where he lived, worked, photographed, and battled for his beloved environment.

Photography to Ansel was not a business—it was a consummate joy. He deeply cared about what he photographed because he knew that photographs alone could never fully preserve the beauty and magnificence of nature.

For him, the greatest gift God had granted him was Earth itself, and surely he was Earth's greatest friend. He once wrote of nature: "It is all very beautiful and magical here . . . a quality which cannot be described."

His photographs, more than any words, came the closest to capturing that beauty and magic.

While we will miss his personal friendship and vitality, there is great comfort in knowing that his work will go on to inspire future generations with his love of nature and his great dedication to its preservation.

For those interested in commenting on his contributions, I will have a special order on this coming Tuesday.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 509 AND OF H.R. 1029

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 509 and of H.R. 1029.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 5395

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services have until midnight tomorrow, Thursday, April 26, 1984, to file a report on H.R. 5395, the Department of Energy National Security and Military Applications of Nuclear Energy Authorization Act of 1985. The minority concurs in this request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, my State of West Virginia has not fared well in various ratings over the past few years.

What West Virginians have always known has just been made public. A recent study conducted by Prof. Robert Pierce of the State University of New York, places two West Virginia cities (including my hometown of Charleston, WV) among the Nation's top 10 best cities in which to live. According to his research, Charleston ranks in the top 15 percent among the safest U.S. cities. It has one of the lowest violent crime rates. Charleston ranks in the top quarter of American cities with a comfortable climate, quality of housing at a reasonable cost and availability of public transportation. The State is also one of the country's leading energy producers.

We West Virginians have long treasured our attractive quality of life. As a matter of fact, just yesterday a Charleston newspaper stated that West Virginia has the highest percentage of homeownership in the entire country. As the newspaper pointed out, it says something about the "stability of our work force" and our "commitment to family, home, and basic American values."

Now that the secret is out, Mr. Speaker, we will roll the red carpet out. Pay us a visit in West Virginia. You will see why we are proud!

INDEFENSIBLE CUTS IN VETERANS' HEALTH CARE PROGRAMS

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my opposition to a report issued by the Congressional Budget Office which proposes draconian and indefensible cuts in health care programs affecting millions of veterans in this Nation.

According to today's Jack Anderson column, the CBO will propose cuts totaling more than $3.3 billion a year from the VA operating budget beginning in fiscal year 1985. These savage cuts would be accomplished through imposing means tests on veterans including those over 65 who seek care. It

would also impose a new copayment process including a $356 deductible for any hospital stay up to 60 days in length.

As the article states:

The most severe impact of the proposed cutoffs would be on older veterans who have no service connected condition but who need long term care. A significant number of these World War I and World War II veterans would no longer be eligible for VA medical care.

Hopefully we can avert this proposal from even being introduced as legislation. It represents a mentality which has no place in our policy toward those Americans who fought to keep our Nation free in time of war. For us to turn our backs on those veterans in their hour of need would be the very height of cruelty. Veterans in this Nation deserve and have warranted our respect—and deserve to have the medical care they need. They do not need the cold back of the hand from their Government.

"WHERE'S THE BEEF"? LET'S LOOK AT THE NATIONAL DEBT

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, our national debt now stands at $1.488 trillion. Who can comprehend that amount of money? I have done a little arithmetic to make it easier to understand:

You want to know "Where's the beef"?—The national debt would buy 4,907 Wendy's hamburgers for every American—that is over 235 million of us. You want to invite the rest of the world to lunch? How about 244 hamburgers for every person in the world.

For Americans, the per capita debt equals $6,330.30.

If we paid $1,000 on the debt every second, it would take 47 years to pay it off.

In $1 bills stacked up, it would reach halfway to the Moon.

Laid end-to-end, it could go 51.3 million miles past the Sun, or circle the Earth at the Equator 5,790 times.

In $1 bills, it weighs more than 1½ million tons—more than the total combined weight of 15 carriers, 2 battleships, 4 dock landing ships, 9 amphibious assault ships, 4 fleet oilers, 2 cruisers, and 12 destroyers.

I am introducing legislation today to help reduce the national debt. I hope my colleagues will read more about my bill in the Extensions of Remarks section of today's RECORD and join me in this effort.

WHAT GENDER GAP?

(Mr. CARNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a lot about a gender gap lately. The media would have us believe this is a Republican problem. Why? Republicans are not responsible for the income gap between men and women. Moreover, suggestions that we want to limit opportunities for women are unfounded and unfair. It should be noted that the only woman sitting on the Supreme Court was appointed by a Republican President, the only two females in the other body are Republicans. And, as a member of the House Science and Technology Committee, I am proud to point to our professional staff as further evidence that Republicans did not create the gender gap.

Most people would agree that it is not always easy to find qualified women for science and engineering positions, simply because fewer women choose technical careers. Because of this, and especially because of the fact that the minority party has far fewer hiring opportunities than does the majority party, I believe we have done very well indeed.

Four out of the seven subcommittees' ranking Republicans have selected women to be the technical consultants for their subcommittees. I might add that as members of the minority party, the Republicans do not have the luxury of having a consultant for each individual discipline; our consultants are expected to cover all issues that come before the subcommittee. This can cover a very broad range of disciplines, especially for a subcommittee such as Science, Research and Technology. The issues that come before this subcommittee can range from medicine, to geology, to patent legislation, and could easily challenge several people to provide the needed expertise. On my own subcommittee, Transportation, Aviation and Materials, we deal not only with legislation pertaining to all modes of transportation, but also materials and communications issues as well.

I am sure I speak for my colleagues on Science and Technology when I say that all four of the women that we have selected as our technical consultants are a credit to their professions and proof that qualified women scientists and engineers are out there. And, Mr. Speaker, I want the record to show that it was the Republicans who found them.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE PROTECTION

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that the American people believe that particularly brutal killers deserve to be punished by death. Since the Supreme Court first found capital punishment statutes procedurally deficient, dozens of States have reconsidered and revised their laws to restore the death penalty to their arsenal of weapons for the protection of the public. The Supreme Court has made it plain that capital punishment does not violate the Constitution when there are sufficient procedural protections to guarantee a fair trial. The Court has told us what those procedures are, and they have been enacted into law in State after State.

The American people deserve the same protection from Federal criminals which they have insisted upon in their own States. President Reagan, in his comprehensive crime control proposal, has urged Congress to enact these procedural reforms so that the death penalty provisions already existing in Federal law may constitutionally be enforced.

This is a fairly simple proposition, Mr. Speaker. We know what the American people want. We know what the Constitution requires. All we have to do is to decide whether we have the will to protect the American people with capital punishment procedures consistent with the Constitution. In the past, the leadership of this House has never trusted the membership to make that decision. This year, Mr. Speaker, let the people's voice be heard. Let us vote.

HOUSE LEADERSHIP SHOULD WITHDRAW OPPOSITION TO CRIME BILL

(Mr. HANSEN of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANSEN of Utah. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, two men entered the Hi Fi shop in Ogden, UT. They pulled a gun on the employees, took them down to the basement, and bound them. Parents of the employees became concerned when their children did not come home after closing time. They went to the Hi Fi shop where they were taken prisoners and bound in the basement.

First, the men poured Drano down the five victims' throats. Next they poked a ballpoint pen in one man's ear and kicked it into his skull. They raped a teenage girl. In execution style, they then shot each of the five victims in the head, forcing a son to see his mother killed, and forcing a father to see his son killed. Miraculously, two of the five victims lived.

Since 1974, these Hi Fi murderers have appealed their case on a number of occasions to higher courts, and all of the courts have upheld the conviction of first-degree murder. Unfortunately, they still have an avenue to delay the carrying out of justice—namely, the writ of habeas corpus at

the Federal level. They can now file an almost unlimited number of writs of habeas corpus. In fact, one convict in Missouri has filed over 100 writs to date. Each writ is reviewed first by the Federal district court, then by the Federal appeals court, and finally by the U.S. Supreme Court. These Hi Fi convicts could conceivably file for writs of habeas corpus until they die of old age.

After one writ has been denied, killers find new grounds to file another writ of habeas corpus to challenge a certain aspect of the case. A recent study of habeas corpus found that about 40 percent of habeas corpus petitions were filed more than 5 years after conviction, and nearly a third were filed more than 10 years after conviction. In some cases, writs of habeas corpus were being filed 50 years after conviction.

The abuse of habeas corpus must cease. It is an abuse of justice and a terrible burden on the judicial system. I, therefore, urge the House leadership to stop delaying and to withdraw their opposition to the crime bill, part of which would establish a 1-year limit on habeas corpus applications.

WE MUST HAVE ACTION ON THE CRIME PACKAGE

(Mr. MACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, when people think of southwest Florida, they think of beautiful beaches, a pleasant climate, a relaxed lifestyle, and quiet retirement communities.

They do not think of southwest Florida as a place where people are afraid to leave their homes at night.

It surprised and disturbed me when I learned from survey results that one out of four southwest Floridians is afraid to walk our streets at night, and last year 56 people were murdered in my district, 212 were raped, and over 1,200 were assaulted.

It is distressing then to have to tell my constituents that the leadership of this House can find no room on its agenda for action on criminal justice reform.

Our State and local officials have led the fight, but they cannot do it alone.

We must have action here in the House on the crime package that is now gathering dust in the Judiciary Committee.

The agenda of the American people calls for tougher sentencing, less lenient bail, the streamlining of the appeals process, and the closing of loopholes that allow criminals to go free.

I urge the House leadership to listen to the American people and to act responsibly and expeditiously on criminal justice reform.

CRIME LEGISLATION BEING HELD HOSTAGE BY HOUSE LEADERSHIP

(Mr. GREGG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, on April 13 the life of Christopher Wilder came to an abrupt end in Colebrook, NH. This was a man who was accused of killing a number of women across this country.

He died in a struggle with two courageous State police detectives, Wayne Fortier and Leo "Chuck" Jellison who grew curious about his activities while in Colebrook.

One of the State police officers was shot; Detective Jellison. He will recover.

Fortunately for us these State police officers were there to participate in stopping Mr. Wilder. But unfortunately for us, today we see that the House leadership is blocking a bill which would have allowed us to subject Mr. Wilder to prosecution. For had Mr. Wilder survived, he probably would have used the insanity defense used by Mr. Hinckley in order to avoid prosecution under Federal law.

I, therefore, call on the House leadership to release as its hostage the legislation involving crime reform and to allow us on the House floor to vote for this package which is so essential if we are to accomplish criminal reform at the Federal level.

COMPREHENSIVE CRIME CONTROL ACT SHOULD BE BROUGHT BEFORE THE HOUSE

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, each year 3 out of 10 households in this country are touched by crime. Every minute of every day, about the time it takes for a Member to give a speech in the House of Representatives, Americans are victims of a robbery and eight burglaries. A murder occurs every 23 minutes, a rape every 6 minutes. Our response to these statistics is a national tragedy. We have ignored the victims. We have allowed our courts and the entire justice system to ignore the right of society as a whole to live in security.

We have heard the horror stories repeated time and again on this House floor and we have been reminded that an answer to this growing problem now is in the hands of our House leadership. Reform is needed and it is needed now.

Our response should be bipartisan. Mr. Speaker, the other body has acted in a bipartisan manner with a vote of 91 to 1 in passing an omnibus crime reform package. That Comprehensive Crime Control Act now languishes here in the House. I urge that this legislation be given a top priority—this session; 8 of every 10 Americans think our courts are ineffective and irresponsible. Urban and rural residents alike name crime as a top problem facing this country.

Let us be responsive—let us take action. I urge that the Comprehensive Crime Control Act be brought to the full House as quickly as possible.

LET US MOVE SWIFTLY TO ESTABLISH PROCEDURES FOR IMPOSITION OF DEATH PENALTY

(Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, various provisions of the U.S. Criminal Code now authorize the imposition of the death penalty for crimes of homicide, treason, and espionage. However, these sentences are generally unenforceable because they fail to incorporate a set of legislated guidelines. Today only the relevant provisions of the aircraft piracy law appear to comply with the death penalty decisions of the Supreme Court.

In 1981, murders were occurring every 23 minutes. According to the Department of Justice, in 1981, 25 million Americans were victims of crimes and 23,000 Americans were killed by criminals.

The stabbing deaths of two guards and an inmate at the Federal penitentiary in Marion, IL, in October 1983 is only one example of a need for capital punishment. Both guards were killed by inmates already serving multiple life sentences for murder. Prisoners serving life sentences can sit back and scoff at a criminal justice system which is powerless to deal with their actions. Prisoners serving life sentences are in effect immune.

Conservatives conclude that the safety of society and retribution for crime should be the predominant concern. The practice of leniency in our judicial system has not curtailed crime in America, but made it easier for a person to commit a crime knowing that his or her chances for just punishment are slim. Now it is time for us to act against the staggering increase of violent crimes. Let us move swiftly, in a bipartisan effort to establish procedures for the imposition of the death penalty.

CONGRESSIONAL PAY RAISE

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we in this House have been working so hard over the last several weeks that some

of our colleagues believe we deserved a pay increase. And, in fact, voted for one just the other day.

That is right, one of the few accomplishments for this session of Congress so far is another congressional pay increase.

The reconciliation bill that we passed just the other day, before leaving on our Easter recess, included another pay raise retroactive to January 1 at that. Anyone who voted for that bill voted to raise his or her own pay.

The American people are justifiably sick and tired of a Congress that does little, period, does practically nothing to deal with the real crises of our times and yet manages to enrich itself.

I would say to the American people, check how your Representative voted on that bill. Did he or she vote for another secret pay hike? If so, is he or she trustworthy enough to continue to represent you in this Congress.

How long are we going to permit sneaky pay increases? How long are the people going to sit still for Congressmen who talk about deficits and vote to line their own pockets?

The budget process in this House has become a way to sneak through more congressional pay. It happened last year, it happened again this year, and we are on the track to have it happen again next year.

□ 1520

We may not be doing much in this House, we may not be working very hard, but some of us voted to have us paid more, nevertheless.

THE NEED FOR COMPREHENSIVE REFORM OF OUR CRIMINAL LAWS

(Mr. LOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Democratic leadership of this body to recognize that the American people depend on their elected officials for laws that will address the problem of crime. While much of the jurisdiction in criminal justice matters belongs to the States, it is a great tragedy that those who control this Chamber have declined to offer any leadership for the Nation whatsoever, on the need for comprehensive reform of our criminal laws.

While the other body has taken action to reform our bail laws, sentencing, capital punishment procedures, exclusionary rule, forfeiture rules, habeas corpus law, and many other areas, such action was greeted by the leadership of this body with such comments as "dead on arrival," and remarks that many of these changes are "too controversial."

While it may be true that omnibus reform of our criminal laws is a difficult process requiring action by a number of subcommittees as charged by some of the critics of the President's Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1983, such naysaying has a way of actualizing itself. The fact of the matter is that the only reason that we do not have a comprehensive crime reform bill on the floor of this Chamber is that those in the Democratic Party who control the committee structure of this House have consciously made the decision not to act on it. This is evidenced by the fact that the bill was not even referred to the relevant subcommittees with jurisdiction for nearly 1 year. By contrast, the fact that the other body promptly went to work on omnibus criminal justice reform and passed legislation reflects a different set of priorities.

The admonition of Scripture is appropriate in that we are told that "ye shall know them by their fruits." Needless to say, when it comes to crime legislation in the House, the "pickings have been pretty slim."

VOLUNTARY SCHOOL PRAYER, BALANCED BUDGET AND LINE-ITEM VETO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

(Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would hope to offer a unanimous-consent request calling for the consideration of the amendments to permit voluntary school prayer, a balanced budget amendment, and the line-item veto.

The Chair has ruled that to make these requests in order I have to have the approval of both the majority and the minority leaderships. I have received that clearance from the minority leadership, and I would now yield to any spokesman representing the Democratic majority leadership for similar consent.

As Joan Rivers would say, help me, help me.

Hearing no response, Mr. Speaker, that should make it clear to the American people who stands in the way of these three important issues—the Democratic leadership of this body.

And I think they have subscribed to that immortal counsel that you can fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time, and that is enough.

COMPREHENSIVE CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1983

(Mr. BLILEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join with my colleagues to commend the Reagan administration for its efforts to address the violence that inflicts the cities, towns, and neighborhoods of America through the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1983.

This 44-point crime package is a major step toward stemming the tide of criminal activity which currently threatens the citizens of our Nation. Some of its most important features include: A reform of our bail laws in order to make it more difficult for a defendant that is likely to be a threat to the community to be released on bail; a provision that would establish determinate sentencing without possibility of parole; the establishment of a "good faith" exception to the exclusionary rule; and a criminal forfeiture provision that would strike at the economic base of criminal enterprises and deny those engaged in racketeering and drug trafficking the fruits of their ill gotten gain.

These and other important provisions of the bill warrant the prompt action of Congress. In this regard, I am heartened by the fact that the other body has enacted legislation embodying the concepts in the President's bill. It is my feeling that it is imperative that this House should likewise not delay any further the consideration of this much needed reform of our criminal laws.

PRESIDENT VETOED BILL ON CRIME CONTROL

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon during these 1-minute speeches we have heard a considerable amount from the minority about the necessity of the Congress passing a Crime Control Act. Not long ago in a nationally televised press conference the President of the United States made the same plea.

I agree that Congress needs to address this issue, but both the President of the United States and our friends on the minority side have forgotten one very critical fact. Last year this Congress passed the Omnibus Crime Control Act. The President of the United States vetoed the act. He did not like it. That act had in it the very things, the very elements, that the President in his nationally televised press conference said the Congress should pass. It had in it the very elements that the minority this afternoon said the Congress should pass. The Congress did pass it. Ronald Reagan vetoed it.

VICTIMS' ASSISTANCE

(Mr. DAUB asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, last week was Victims Assistance Week. I had the privilege of having a very distinguished and dedicated Nebraskan in my office, Shirley Kuhle of the Nebraska Crime Commission. She told me of her progress in making Nebraska one of the leading States in terms of assisting battered women. Now she has focused on even more far-reaching goals which include setting up victims assistance programs that work in conjunction with local police departments.

Imagine the difficulty I had explaining to her why this body does not find these same issues to be important ones. I had to explain that the Senate passed a comprehensive crime reform package almost immediately but the House took 51 weeks to even refer the bill to the relevant subcommittees. The House leadership has taken a "we could care less" attitude toward criminal reform and its time for some of us to speak up and protest.

This is, and always has been a nation of laws. But first of all it is a nation of individuals for whom those laws were made. Seeing as this House is the people's body, some of us want to let the American people know that we are listening. We do see criminal statistics and know that crime is a real threat to each of us and that legislation can address this important matter. Let us debate and consider this legislation.

THE INSANITY DEFENSE

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, all Americans were startled when President Reagan's assailant was acquitted by reason of insanity. I will not try to second guess the jury in that case, but that decision caused many Americans to take a second look at the insanity defense. One of those Americans was the victim of that crime, Ronald Reagan, and he has submitted the results of his reflections to us as part of the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1983.

Since the last century a defendant who is truly mentally ill has been able to win acquittal by demonstrating that he did not know what he was doing or that he did not know it was wrong. In recent years, however, many courts have also permitted acquittals where a defendant lacked substantial capacity to conform his conduct to the requirements of the law. Trials have become a contest of expert witnesses, with victory going to the side with the most persuasive psychiatrist. Many a defendant has gone free, even though he knew his acts were wrong, because his doctor said, "He could not help himself." Even worse, some courts require the prosecution to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant could control his conduct.

The President's proposal simply restores the traditional rule. No longer will a defendant be able to claim that he could not keep from doing what he knew to be wrong. Moreover, the defendant will have the burden of proving his insanity by clear and convincing evidence.

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, it makes sense to turn back the clock. The President is seeking to protect our citizens by restoring a rule that has worked well in the past. I urge the House to support him in his effort.

□ 1530

COMPREHENSIVE CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

(Mr. RUDD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend this remarks.)

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, comprehensive criminal justice reform deserves serious consideration in the House of Representatives.

Like so many other pieces of important legislation that the American people have called on us to consider, however, such as the balanced budget/tax limitation constitutional amendment, the school prayer amendment, and the line-item veto amendment, I fear that Criminal Code reform has also fallen by the wayside in this democratically controlled House.

It is an outrage that it took the leadership 51 weeks after the introduction of the comprehensive Criminal Code reform package to even refer it to the appropriate subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee.

The other body has already acted in a bipartisan manner to approve an omnibus Criminal Code reform package on a vote of 91 to 1. Since the Democrat majority controls the House schedule, it should be crystal clear to the American people who is standing in the way of restoring the balance in our criminal justice system in favor of law-abiding citizens.

THE CRIME PACKAGE SHOULD COME TO THE FLOOR

(Mr. WEBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, some members of the majority party have criticized our position on crime by recalling the President's veto of H.R. 3963 in the last Congress. This was a crime measure which was rushed through in the closing moments of the last Congress. I would agree with them that there were several good provisions on that bill. I would also argue that there were several questionable provisions in that bill which would have in fact complicated the process of fighting crime. The President concluded that the bad features outweighed the good, and while any one might have made a different judgment, I can understand how the President reached his.

Nevertheless, the half-hearted measure passed by the last Congress is no excuse to the failure of this Congress to act. The other body has passed bail reform and sentencing reform; the majority leadership in this House has not given us the chance to vote on either. The leadership has not given us a chance to vote on the reform of the insanity defense or the restoration of the death penalty. Neither have we had an opportunity to restrict the absurd practice by which important probative evidence is excluded from consideration by the jury because of technical infringements of obscure judicial rules by police.

The record of the coming months will show whether or not the 98th Congress is serious about crime control. President Reagan and his supporters in this House have put together a comprehensive and effective package to give the American people the protection they need. We call upon the leadership of this House to move that package to the floor for a vote.

WORRY, WORRY; WAIT AND WAIT

(Mr. LUNGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, one gentleman today, one gentleman yesterday and the Speaker, on March 27, tried to deflect criticism on the question of the crime control package by suggesting that the President essentially vetoed this same bill a year and a half ago. That is absolute nonsense; it is garbage; it has nothing to do with the facts. The President vetoed a 6-point package that had only four elements that even looked like elements in his 42-point package. They are not even talking about the other 38.

The bill that the President vetoed had nothing to do with sentencing reform; had nothing to do with bail reform; had nothing to do with changing the exclusionary rule; had nothing to do with the insanity defense; had nothing to do with changing habeas corpus; had nothing to do with reestablishing capital punishment, and a whole host of other things.

All right, you have criticized the President for his veto, but what is the excuse for these 2 years to sit here day-in and day-out and refuse to bring it up? The insanity defense has not

been brought up to this floor. Most Members do not know that the child pornography bill has not yet passed in final form. We passed out a version of this last year; it is my information the compromise version is sitting at the Speaker's desk where it has been sitting for 4 weeks.

If you happen to be a head of a major labor union, you can get this House to change a Supreme Court decision within 28 days; if you happen to be concerned about child pornography, you have to worry, and worry, and wait, and wait.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS SPONSOR OF H.R. 5345

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a sponsor of the bill, H.R. 5345.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 2570, TO CONTINUE TRANSITION PROVISIONS OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT UNTIL MAY 26, 1984

Mr. WHEAT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 98-698) on the resolution (H. Res. 490) providing for the consideration of the Senate bill (S. 2570) to continue the transition provisions of the Bankruptcy Act until May 26, 1984, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4275, RECLAMATION HYDROELECTRIC POWERPLANTS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1983

Mr. WHEAT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 98-699) on the resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4275) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain hydroelectric powerplants at various existing water projects, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1985

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 480 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 480

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4974) to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for fiscal years 1985 and 1986, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, and each section of said substitute shall be considered as having been read. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. WHEAT) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TAYLOR), for purposes of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 480 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4974, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act for fiscal years 1985 and 1986. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be divided equally and controlled between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology and makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute which is recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology and is now printed in the bill. This amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as original text for the purposes of amendment under the 5-minute rule and each section of the substitute shall be considered as having been read.

The rule also provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4974 authorizes $1.56 billion for the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1985 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1986. Included in the bill is $60 million for advanced scientific computing and $84 million for graduate research fellowships in the fields of science and engineering.

Also included in the legislation is $258.1 million for behavioral, social and information sciences and $52.4 million for programs that come under Scientific, Technological, and International Affairs.

Finally, H.R. 4974 amends the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to permit the Foundation to initiate and support fundamental engineering research and engineering education programs and to provide greater flexibility in establishing special commissions by the National Science Board.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we adopt the rule so that we may proceed to consideration of this bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 480 is a 1-hour, open rule under which the House will consider legislation authorizing $1.56 billion in appropriations for the National Science Foundation for fiscal 1985.

The rule is a straightforward open rule, allowing any germane amendments under the 5-minute rule. The rule provides that the Science and Technology Committee substitute now printed in the bill be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section of the substitute shall be considered as having been read.

In addition, the rule provides the usual language regarding one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the bill made in order by this rule, H.R. 4974, authorizes a total of $1.56 billion for the National Science Foundation for fiscal 1985. This amount is a $244 million increase over the appropriations made for fiscal 1984, and is some $58.5 million above the President's request.

As the Members will note in the minority views that accompany the committee report, the President has acknowledged the importance of research in the mathematical and physical sciences and the other programs of the National Science Foundation by requesting healthy increases both this year and last.

The minority members of the Committee on Science and Technology oppose the authorization level in the bill as reported, and under this rule will be permitted to offer amendments to bring the bill in line with the President's request.

I urge adoption of this rule, so the House can proceed to debate the bill.

□ 1540

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 280 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4974.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4974) to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for fiscal years 1985 and 1986, with Mr. WHEAT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4974 provides authorizations of appropriations for the National Science Foundation of $1,557.5 million for fiscal year 1985 for the research and educational activities supported by the Foundation. This amount represents a $58.5 million increase above that requested by the administration. The committee concurs with the administration's proposed allocation of funds within the Foundation budget, and therefore has not adjusted the base funding level of any research program. The budget increase recommended by the committee is an addition which the committee feels is required to establish or maintain key programs in advanced scientific computing, graduate research fellowships, to stimulate competitive research, and strengthen information sciences. Even with these increases the committee action is less than NSF's request to the Office of Management and Budget.

Of the add-on, $40 million will be used to increase the initial funding for the advanced scientific computing program. This program, designed to supply academic science and engineering researchers with access to powerful computing resources, allows for advances in science and technology now stalemated by the lack of access to large-scale computing or supercomputers. This initiative will also stimulate our high technology industry. U.S. industries, under increasing competition from abroad, rely upon a strong science and technology base and a worldwide market demand for its products and services. In this respect, the National Science Foundation's efforts to stimulate innovation play a key role.

Another key component of the basic foundation of U.S. science and technology is its manpower. It is vitally important that the Nation continue a strong investment in the maintenance of high quality scientific and engineering personnel. To this end, the committee has included an additional $8 million for graduate research fellowships, bringing the total to $29 million. These moneys will allow for greater numbers of awards and an increase in the cost-of-education allowance for each fellowship. Also, the increase reflects the request the National Science Foundation made to the Office of Management and Budget in this area for the fiscal year 1985 budget.

Within the research directorates, we have, again this year, increased funding for the behavioral, social, and information sciences by $5 million to bring them nearer the 1980 funding levels. Over the last several years, funding cuts, followed by only small increases have greatly decreased the amount of worthy research that can be supported in these areas. Much of this work is essential to understanding economic trends and problems in our increasingly information-driven society.

Funding for the experimental program to stimulate competitive research (EPSCoR) has been restored to $3 million to allow for the program's continuation. Designed to more evenly distribute Federal funding for research among the States, EPSCoR has allowed many participating States to more successfully compete for Federal research funds from all agencies. Continued funding will let other States take advantage of this opportunity.

Finally, we have increased the research improvement in the minority institutions program by $2.5 million to a total of $5 million. Reflecting demographic changes, language has also been included which directs NSF to make these funds available to universities which educate a large number of minority groups, including not only blacks but also Hispanics, American Indians, and Asian Americans.

The committee's authorization bill also includes an amendment to the National Science Foundation Organic Act of 1950, which provides technical changes already reflected by the Foundation's support of fundamental engineering research. This amendment was carefully considered in subcommittee and full committee hearings, and is supported by a variety of prominent professional and academic organizations. The committee expects the amendment to emphasize and strengthen support for both basic scientific and fundamental engineering research within the Foundation.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call particular attention to the importance of the $40 million we have added for the advanced scientific computing initiative. Supercomputers have become an essential tool in solving the complex problems vital to our defense, economic, and scientific interests. There is clear evidence that the lack of access to large-scale computing resources limits progress in many aspects of science and engineering. The Science and Technology Committee chose to authorize an additional $40 million for the coming fiscal year for this new initiative, in order to begin a viable and sustainable program. An effective large-scale computing program involves not only developing supercomputer centers, but also the support of a wide-reaching network, local university computer support, software development and researcher access to each new generation of machines. Initial funding must allow for the implementation of all the vital program components. Based on the sound advice of NSF's supercomputing advisory committees and from the input from the scientific community, private sector, and other Federal agencies, we are confident that these funds represent a necessary first and will be spent wisely. In coming years, we expect that this program will have developed into an integral part of the scientific enterprise carried on by the NSF.

In summary, our recommendations for the Foundation provide support for all areas of basic science and engineering research. Emphasis is placed on a new initiative to develop an advanced scientific computing program necessary to stimulate economic growth, advance the frontiers of science and technology, and enhance the education of our future scientists and engineers. The 17-percent increase over last year's budget represents the Science and Technology Committee's commitment to insuring the continued vitality and health of university science and engineering research and education.

For the use of all Members, I have included in my statement the summary from Committee Report No. 98-642 accompanying H.R. 4974.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the ranking minority member of the Science, Research and Technology Subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Technology, I would like to commend my fellow committee members, and especially the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN) for their expedient action in bringing the annual authorization bills to the floor. Particularly under the leadership of the gentleman from Florida, DON FUQUA, and the ranking Republican, the gentleman from Kansas, LARRY WINN, we have worked diligently to

iron out differences with these bills wherever possible.

To date, the House has acted on three such pieces of legislation: the fiscal year 1985 authorizations for NASA, NOAA, and EPA. This week, the House will consider what we are considering today, which is H.R. 4974, the fiscal year 1985 NSF authorization bill, and H.R. 5172, the fiscal year 1984 and 1985 NBS authorization bill. Finally, the DOE bill, which was reported to the House, is awaiting a rule.

As is frequently the case with the Science Committee, differences between members rest more so with appropriate levels of spending rather than opposition to programs or initiatives. Such is the case with this bill that we are considering today. The administration, despite the national deficit problems, has requested a 32-percent increase in funding for NSF since fiscal year 1982. I wish to emphasize that fact. In 1984, the request was an 18-percent increase; and in 1985, the request was a 13.6-percent increase. That is a tremendous increase for any agency in these times of fiscal stringency.

Many Members, and certainly constituents of mine, ask why such an increase has come from an administration committed to holding down Federal spending and balancing the budget. The answer is clear and, I believe, admirable. The answer is that our national strength and integrity are closely linked to a solid support for basic and applied science and engineering research and education.

The National Science Foundation is one agency with a unique capability of promoting such excellence and innovation in all fields of science and engineering through its support to colleges, universities, and individual investigators, graduate students, minority institutions, Nobel Prize winners, and notable scientific and engineering organizations and think tanks.

In fiscal year 1983, NSF's basic research obligations accounted for 16 percent of the total Federal support of basic research and nearly 25 percent of the total Federal support for such research at academic institutions.

In the past 4 years, Congress received requests for significant increases for NSF-supported research and equipment, instrumentation, and facilities received a 100-percent increase between 1982 and 1984, and an additional 20 percent is requested in 1985.

□ 1550

Major emphasis has been placed on the precollege education role of NSF to facilitate an increase in quality science instruction for the young of our Nation. Centers for cross-disciplinary research in engineering, accounting for $10 million new initiative for 1985, have been proposed to integrate teaching of engineering practices for undergraduate and graduate students through research experience and close interaction with industry.

For 1985, researchers at predominantly undergraduate institutions may receive increased support, from $36.8 million to $42.4 million, while at the same time graduate research fellowship funds have been proposed for increase. Since last year, the Foundation has reorganized its computing resources to accommodate an ever-increasing demand for research on conventional and parallel processing, software, and software needs. Increased supercomputer time has been made available to individual researchers, and the fiscal year 1985 request contains two proposals to further advance this need. A $20 million effort to increase computer time, networking demands, and local linkage is also included. Also the National Center for Atmospheric Research will receive an additional supercomputer in fiscal year 1985.

In all, Mr. Chairman, it is unfair to say that the administration has been anything less than receptive. Rather, it has been extremely generous to the needs of the science and engineering research communities.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1985 Presidential request. I do, however, oppose H.R. 5974 which we are considering today because it has increased rather significantly the funding levels requested by the President which, as I noted before, under the President's proposal, represented an approximately 33-percent increase over the last 2 years. At the appropriate time, I intend to offer an amendment to reestablish that requested 32-percent increase in funding for fiscal year 1985, and I urge the support of that amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, the gentleman who is responsible for getting this bill through all the hearings and to the committee and on to the floor. He has done a great job and has shown great dedication to this task. I am very happy to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN).

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman I thank the gentleman very much, and I certainly appreciate those kind words. I want to emphasize, too, that every member of our subcommittee and also of the full committee has contributed a great deal to bringing this authorization to the level of consensus that it has received and to the shape that it is in presently. I think that that credit goes to the Committee on Science and Technology as a whole. Certainly everyone in the science community knows of the particular interest of the chairman of the full committee in this subject, and so there is a lot of credit to go around.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to encourage support for this authorization as it is reported by the committee. I think we should pause to consider how important the National Science Foundation is and what a substantial role it plays in the investment which we must make together really as a Government, because there is no other source of support for truly basic research. We should recognize how important this function is for our Nation as a whole.

The National Science Foundation is literally the lifeblood of our Nation's academic community, including 2,300 universities and colleges. Thousands of faculty, undergraduates, and graduate students depend on the financial resources made available by the Foundation.

We should also pause to remember that the National Foundation is the only agency in our society that has responsibility—responsibility delegated to it directly by the Congress and by law for the health of American science and engineering. And in that sense, although other funds flow to science and engineering from other mission agencies, no other agency sits down and looks itself in the eye and tries to meet the broad responsibility for the health of science in each of its various forms.

As such, the National Science Foundation makes an absolutely critical contribution to the health of this country, both in defense, in the basic defense, and also particularly in the economic sense, now that we are moving so rapidly into an international economy and an international economy that is so dependent on technology and advances in science for economic growth.

This is an area where we truly cannot afford to be stingy. It represents our Nation's investment in our future.

In view of the importance of the National Science Foundation to the national interest, the Committee on Science and Technology has recommended a 4-percent increase in the authorization for fiscal year 1985 for the National Science Foundation over and above the administration's request. Most of this increase will support the initiation of a new advanced scientific computing program, an initiative in supercomputers that is truly critical to the future of our economy. That accounts for literally $40 million out of the $58 million that was added by the committee over and above the administration's recognition of the effort that we ought to make in this area. The remainder of the increase is targeted to restore and upgrade ongoing

National Science Foundation programs which have contributed effectively and enhanced our standing in science and engineering research.

The importance of the computer initiative is widely recognized. In the Washington Post of February 7, 1984, the headline reads: "Japanese Firms Build Two of the World's Fastest Computers."

Every commission—and we have had several that have been put in the field by the National Science Foundation and by the President's science adviser—every commission has recognized the critical effort that we must make in this area, and every commission has recognized that we must do substantially more than the administration requested in its authorization. The initial review, known as the Bardon Report, found that our necessary investment would be on the level of $180 million.

We have essentially a $60 million initial effort in this function for supercomputers in this fiscal year which we are authorizing, and I think every reasonable view is that that is only a reasonable start on the problem.

So I think we really have to recognize the importance and legitimacy of this effort on this level in supercomputers.

Another point should be underscored, and that is the importance of our continuing efforts to support scientific and engineering personnel. At present, the United States has a severe shortage in many areas of people power, trained people power in the areas of science and technology. A contributing factor to this shortage has been the decreased Federal support for fellowships and research assistantships which have fallen from a total of 80,000 in 1969 supported by the National Science Foundation to, as I understand it, only 40,000 today. This has come at a time when the cost of education has also outdistanced the amount of individual stipends which we were provided.

I think it is instructive to compared the National Science Foundation's level of support in this area with that experienced by other mission agencies, particularly the Department of Defense. Under funding for the Department of Defense, the fellowships and the research assistants type programs have kept pace or have done substantially better in keeping pace with increased costs compared to the National Science Foundation. For example, during the first year of support under the DOD fellowships, a researcher was supplied $13,000 in stipends and full tuition at the university that is involved, plus an award of $2,000 that goes directly to the academic department involved. In contrast, the National Science Foundation's stipend is only $9,000 a year, with the cost of education allowance, rather than full tuition, being only $4,900.

□ 1600

Therefore, the committee has attempted to add funds, some $8 million to the National Science Foundation program to increase both the number of the fellowships and the stipends in order to make up for the cost of this kind of discrepancy.

Third, we again recognize this year that we have to do something more in the area of behavioral, social, and information sciences in order to restore them to previous levels of effort. In 1980 and 1981, the behavioral and social sciences were reduced substantially greater in percentage terms than were the other areas of interest to the National Science Foundation. At the time, I think that there was general recognition that those reductions were harmful and general recognition that particularly in the area of behavioral and social sciences lies the key to the improvement of economic productivity that this country seeks to enhance.

I can never forget listening to "Face the Nation" shortly after the present administration took office and when the president of General Motors was asked what changes were really needed in order to restore a healthy economic function of his firm, he said, "Rather than change regulations or taxes or any economic burden, if our people would just come to work half the time, we would be in pretty good shape."

I think the behavioral and social sciences have a tremendous amount to contribute to our understanding of what the best motivations are for our people and how to get the best contribution from our work force to our economic problems.

Certainly when we measure the effort given by other societies, such as Japan, we have a long way to go.

So we add a small amount, which does not as yet bring this educational and research function back to 1980 levels even on an absolute basis, but we tried to add a little bit to strengthen the administration's authorization in this area in order to recognize the importance and the legitimacy of the social and behavioral sciences.

I think the National Science Foundation deserves certainly recognition for the increasing emphasis on engineering research represented by their initiatives in the Centers for cross-disciplinary research. Engineering and science cross and blend in a way that really cannot be separated one from another and one way we can enhance the engineering function is to involve that level at each of these disciplines in a cross-disciplinary effort and that will go a long way to helping us strengthen some of the engineering capabilities we need in this country.

The committee also added language in the organic act supporting and directing the National Science Foundation effort an increased emphasis on fundamental engineering research. I think that is certainly recommendable in view of the direct contribution that engineering has to make to our engineering health and in view of the difficulty of getting adequate funding to basic engineering research. When we look at our engineering establishment, we realize there are serious shortages in the educational component, particularly on the Ph.D. and other levels, and certainly the National Science Foundation, in keeping with its responsibility for the basic scientific health of the country, has a substantial role to play there and we recognize that in the committee amendment.

I would really urge all Members to be supportive of the work product of this committee. I think there is substantial consensus on both sides of the aisle of the direction to go and for the most part the level of effort we should be giving and I hope that wide consensus is recognized by the House.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), a member of our committee.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the full committee for yielding time to me to make a few remarks with regard to this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4974, the fiscal year 1985 National Science Foundation authorization. I congratulate the full committee and subcommittee chairmen and ranking members for their excellent work on this legislation. I was pleased with the administration's request for the National Science Foundation when it was brought before the Science and Technology Committee earlier this year. The administration request reflected a greater understanding of the importance of adequate funding for scientific research to the overall health and vitality of our country. The Science and Technology Committee made a few minor changes, and some additions, where the Members felt that some areas had been overlooked.

The committee provided $40 million to the National Science Foundation for advanced scientific computing. Mr. Speaker, scientific computing is proving to be the key to our future. The Working Group on Computers for Research's report, "A National Computing Environment for Academic Research"—the Bardon/Curtis report—estimated the United States needed $180 million to properly support academic supercomputing facilities. Today many U.S. science and engineering researchers must go to foreign

facilities for supercomputing. The $20 million requested by the administration would fund only a study of our long-range computing needs. For this reason the committee requested an additional $40 million to allow NSF to start to enhance its scientific computing program and to maintain NSF as the lead in coordinating interagency supercomputer centers and networks. The $40 million would also make a clear statement to U.S. supercomputer companies that our Nation supports supercomputers.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly gratified that the committee agreed to an amendment I offered in subcommittee to increase the amount available for graduate fellowships by $8 million. This amendment will allow the Science and Engineering Education Directorate to increase the number of graduate fellowships, as well as the cost-of-education allowance. This would be a first step in increasing these stipends to a level comparable to similar Department of Defense fellowship programs. I would like to reiterate the emphasis placed in the Science Committee's NSF Report (H. Rept. 98-642) on the need for a vigorous education program relating to predominantly undergraduate institutions.

I am also pleased that the committee took favorable action on an amendment offered by distinguished colleague from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and me, regarding the role of NSF in fundamental engineering research. Following a hearing on March 21, 1984, the full committee approved a compromise amendment derived from legislation Mr. SKEEN and I introduced, H.R. 4822, which includes fundamental engineering research as an explicit activity of NSF in its charter. I would like to include two editorials on this subject appearing in this week's Science magazine by Dr. Lewis Branscomb, Chairman of the National Science Board, in answer to an earlier editorial by Dr. Frank Press, President of the National Academy of Sciences.

[From Science, Apr. 13, 1984]

AMENDING THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT

The intent of a proposal before Congress to amend the National Science Foundation Statutory Act of 1950 is to provide for a stronger emphasis on engineering in NSF programs, principally by inserting the words "engineering" or "engineers" in almost every place that "science" or "scientist" appears in the text. I fully share the concerns that prompted the suggested changes, and I have spoken to the importance of efforts to ensure our continuing technological strength, both nationally and internationally. Among the many problems we face are faculty shortages; inadequate, often outdated instruments and equipment; insufficient funding for engineering research; inefficient transfer of new scientific and engineering knowledge into public and commercial sectors; and inefficient transfer from industry to the universities of industrial knowledge and needs.

We do have to act. That agreed, there are, in terms of the proposed amendment, several questions before us. What can effectively be done within the existing statutory framework? Are new arrangements needed, and what are their likely effects? What processes should be followed for forming new arrangements and for implementing them?

First, what can be effectively done within existing arrangements? The Administration's proposed fiscal year 1985 budget answers the question. For example, there is a substantial increase for engineering research in the NSF budget—the largest proportionate increase for any of the directorates. In addition, support for engineering is embedded in the budgets of the mission agencies, with individual agencies providing much more support than the $147 million proposed in fiscal 1985 for engineering research within NSF. In 1984, an estimated $786 million was provided by the federal government for basic research in engineering, most of that coming from agencies other than NSF.

Let us assume that the new arrangements of the sort suggested in the proposed revisions are adopted. What are the likely outcomes? A major change may be to dilute the fundamental mission for which NSF was created—to support basic research in all the sciences. One needs to remember that, in contrast to engineering, many of the sciences are not related to any agency's mission except NSF. Is there any assurance that, as engineering research grows within NSF, there will be commensurate growth in its overall budget? If not, what impact will competition for funds have on the sciences that depend heavily on NSF support, such as mathematics, and chemistry?

Although partitioning NSF between science and engineering is not the intent of the House Committee on Science and Technology, the wording used in the amendment can be given this unfortunate interpretation. Given the very few changes made to date in the 1950 act, can that act not, in its present form, provide for a larger role for engineering within NSF?

The science and engineering communities—academic, industrial, and governmental—should work together in a constructive way to address the problems of engineering. But one must ask whether legislative remedies will be truly effective in promoting this dialogue or may instead lead to corrosive frictions? Amendment of the NSF organic act is a serious undertaking whose consequences are uncertain. Will there be other requests to amend the act? Will we have a "discipline of the month" series of amendments, leading to the ultimate decay of one of the most successful institutions established by the federal government?

It is not clear that the changes are necessary. They may even be counterproductive. What is critical is to continue the dialogue on engineering that has been under way for several years. That dialogue has aleady produced substantial results. And, if conducted in a collegial manner with all parties involved, then we may fashion more effective remedies that will benefit not only engineering but also science and the federal role in research and development.—Frank Press, President, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C. 20037.

[From Science, Apr. 27, 1984]

ENGINEERING AND THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

For some years the National Science Board has been working with the directors of the National Science Foundation—in particular, Richard Atkinson, John Slaughter, and Edward Knapp—to modernize the NSF mission in support of academic engineering. With strong encouragement from the National Academy of Engineering and professional societies, and with the support of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, gratifying progress has been made. The Engineering Directorate has been established, a new mission for NSF in engineering established by NSB, and new program directions established by the NSF director.

All this has been accomplished within the frame work of the NSF Act, which, as Frank Press points out in his editorial (April 13), does not require amendment to permit this. Nevertheless, the consensus of the NSB is that the amendments proposed by the House Committee on Science and Technology are reasonable and constructive. Engineering would no longer be defined as a scientific discipline. At the same time NSF's role would be support for programs ". . . fundamental to the engineering process and programs to strengthen engineering research potential and engineering education. . . ."

This proposed new phrasing should help put to rest two concerns that have bothered both scientists and engineers. Engineering is seen as more than science. We should not say to engineers, "You can receive support only if your work competes as science." Such pressures in the past have hurt U.S. engineering, have hurt the economy, and have not helped science. The phrasing also emphasizes the academic and research orientation of NSF support and makes clear that NSF will not do the engineering work of other agencies or engage in commercially oriented problem-solving.

For these reasons, I do not share Press' concern about the "likely outcomes" of adoption of the proposed amendments. His main concerns are that (i) NSF's fundamental mission will be diluted and (ii) the engineering budget will grow at the expense of science. On the first point, the fundamentals of engineering are being defined and their educational linkages strengthened. On the second, there is a way for science to lose but also a way for both science and engineering to gain.

If we insist that engineering is only another discipline of science, like physics or anthropology, all the pressures to modernize American engineering in the interests of national security and economic competitiveness will be played out in a fixed-pie scenario—one discipline against another. Or, if this process frustrates those concerned with upgrading our national engineering capability to the point that they abandon NSF as a significant participant in the effort, it will lead to a National Technology Foundation or some other new federal structure to do the job. Much of the political support enjoyed by fundamental science today might well be bled off into the support for the budget of such an agency, which would focus the majority of its work on near-term benefits. Growth in the budget for science could be a major casualty. So too would be much of the fruitful interchange between science and engineering, which is best promoted with a single agency incorporating both.

Engineers should help NSF refine the research and education strategy that best fulfills the NSF mission in engineering and should support the study of engineering research priorities now under way at the NAE. Industry needs to understand how well its interests are served by a supportive but nonintrusive NSF program and help NSF get the additional resources it deserves. Scientists should welcome the development of new NSF initiatives that build an ever stronger case for the economic importance of basic science through an effective engineering capability that can deliver added benefits to the American people.—Lewis M. Branscomb, Chairman, National Science Board, Washington, D.C. 20550.

Mr. Chairman, both the west and the east coast experienced earthquakes within the last several days. Yesterday's San Francisco, CA, earthquake registered 6.2 on the Richter scale. Sunday night, a moderate earthquake was experienced from Washington, DC, to New York. The Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act, signed into law by the President on March 22, 1984, includes authorization of the National Science Foundation, as well as the National Bureau of Standards, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Department of the Interior. In the interest of simplicity, I understand that the chairman of the committee will offer a technical amendment to clarify the intent of the committee not to provide "double authorization" for the earthquake programs. Since the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act has already been signed by the President, this should have no adverse effect on the programs. However, this action should not be construed as a reduced commitment of the committee for the earthquake research support provided by NSF. I would like to include for the RECORD an article appearing in Newsweek regarding the earthquake threat in an area of the United States not usually thought of as earthquake prone, but which suffered one of the most severe earthquakes in written history, New Madrid, MO. I also include a Los Angeles Times article on the recent San Francisco earthquake.

[From Newsweek, Apr. 30, 1984]

QUAKING IN THE MIDWEST?

During the winter of 1811–12 the small Missouri town of New Madrid was devastated by three of the most powerful earthquakes ever to jolt the North American continent. Three times the land heaved and rocked like a roller coaster gone berserk. Trees and buildings collapsed like so many matchsticks, the flow of the mighty Mississippi actually reversed and church bells in distant Boston rang from the shock. Each quake was followed by a series of aftershocks, leaving the ground trembling "like the flesh of a beef just killed," according to one account.

Scars on the landscape still provide reminders of those giant temblors, which may have reached an awesome 8.7 on the Richter scale, and the 3,200 present inhabitants of New Madrid are accustomed to the rumblings of minor subterranean indigestion. But since 1895, when a moderate tremor (about magnitude 6) struck, the region has been relatively quiet. Too quiet. Geologists have identified the smoking gun—a fault created some 500 million years ago when the continent almost ripped apart—and they have known for years that the gun is being loaded again with underground pressure. While gigantic earthquakes seem to occur in the area about every 600 years, smaller but still potentially dangerous tremors have hit every 40 to 80 years, making a quake overdue. "There is a high disaster potential," explains geophysicist Otto Nuttli of St. Louis University. The warnings have finally set bureaucratic wheels turning; last week the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) granted $300,000 to a seven-state consortium that is struggling to predict—and prepare for—the aftermath of a big shock.

NATURAL DISASTER

The consortium's conclusions will undoubtedly echo what scientists have already said: a repeat of the 1811–12 quakes would cause the worst natural disaster in U.S. history. In at least seven states, buildings would topple, bridges would collapse and pipelines would break. The result would be widespread devastation, roaring firestorms, billions of dollars in damages and thousands of deaths. It would be, Nuttli has said, "a disaster whose magnitude would only be eclipsed by an all-out nuclear war."

One major problem has been that few building codes acknowledge the threat of massive temblors. Architects have successfully argued that because quakes happen so infrequently in the Midwest compared with California, buildings need not meet stricter California standards for earthquake-proofing. The seven-state consortium, FEMA hopes, will be able to change the codes so that when the big one comes, a few buildings might remain standing.

The shadow hanging directly over their town, however, does not seem to faze the residents of New Madrid. Mayor James Cravens sells T shirts emblazoned with the gallows-humor slogan, "Visit New Madrid (While It's still There)," and L. H. Recker, editor, publisher and owner of the New Madrid Weekly Record, professes indifference. "The predictions are so far-fetched," he complains. "Most people here don't give it a thought."

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 25, 1984]

MAJOR QUAKE ROCKS NORTHERN PART OF STATE

(By Jerry Belcher and Eric Malnic)

A major earthquake rocked vast reaches of Northern California Tuesday, injuring at least a dozen people, jolting homes off their foundations and touching off a number of fires.

The quake's epicenter was 12 miles east of San Jose and registered 6.2 on the Richter scale, according to seismologists at the University of California, Berkeley.

Most of the damage and injuries occurred in and around the farming town of Morgan Hill, 10 miles southeast of San Jose.

The city of San Jose also was heavily jolted by the quake, which struck at 1:15 p.m., and two major fires broke out within minutes of the initial shock. Seismologists said the quake, followed by a series of aftershocks, was centered on the Calaveras Fault.

SKYSCRAPERS SWAY

A crack opened in the roadway atop Anderson Dam, five miles east of San Jose, and upstream gates were immediately closed, but a spokeswoman for the state Office of Emergency Services said there apparently was no immediate danger.

Skyscrapers in San Francisco swayed alarmingly. In Berkeley and Oakland, many workers fled into the streets. In Fremont, at least one high school was evacuated, with about 2,000 youngsters dashing for open spaces.

"It swayed so much I thought I was on a horse," said rancher Rex Lindsay, who lives on Mt. Hamilton, east of San Jose, virtually on the epicenter of the temblor.

"It is chaos here," said a Morgan Hill policeman. Another police officer said there were 12 people injured in the town of 16,000, none of them seriously, and that nine buildings were damaged, three so badly they had to be condemned. In addition there were several fires, but the officer said he could not estimate how bad the situation was.

"Most of the damage has been in the Morgan Hill and San Martin area," reported Mary McLellen, director of disaster services for the Santa Clara Valley Red Cross in San Jose.

She said several children at Raymond Gwinn Elementary School were injured by falling objects. "There are maybe a dozen injuries reported," she said.

McLellen said first reports indicate several homes were damaged in San Martin and in Jackson Oaks, near the Anderson Dam.

"We're ready to open a shelter if the need exists," the Red Cross official said. "We have a team going to the south county to assess damage now."

Jane Decker of the Santa Clara County Office of Emergency Services said that "considering the magnitude of the quake we don't seem to be faced with a lot of major damage." She also reported that the Morgan Hill area seemed hardest hit.

ELECTRICAL POWER OUT

The quake knocked out electrical power in several parts of Northern California, but most was restored within a matter of minutes. However, there were reports that electricity was out all around Morgan Hill. Telephone communications in and out of Morgan Hill also were disrupted for a time. Decker also said the quake reportedly set off fires in a garage in an East San Jose shopping center, causing an estimated $1 million damage. Another fire caused heavy damage to a San Jose restaurant.

Thomes McEvilly, professor of seismology at UC Berkeley, said the temblor, at 6.2 on the Richter scale, "was a major earthquake." There were four or five aftershocks in the range of 3.5 to 4 within the next two hours, McEvilly said.

TWO ROLLING JOLTS REPORTED

"If it (the epicenter) had been in a built-up area it would have done a lot of damage," McEvilly said.

The San Francisco earthquake of 1906—the 78th anniversary of that disaster was observed only last Thursday—was rated at 8.3 on the Richter Scale. The Coalinga earthquake on May 2, 1983, which virtually wiped out the town's business center, registered 6.7.

Most people reported Tuesday's temblor as two rolling jolts.

"I felt it as two big jerks," said Lotus Bakes, a clerk at the Lick Observatory near the epicenter. "Everybody dashed out of the building," she said. "Dishes were broken. Things fell off shelves."

A large boulder jolted loose by the quake rolled down a hill and slammed into a car

that Bakes' husband was working on. She said he wasn't hurt.

In San Francisco's landmark Tadich's Grill, manager Chris Sentovich said the quake "startled" late luncheon patrons. But he added, "when it was over, they clapped. The chef didn't spill a drop of food."

"I was standing there (doing the dishes) and all of a sudden the doors started shaking," said South San Francisco housewife Lee Brian. "It wasn't sharp, but it just kept going. At first I thought . . . is my house blowing away? The cat ran into the garage. . . . I'd been thinking about canceling my earthquake insurance. Now maybe I won't."

San Francisco advertising executive Jennifer Wilkinson was convinced she was about to die. She was on the second floor of a downtown building. "It was incredible," she recalled. "I saw the Venetian blinds jumping up and down. In all my life in the Bay Area I've never felt an earthquake. This time I thought . . . 'I'm going to die.' "

In San Jose, City Hall and Santa Clara County Hall of Administration workers fled into the street. Elevators in the buildings automatically shut down, and about a dozen people were trapped inside for a time.

There were reports of pictures knocked from walls, chandeliers swinging wildly, plaster falling and merchandise and dishes jolted from shelves throughout much of the area.

"It was the worst;" said Mary Guglielmo, owner of the Plateau 7 Restaurant, atop a seven-story building in San Jose. She said wine bottles toppled from shelves and a small tree fell over. "It just went on and on," She said.

In Minden, Nev., Douglas County Librarian Connie Brashear said the jolt "moved some shelving . . . caused plants to wave back and forth, swayed the building and woke up one of our cats."

In Martinez, 35 miles east of San Francisco, Nel Veder said it was the strongest she'd felt in 15 years. "Cupboards rattled, chandeliers swayed. It was a long rolling quake of about 20 seconds duration."

California's last significant earthquake was on Jan. 22, when a temblor centered on the Monterey Peninsula hit 5.25 on the Richter scale. The Richter scale is a gauge of energy released by an earthquake as measured by ground motion recorded on seismographs. Each higher number on the scale represents a tenfold increase in energy released.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Science and Technology Committee bill.

□ 1610

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. FLIPPO), a former member of the Science and Technology Committee.

Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) for their work and leadership in bringing this measure to the House floor. All the Members of the House should be pleased and proud of the work and leadership all the members of the Committee of Science and Technology are providing in developing national goals, policies, and programs to maintain the leadership of our country in science and technology.

H.R. 4974 deserves the support of every Member of this body. The bill carefully balances the national need to invest in basic research with the requirement for Federal fiscal responsibility. This measure prudently establishes research priorities and the allocation of funds in the bill accurately reflects national goals and objectives.

Mr. Chairman, I want to direct my remarks in support of one area of the NSF budget that is of interest to me and I am sure most of my colleagues. For some years I have been interested in seeing a wider development of scientific talent and of centers of excellence across the country, and a more equitable distribution of Federal funds to support such development.

The awarding of Federal grants on the basis of quality and technical merit insures that only first-rate research will be supported. This is sound policy insuring that the investment of Federal revenues will yield the highest returns. We must recognize, however, that this policy also tends to perpetuate the uneven distribution of research capability throughout the country. Of the total Federal budget for fundamental research spent on college campuses, the bulk of the funds are distributed to those campuses in the States with the highest level of funding. For example, this year 60 to 65 percent of available Federal research dollars have been allocated to campuses in 10 States where the support for higher education is the highest, while only 1 to 2 percent went to schools in the 10 States where funding is lowest.

The National Science Foundation has, at the urging of the Committee on Science and Technology and many other Members of the House, given some attention to this problem.

For the last 5 years NSF has been operating the experimental program to stimulate competitive research (EPSCoR). This program was designed to first, increase the capability of scientists and engineers in States that have been relatively less successful in competing for Federal R&D funds; and to second, encourage a wider distribution of scientific talent, and Federal funds.

Under the EPSCoR program NSF awarded $2.5 million to $3 million each year from fiscal year 1981 through fiscal year 1984 to universities in five States that were among the lowest in total Federal research funding. The awards were made to help support statewide research improvement plans, and the five States chosen were Arkansas, Maine, Montana, South Carolina, and West Virginia.

The EPSCoR is scheduled to end this year. Fortunately, the members of the Committee on Science and Technology saw fit to reauthorize this program in H.R. 4974. This was a wise decision on the part of the committee. The program has been successful yielding great benefits to the country.

A report by NSF in October 1983, midway through the program, showed that while the change in the rank-order of States participating in the EPSCoR program was not dramatic, a number of results were noted. These include:

The quality of the faculty in participant institutions had been improved;

Over one-half of the 183 EPSCoR-supported scientists had already received other Federal awards;

Interaction between scientists in participant States and nationally recognized scientists had increased significantly;

Participant scientists were getting increased exposure, and research productivity had been increased; and

In all participating States, internal communication between scientists, administrators, legislators, and the community had been improved.

In a recent Science editorial, Prof. Gary A. Strobel, who has directed the EPSCoR program at Montana State University, highlights a number of achievements made at this university under the program. He states that well over 50 percent of the original EPSCoR investigators have acquired extramural research funds from Federal, State, and private organizations and agencies—in amounts which nearly double those originally received from NSF. Dr. Strobel says that after NSF funding has ceased, the program will continue with State funding.

Looking at the record of what has been accomplished with a relatively small investment of funding under this NSF program, it seems to me it is an emphasis worth continuing.

I feel this is important not only because it enables these less-than-top funded institutions to compete for Federal research dollars, but because it enhances our total research base, improves undergraduate education in science in these locations, and provides better graduate education.

It seems to me that in these times, when our Nation is struggling to keep its leadership in science, high quality centers of excellence need to be encouraged in all areas of the country and scientific talents developed and used wherever they are available.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4974 is a sound piece of legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4974, the National Science Foundation reauthorization bill. The National Science Foundation provides support for basic research, primarily through

grants to colleges and universities. These funds are essential in helping our current scientists and future scientists address the needs of our country.

Of those areas of scientific research funded by the National Science Foundation, I believe that the behavioral and social science programs are of special importance in providing essential information that can be used to improve the quality of American life in such areas as education, health, and economic stability. This includes research on how our children learn and how we can teach them to grasp complicated concepts in such important subjects as mathematics and science. The Nation has placed a special emphasis on improving the education system in this country, and by strongly supporting this type of research on teaching and learning, we can insure a healthier educational system.

I strongly support H.R. 4974, and am particularly pleased to see that this bill increases funding for behavioral and social science programs by $3.6 million. This increase will assist in preserving the quality of behavioral and social science research, which affects all our citizens.

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, as we consider H.R. 4974, the fiscal year 1985 reauthorizations for the National Science Foundation (NSF), I would like to offer my support for the addition of funds for the biological, behavioral and social sciences (BBS) directorate of NSF. For the past several years, funding for the behavioral and social science research programs within BBS has been inconsistent and has fallen behind the strong pace of other NSF research programs.

This trend is continued in the administration's budget request for fiscal year 1985, where many of the behavioral and social science programs would barely keep pace with inflation. In contrast, an overall 14-percent increase is proposed for NSF's research programs.

The disparate funding for these sciences jeopardizes progress in areas of research that have implications for any enterprise where humans are involved. Some examples are the workplace, where human efficiency and productivity are primary concerns; energy use at home and in industry; science education; aviation, where safety often depends on human performance; and the health care system, where disease prevention and health care promotion efforts are often a matter of developing healthy behavior.

I am proud to represent two academic institutions that conduct NSF-supported research: The University of Connecticut, Storrs Campus, and Wesleyan University. Together, these schools received more than $125,000 in fiscal year 1983 ($110,421 University of Conn.; $24,790 Westleyan University) for research in neurobiology, economics, history, and psychobiology, among others. I am quite familiar with the high quality of the work being done in both universities and would decry any attempt to slow their research efforts in these important fields. That is why I urge my colleagues—many of whom represent institutions receiving NSF support for behavioral and social science research—to support the improved funding for these sciences that is contained in H.R. 4974.●

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this bill, not because of any problem with the focus or function of the National Science Foundation, but merely because it is an unacceptable increase in spending at a time of deficit crisis.

The committee has brought us a bill that increases funding for NSF by about 18 percent. If we allowed increases of that magnitude to every worthy function, we would add another $85 billion to our deficit in 1 fiscal year alone.

No function of Government can be allowed such an increase as this. I have no choice except to vote "no."●

● Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my wholehearted support to this authorization bill, because it will inject new strength into many excellent National Science Foundation programs.

I want to focus on sections of the bill that deals with the science and engineering programs administered through NSF. The proposed funding will give the Foundation an active role in helping to overcome a key problem: Our children are not acquiring the knowledge and skills they need in today's technological world.

Substantial amounts of advanced technology research are now being conducted in Oklahoma by both the public and private sectors. I am interested in seeing that we have competent and productive workers to fill these jobs. The NSF role—although only a portion of the Federal involvement in education—adds credibility and a sense of direction to science and engineering education programs.

The emphasis this bill places on computers and education is also commendable. A strong NSF computing effort will support increased services for science and engineering university researchers and help the budding role of computers in precollege classrooms.

I am pleased that this bill reflects many of the initiatives set forth in H.R. 1310 passed by the House early last year. H.R. 1310 puts emphasis on the need for comprehensive teacher training to improve instruction in science, math, and foreign languages, but the other body has yet to act on it. I cannot emphasize too strongly my desire to see these programs implemented.

There are few causes as worthy of our precious budget dollars as an investment in the minds of our young people. I urge my colleagues to support this authorization bill.●

● Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state the importance of scientific research and technology in modern society and the need to maintain the strong U.S. position in these areas.

Although I am unable to support H.R. 4974, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1985, due to the additional $58.5 million increase over the President's requests, I offer my support for the advanced scientific computing concerns contained in this legislation.

The rapid advances in information and communications technology has enhanced the opportunity and need to coordinate and integrate research and development of the supercomputer. If we are to maintain economic growth and productivity, and remain competitive in the international market, we must address the needs of the U.S. supercomputer users and developers.

The Government has supported the U.S. computer industry since its inception. It is our responsibility to continue the progress of the computer industry, and insure the U.S. continued leadership in this technology which is vital to scientific advances and our national security.

Within the realm of fiscal responsibility, I state my support for the promotion of the supercomputer technology insuring the competitive edge of the U.S. science and national security.●

● Mr. MOODY. Mr. Chairman, today's debate on H.R. 4974, the fiscal year 1985 authorizing legislation for the National Science Foundation (NSF) involves several important issues relating to Federal support of research. It is essential that we not overlook the impact that this legislation will have outside the scientific community as well. I am referring specifically to the improvements proposed in H.R. 4974 for NSF's behavioral and social science research programs. H.R. 4974 would help offset the pattern of inadequate funding that has been the case for these programs for the last several years.

Behavioral and social science research addresses the human elements of a variety of problems that are of concern to this Nation. This research ranges from investigations in the physiological aspects of behavior to the measurement of socioeconomic phenomena, and is conducted in a wide variety of disciplines, including neuroscience, psychobiology, perception and memory, economics, anthropology, linguistics, and sociology.

Two institutions in my district—the University of Wisconsin and Mar-

quette University—conduct topnotch, rigorous research in each of these disciplines as well as in other behavioral and social sciences. In fiscal year 1983, the NSF directorate of biological, behavioral and social sciences (BBS) awarded well over $200,000 in behavioral and social science research support to these schools.

Knowing this, I am concerned that the fiscal year 1985 budget request for NSF once again offers only second-class treatment to most of NSF's behavioral and social science research activities. The small increase of $5 million for BBS that is included in H.R. 4974 would go a long way toward restoring the beleaguered budget for these sciences and would allow them to operate with greater vitality than they have experienced in recent years.

For these reasons, I would urge my colleagues in the House to approve the modifications to the fiscal year 1985 budget of NSF that are proposed in H.R. 4974 and, in particular, urge your support of the much-needed addition for behavioral and social science research.●

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. KASTENMEIER). All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the reported bill shall be considered as an original bill for purposes of amendment, and each section shall be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1985".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year 1985 the sums set forth in the following categories:

(1) Mathematical and Physical Sciences, $416,710,000.

(2) Engineering, $147,100,000.

(3) Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences, $258,120,000.

(4) Astronomical, Atmospheric, Earth, and Ocean Sciences, $373,480,000.

(5) Antarctic Research Programs, $115,080,000.

(6) Scientific, Technological, and International Affairs, $52,400,000.

(7) Program Development and Management, $70,902,000.

(8) Science and Engineering Education, $83,700,000.

(b) In addition to the sums authorized by subsection (a), not more than $40,000,000 (over and above the $20,000,000 available for Advanced Scientific Computing in subsection (a)) is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1985 for Advanced Scientific Computing.

(c) Of the amount authorized under subsection (a)(3), not less than $73,880,000 shall be available to the Behavioral and Neural Sciences Division and the Social and Economic Sciences Division, and not less than $8,000,000 shall be available to the Information Science and Technology Division.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FUQUA

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FUQUA: On page 2, line 6, strike $147,100,000 and insert in lieu thereof, $127,150,000, and

On page 2, line 10, strike $373,480,000 and insert in lieu thereof, $364,765,000, and

On page 3, after line 3, add a new subsection (d) to read as follows:

(d) Program funds for earthquake research in addition to amounts for related programs which are authorized under subsections (a)(2) and (a)(4) have been provided separate authorization of $28,665,000 under Public Law 98-241, the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act.

Mr. FUQUA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, funds for Federal earthquake programs have in previous years been included in the NSF authorization bill as well as the national earthquake hazards reduction authorization bill to insure that this important program is authorized. In fiscal year 1985, funds for earthquake research were again included in both bills.

On March 22, the Science and Technology Committee ordered the NSF authorization bill reported. On the same day, the President signed the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act (Public Law 98-241) into law. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, since the earthquake research program at NSF has already been authorized for fiscal year 1985 in Public Law 98-241, the amendment eliminates the double authorization.

The Committee on Science and Technology wishes to insure, in coming fiscal years, that the important earthquake research is continued as an integral part of the NSF program. Therefore, the committee will expect NSF to continue to request funds for this program in future fiscal years. As in the situation this year, the committee will consider appropriate action to provide one authorization depending on the progress of the two bills which authorize earthquake programs.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I think it is appropriate that we do delete this language.

I would like to note, however, that this is not a reduction in the authorization level of the NSF from the levels the committee passed under this bill because of the fact that we had a double authorization here. Therefore, I know the chairman has mentioned it, but I do not think anyone who is listening should feel that there is any reduction in funding levels as a result of this amendment being passed.

The funding levels remain at the same level which, as I mentioned before, we intend to offer an amendment to reduce.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. FUQUA

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I offer several amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FUQUA: On page 4, line 22, strike the dash.

On page 4, line 23, strike the "(1)".

On page 4, line 24, strike everything after "explanation", and insert a period.

On page 5, strike lines 1 through 4.

□ 1620

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent that we go to section 7 for the purpose of considering these amendments?

Mr. FUQUA. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment to clarify the report and wait provisions in the bill. The language being removed by the amendment from the bill was written as a convenience to the executive branch, but we have learned they do not wish to see it retained in the bill. So, therefore, I am asking its deletion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to section 2?

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. GREGG

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. GREGG: On page 2, line 8, strike "$258,120,000" and insert in lieu thereof $253,120,000".

On page 2, line 13, strike "$52,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof $46,900,000".

On page 2, line 17, strike "$83,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof $75,700,000".

On page 2, strike lines 18 through 25 and renumber the remaining lines accordingly.

On page 3, strike lines 1 through 3 and renumber the remaining lines accordingly.

On page 5, strike lines 1 through 4 and renumber the remaining lines accordingly.

Mr. GREGG (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered en bloc, considered as read, and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

Mr. FUQUA. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I do not intend to, is the gentleman's amendment the same amendment that he provided before the debate began?

Mr. GREGG. Will the gentleman yield, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Yes, it is.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent that that section of this amendment which amends section 3 be allowed, that it be made in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman requests that the amendment be made in order for section 7?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimous consent it be made in order relative to section 7.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FUQUA. Has not section 7 previously been amended by the amendment just agreed to?

Mr. GREGG. I believe the chairman of the committee is correct on that. I would change my request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct; that part of the amendment has already been agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified to delete the last line of it, which begins "On page 5."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There is no objection.

The modification to the amendments offered by Mr. GREGG is as follows: Strike out "On page 5" and all that follows through the end of the amendment.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which is offered in the spirit of strong support for the scientific and engineering demands of the Nation is an amendment which brings the funding of NSF to a level which is 13.4 percent higher than last year and approximately 33 percent higher than 2 years ago.

It is, however, approximately 5 percent less than the increased funding levels proposed by the majority in the bill.

The gravamen of this issue is the supercomputer or additional supercomputer money which have been placed in the bill, which are in the bill above the President's budget levels. This is approximately $40 million of the $58 million, which is involved in my amendment as the difference between the majority's funding levels and my amendment's funding levels.

The reason I have reduced the supercomputer request by $40 million is that this money simply cannot be handled by NSF at this time.

The bill has in it, as presented and not amended by myself, $20 million for supercomputers. In addition, the NSF, with that money, the NSF is going to be able to obtain one new supercomputer. There are presently a number of supercomputers at the Federal level, 36 I believe it is, and there are, in this year being purchased, 6 more supercomputers.

The fact that the NSF is unable at this time to handle the supercomputer additional funds which have been requested by the majority was made clear not only in our testimony, I believe, before our committee, but also by Dr. Keyworth, who stated in a letter to the committee which I intend to present in the full House:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, March 21, 1984.

Hon. DON FUQUA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DON: I understand that the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology is planning to report out an NSF authorization bill almost $100 million above the President's request, with $80 million of this increase for university advanced scientific computing. It is my firm belief that a one year increase of this magnitude would be a serious misallocation of science support resources.

There have been reports in the newspapers in the past several weeks of the alleged superiority of the latest Japanese supercomputers, especially the Fujitsu VP200, compared to the current U.S. models. Our latest discussions with knowledgeable experts from both industry and academia indicate that these reports were grossly exaggerated and misleading, and that the current Cray X-MP is still the machine to beat. There is no question, however, that the U.S. industry is being challenged. We are completely sympathetic to the notion that greater university access to supercomputers will be a major factor in developing the talent and stimulating the demand for future advanced computing systems that will maintain our superiority in this field.

Nevertheless, after extensive discussions with university researchers, and with other key players, we are convinced that the universities could not effectively absorb the proposed rate of increase in supercomputer funds. It will be a year or more before the three existing university supercomputer centers are able to offer the level of support and service necessary to meet the needs of new scientific supercomputer users, especially at remote locations. We are working to increase the number of such centers, as you know, but it cannot happen overnight. Similarly, computer science departments cannot all become instant supercomputer research experts. Finally, we should not lose sight of the significant support for university supercomputer related research from other agencies, such as DOE and DARPA. I am working to establish a visible, high-level focus for coordination and prioritization of agency supercomputer related activities.

Supercomputers remain an extremely high priority on our science policy agenda. We are concerned that key areas, such as software and parallel processing may be receiving less than appropriate attention. In general I support the priorities established by the NSF Advisory Committe on Advanced Scientific Computing Resources. However, I believe that an increase of the proposed magnitude both would be wasteful and could disrupt other, equally important, scientific research initiatives within the agency.

Yours truly,

G. A. KEYWORTH,
Science Adviser to the President.

In other words, our chief science adviser at the Federal level feels rather strongly, as does the NSF's leadership, that it cannot at this time handle the moneys which are being added to an already large increase in the budget.

I think it should be noted, also, that last year we added additional funds into the NSF budget and those funds were not able to be spent on the new programs authorized, and as a result, the Appropriations Committee ended up taking moneys out of needed basic research to use in a program which did not get off the ground and therefore the basic research program suffered and the new program was not started.

I am afraid that if we go forward with this supercomputer allocation as proposed by the majority, we will end up in the same type of situation again without our desire, but in any event, effecting the research components of the NSF.

The other moneys involved in the amendment are approximately $8 million, which was an add-on in subcommittee made by Mr. BROWN of California, which add-on was for additional graduate fellowships. Now I happen to be a very strong supporter of the elementary and secondary school education programs of the NSF and in fact feel that I have played an instrumental role in getting the NSF back into the business of helping out at the elementary and secondary school level.

These funds, these additional $8 million, have been added on to the elementary and secondary school level; they are however for graduate school programs.

Again, I think we have a problem with that sort of funding. I do not believe that the NSF is in a position to handle the additional dollars. I am also afraid that we will again end up with the Appropriations Committee funding that $8 million by taking money out of either basic research or possibly out of the fledgling elementary and secondary school areas which are getting off the ground and thus negatively impacting those programs.

We know there are other moneys already in this budget, significant moneys for graduate programs. In fact, the vast majority of the money spent on the NSF budget is for graduate programs.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GREGG was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GREGG. In fact, the majority of the funds in this budget go to graduate programs and postsecondary programs. Thus, I feel that if we do anything in this funding resolution which impacts the very small amount which is now being spent on elementary and secondary school funding, the $75 million we have in the budget out of $1.5 billion budget, or which may impact them, we would be making a serious mistake.

There are additional funding changes in my amendment; specifically in the STIA area. We take $5.5 million out and in the biological and behavioral science area we take another $5 million out. These were add-on proposals which occurred over the administration's budget. I wish to stress again that this is not anywhere near a barebones budget as proposed by the administration.

We are talking about a 13.4-percent increase over this coming year on top of a significant increase in the prior year; adding up to 33 percent of increase over the last 2 years. At a time when all of us are going back to our districts and discussing deficit and how we are going to address the deficit, I believe it is very hard to justify an increase in excess of 33 percent over 2 years for one agency, no matter how valuable that agency may be and in this case, I consider it to be one of our most valuable agencies.

Everyone in this House can vote for my amendment and go back to their district and effectively present the case that they have voted for a 33-percent increase in funding for NSF over 2 years.

□ 1630

And have voted for specifically a 13.4-percent increase in funding for NSF this year and know that they have also maintained budget fiscal responsiblity.

It seems to me that this is an amendment on which one can win going both ways and one which is rare in this time of fiscal restraint to be able to have before us.

Therefore, I would ask the House Members' support for this amendment.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge Members to think twice and maybe thrice about supporting the amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire. I know that the amendment is offered in very good faith. But I believe that at bottom the gravamen of this amendment is an unwillingness to accept the responsibility we have in the Congress to make our own judgments about the importance and the distribution of the programs which we authorize.

I am sure the gentleman can point to support for the statement that the NSF would have difficulty consuming the funds that would be provided under this authorization.

At the same time, there is very expert opinion in support of the exact opposite conclusion. Dr. Lewis Branscomb, the Chairman of the National Science Board, testified before the Appropriations Committee that the $20 million that we would go back to in this amendment was simply not enough money to meet a well-documented need. We know that NSF's own 1985 authorization request to OMB for supercomputers was $47 million, more than the total provided here and over $27 million more than the gentleman from New Hampshire would provide under his amendment.

You can go back, depending on where you start, and allege that the effort under the National Science Foundation is being increased. Part of the problem is that the decreases in certain efforts were so substantial in 1981 and 1982 that when the Congress reassested its responsibility to make judgments about the levels of those programs, we are put in a position of asking for substantial dollar increases.

But there are two edges to that sword. The real problem goes back to those 1981 cuts. If we come to the conclusion, as I think most have, that those cuts were unwise, particularly the cuts in science education that cried out for being restored then it is incumbent on us, I believe, as the body in which the Constitution invests the responsibility to make these judgments to do the right thing. And I cannot imagine that we should risk underfunding in the area of accessing our scientific community to supercomputers.

I would ask that the amendments be rejected.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members listened carefully to the excellent statement of the gentleman from New Hampshire who is offering this amendment. I strongly support his amendment. In no way does this amendment do damage to the National Science Foundation. It simply restores the President's budget request for the coming fiscal year.

It was only a few short years ago, in the previous administration, when the budget for the National Science Foundation was about $1 billion per year. Today, we are talking about authorizing over $1.5 billion for the Foundation. In any era, this is substantial growth, even taking inflation into account. Given the difficult fiscal and economic situations this Nation has faced in recent years, I find the relative prosperity enjoyed by the National Science Foundation doubly extraordinary. As the gentleman from New Hampshire has pointed out, in just the past 2 years alone, the Foundation has received from the administration a requested increase of 18 percent for fiscal year 1984 and a 13.6-percent requested increase for fiscal year 1985. A more than 31-percent increase over 2 years is a much better budget increase than that enjoyed by the Department of Defense, and yet I do not hear my colleagues saying that this is excessive for NSF.

This amendment does not cut any programs in the Foundation. Adequate funding is still supplied for engineering research, advanced scientific computing, instrumentation, programs for women, minorities, and handicapped, the behavioral and social sciences, science and engineering education, and many other worthwhile programs. I know that like myself the gentleman from New Hampshire strongly supports the programs of the National Science Foundation. He proves that by the careful way that he has drafted this amendment. It will provide for vigorous and sustained growth by the Foundation, but it will do so in a fiscally responsible manner.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as has already been indicated, the gentleman from New Hampshire has made a very valuable contribution to this legislation and to the general operations of the National Science Foundation.

I find myself in agreement with many of the emphases which he has sponsored with regard to the improvement of scientific and technical education. He is quite correct about the importance of providing funding at the elementary and secondary levels and

for fellowships at the undergraduate level. His amendment, however, proposes to reduce the amount of the graduate fellowships which, as I indicated earlier and he indicated, were put in to the authorization as a result of an amendment which I offered in the subcommittee.

I, as he knows, would have preferred to offer additional funding for undergraduate fellowships and to strengthen our total scientific and technical education efforts in other ways, but we restrained ourselves in committee, although the report does give substantial support for continued initiatives by the Foundation.

Much as I respect the gentleman's effort to reduce the amount in the authorization to the level requested by the administration, I would suggest to all of the Members that this is really not the best criteria to use.

If this House insisted on adhering to the administration's requests across the board on all budgetary items, the gentleman knows that it would increase the amount of the deficit by $30 or $40 billion above that which the House has already approved in their budget resolution.

□ 1640

So, as a general rule, to adhere to an effort to bring all items of authorization or spending that come before us to the level of what the President has recommended would drastically increase the amount of deficit that faces this country. I know the gentleman does not propose to do that. I know he does not think he can balance the budget with the National Science Foundation's authorization, and I respect his motives. But I suggest that this is not the wisest way to proceed at this particular time. He knows the effort that was put into analyzing the need for additional support for advanced computational facilities. This was not a partisan effort in any sense of the word; it was shared by many Members of the minority. There is a feeling that we are at a critical juncture in connection with the competitive posture of this country with regard to the rest of the world in this important field. The effort that we are making to improve our posture in advanced computation is one which will contribute to the security of this country. The gentleman knows that, and I am sure that he feels that this funding can be approved later, that it is something that the administration itself will request in future years. It is the feeling of the committee—and I hope that the House will support it—that we cannot afford to procrastinate in this vital area of technological competition with the rest of the world.

That is the reason for these small, almost miniscule, increases that have been put into the authorization bill by the committee after years of study of this situation.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire, whose views I respect very highly.

Mr. GREGG. I certainly agree with many of the representations the gentleman has made. However, I think it should be clear—and I am sure the gentleman is aware of it—that there are six new supercomputers in this budget as presented, not in this specific budget, but in the President's budget, and I think that is a fairly aggressive commitment to this type of technology by the administration.

Is the gentleman supportive of those six supercomputers?

Mr. BROWN of California. I certainly am, and I commend the administration, as I have already indicated, for the initiatives they have taken.

Mr. GREGG. And, of course, we do have in this budget as presented a 13.4-percent increase represented, and I think that again shows the administration has made a commitment here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) has expired.

(On request of Mr. GREGG and by unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GREGG. Does not that also show that the administration has made a commitment?

Mr. BROWN of California. That also shows a renewed commitment by this administration to the advancement of science and technology. And again I commend the administration. But I will speak further to that point.

Mr. GREGG. Well, I would just like to represent at that point that we agree on those two points, because we are talking about supercomputers and spending here, that I do not believe that this budget falls into the category of many of the other budgets the gentleman has been referring to that have come from the administration which the gentleman may have disagreement with. This budget is a little unique—it is extremely unique. It represents significant increases, it represents significant new initiatives, and I believe that we can vote for it, as amended, and still reflect the significant increases and new initiatives.

Mr. BROWN of California. If the gentleman will allow me, may I ask him a question?

Mr. GREGG. Certainly.

Mr. BROWN of California. Is it the gentleman's position that the entire budget presented by this administration is sacrosanct and that it should not be subjected to any changes?

Mr. GREGG. Well, since I voted against the defense budget last year, I would say that that being the biggest item, I would say that was not the case.

Mr. BROWN of California. So the gentleman is not supporting every request that the administration is making in connection with their budget this year?

Mr. GREGG. If the gentleman will yield further, no. In fact, there are a number of budgets which I have not supported. But this one I think is on the right track, and that is why I am supportive of it, because of its increases and because of the new initiatives.

Mr. BROWN of California. I commend the gentleman for his pragmatic approach. I admire him, and I think he is doing the right thing, except in this particular case I think he has strayed off course for reasons which I will be glad to elaborate on further.

With regard to the position that he takes, that the 14-percent increase this year solves all of our problems or that the 33-percent increase of the last 2 years is an indication that this administration is on the right track, I would point out to the gentleman—and I am sure he is well aware of this—that we still have an fiscal year 1985 authorizing level in this bill which is approximately the same as the last budget of the Carter administration in 1981. In other words, despite the increases, they come on top of 2 years of substantial decreases which were made in this budget.

Mr. GREGG. If the gentleman will yield at that point, if we are going to bring in that Carter increase, that Carter increase I think had some mirrors, smoke, and political ramifications to it because it represented close to a 45-percent increase in 1 year in budgeting for NSF, which I do not think anybody could reasonably expect NSF could have handled in that short a timeframe.

In fact, some of the increase we put in last year NSF is going to have to lapse because of the fact that it simply cannot get the programs up in time, especially science education in elementary and secondary.

Mr. BROWN of California. I appreciate the gentleman's point. There was a belated recognition in the last year of the Carter administration that there was political gain from giving the science programs in this country what they really needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROWN of California was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BROWN of California. I think there was a certain amount of political posturing. But from my standpoint, I do not think that that was an ill-conceived budget. And the point that I am making is that this budget merely

brings us back to the proposed budget of 4 years ago.

The gentleman certainly cannot contend that that represents a horrendous increase in the support for science and technology in this country.

I happen to honestly believe that our future as a nation, in its economic activities, its defense activities, in all of its activities, depends upon our giving support to science and technology in a reasonably generous way.

I think this budget begins to do it. It is still not as good as I would like. But because it is moving in the right direction, I have commended the administration for it, and I urge that this amendment be defeated so that we may continue on the path that we have taken.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the penultimate word.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Gregg amendment to H.R. 4974, authorizing appropriations for the National Science Foundation for fiscal years 1985 and 1986. I strongly support the leadership role the National Science Foundation is undertaking in initiating the development of an effective long-term and large-scale computing program. I believe the use of supercomputers for the advancement of many areas of science and engineering is in the national interest. It is not in the national interest, however, to increase the budget request for supercomputers $40 million over the administration and the NSF's own advisory committee request.

And while I am on the subject of matters in the national interest, I should point out to members of the committee that as we consider this authorization, we are faced with a deficit level approaching $200 billion for fiscal year 1985. And so Mr. Chairman, it is in the national interest that I cannot support the NSF authorization bill for fiscal year 1985 unless the amendment by Mr. GREGG is adopted by this body.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Gregg amendment.

It seems to me that this amendment goes in the right direction of finding ways in which to reduce the funding that is in the committee bill back to the level that was originally proposed by the President which, as has been mentioned here previously, was 13.5 percent more than what we spent in 1984. In 1984, we had a budget which proposed an 18-percent increase. So we have regularly increased these budgets. So we are talking about a rate of increase here which is four times what the rate of inflation is in the country.

The Gregg approach is an approach aimed at trying to assure that we do stay within some budget limits.

Now, I would say that the reason why I strongly support the Gregg amendment is because this is a targeted approach, it is an attempt to take the business of cutting back on the spending levels in this bill and targeting it in a way in which we assure that the money reduced is in a reasonable kind of area in each case.

However, I would suggest to the committee that there are other ways of cutting budgets. There are other ways of reducing authorizations. And if we cannot do it by a targeted approach, we can certainly take a look, perhaps, at untargeted approaches to reduce the levels, as well.

Now, whether or not you are for this amendment, I guess, does depend upon where you come from. If in fact you take a very narrow perspective of the world and a narrow perspective of what we do here, you can probably find reasons to accept the arguments of the gentleman from the other side. If in fact you want to focus on only this bill and you want to focus on only the things that are covered by this bill, you can say: "Oh, yes, we can justify more money here, and we can justify more money there, and we can justify more money over here." Every one of these programs is a good program. Every one of these programs has some merit to it. And if you want to be that narrow about this program, you can find reasons for supporting the increased levels of spending that are in the committee's bill.

However, if you want to take a little more broad view of national policy and recognize that we are faced with a $175 billion deficit, I would suggest that the Gregg amendment is something you ought to take a very close look at.

Now, we cannot simply come to this floor and consistently say that the President's budget is meaningless and we ought not to look at that in this case. Virtually every argument that is made out here is in some way trying to justify the congressional budget or the President's budget, whichever is higher. Now, that is the reason why we have gotten ourselves into so much trouble down through the years.

As I mentioned during the budget debate here a couple weeks ago, when we came to this floor with a budget, we were coming out here with a phony, to begin with, because we have managed in this Congress to exceed our own budget projections over the last 5 years by $276 billion.

□ 1650

We cannot stick within our own budgets because we are always coming out here and violating either the President's budget or our own budget, whichever happens to be the higher figure. That is exactly what we are doing here; we are coming in here with more spending. We are coming in here with $58 billion of spending increase over the President's budget. If we want to get the spending cut back, if we want to do something about reducing spending levels, here is a place to start, and you can do it in a very responsible way with the Gregg amendment which targets those spending cuts at various locations.

I would say that if we cannot do it by the Gregg route, we will have an opportunity then to do it by another route, and I would suggest that that may be a good deal tougher to vote against.

I would hope that the committee will assess its position and decide that the Gregg route is by far the best way to go. That this is the way in which the committee can reduce the spending back to a 13.5-percent increase and go forward from there. If we cannot do that here, than I would ask where we can do it, and my suggestion is that probably we cannot do it anywhere.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Hampshire has offered an amendment, and I am sure well intended, to do what he thinks is best in bringing this bill back to the budget request of the President. The committee and the subcommittee held numerous days of hearings under the able leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN) and Mr. GREGG serves as the ranking minority member on that subcommittee, and his attendance and efforts have been very constructive in trying to bring this bill to the floor.

I think the amendment that is offered today just totally ignores some of the priorities that the members of the committee feel that should be included. One of them is to help, and it is a very small program, but to help stimulate competitive research in a lot of colleges and universities that do not participate in the NSF programs. We have some money in for research and improvement in minority institutions, a very important program.

Let us get to the most important one that the committee added funds for, and that is the $40 million for the advanced scientific computing. Now, in this country we have over 2,000 colleges and universities. Only three of those have supercomputing capability. I will guarantee you that just about every Federal agency that wants one has one. The Department of Defense, Department of Energy, NASA, they all have them. But they use them for their own work; they are not teaching anybody; they are not doing any research in these programs that they have. Most of them are cloaked with

secrecy because of the security aspects with them. So universities have no way to participate in these programs.

Reference was made to the letter from Dr. Keyworth, the President's Science Adviser. Well, at the time that letter was written the subcommittee, and I think wisely so, had added about $80 million to this program. There was some concern whether it could be adequately spent within this fiscal year. Dr. Keyworth addressed his letter to that figure. But I might add, in the last page of his letter, the last paragraph, he says that:

"Supercomputers remain an extremely high priority in our science policy agenda." And that, "In general I support the priorities established by the NSF Advisory Committee on Advanced Scientific Computing Resources."

Well, what did they recommend? They recommended in the course of their studies $180 million plus be added to this program for supercomputer activities. They said then that they felt like they fell short of the need with even that amount of money. There was $20 million in the budget, and we added $40 million; I offered the amendment in committee to reduce it back in half. I did not do that with any great amount of pride, but I thought it was a compromise, a prudent compromise, and it would take care of some of the concerns that Dr. Keyworth had mentioned in his letter.

A member of the Grace Commission on March 30 of this year, Carl Bays, who is from the research and development task force of the Grace Commission, said, and I would like to quote, he said:

A central challenge for the government is in the maintenance of strong support for a broad range of research and development activities.

He did not end there, he went on to say:

This is not an easy challenge in time of deep concern about government budgets, but it is one that we must meet, and the government does have a clear role.

I think that we must look at what will the supercomputers be doing. Well, they will be distributing to areas where we can have low-cost, higher capability supercomputers; they will introduce advanced prototype machines for use in the university setting for training and development. Where does the Government and industry obtain the talent it needs to operate supercomputers? Where do they come from? They come from colleges and universities. Only three, only three, Mr. Chairman, in the whole United States.

Many of our scientific people and researchers are now forced to go to foreign countries in order to get supercomputer time so that they can do their work properly. The supercomputer industry in the United States is under very stiff competition from outside developers including the Japanese superspeed project, and some other programs in Europe. It is very vital, Mr. Chairman and the members of this committee, that we in this Congress have a responsibility to exercise our duties also as well as the executive branch.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FUQUA. This is money that will make back tenfold this investment in jobs, in knowledge, and advancement of a very important field that is very crucial to this country for our continuation as a technological leader in the late 1990's and the years after that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) has expired.

(On request of Mr. GREGG and by unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman has made the point about the three computers in the universities that presently exist, and I obviously agree with him that there are three computers, but I think that it should also be made clear, Dr. Keyworth made clear, and some of the testimony I think implies that those computers right now are not able to be used to full capacity. Because they are not set up, there is not the necessary support, to quote from Dr. Keyworth:

It will be a year or more before the three existing university supercomputer centers are able to offer the level of support and services necessary to meet the needs of the new scientific supercomputers used.

Thus, we will need more supercomputers at the university level, there is no question about that. But to add it in at this time is going to be premature, and I suspect may end up with the Appropriations Committee doing what they did to us in education last year which was to drain off some research dollars in order to stay at the 13.4-percent increase.

Mr. FUQUA. Let me say to the gentleman that we are not talking about necessarily spending all this money on buying more or new supercomputers so that we can put one in every one of the 2,000-plus colleges and universities; what we are trying to do is to advance the concept of networking the utilization and expand the frontiers of availability to the colleges and universities so that they can utilize these computers.

There may be additional uses for computers, but not a mass market for them or procurement of them. But we are trying to utilize them because the ones that are owned by the Government have very limited access to colleges and universities. We are trying to open that up, but the very sense of the programs that many of them have limits the availability to outside people doing computational work on their computers.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), a member of our committee, has made great contribution in a bill last year about networking so that we can hook up through satellites and better utilize the capacity of these machines. This is what we are talking about.

□ 1700

Mr. GREGG. If the gentleman will yield further on that point, I think the point that is being made by Mr. Knapp and is being made here by Dr. Keyworth is that they are not in a position to spend more money than they are already going to get in this budget, which has a 13.4-percent increase, in order to bring about either the new networking that would be additionally added under the gentleman's $40 million, or to add a new computer which might be bought with this additional money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. GREGG and by unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GREGG. But they are pursuing the issue of Networking, they are aggressively pursuing the issue of expanding the availability of these three university systems, and are working with the three universities to do that. However, they feel they can do it withisn the 13.4-percent increase and they do not need an additional 5 percent here on top of an already increased budget.

Mr. FUQUA. Let me point out to the gentleman that Dr. Keyworth said he was in general support of the priorities established by the NSF Advisory Committee on Advanced Scientific Computing Resources, and they recommended $188 million. We are way, way lower than that, and I think we are at a level that can adequately be expended in a very prudent fashion.

I would not want to ask for more money than can be spent in a prudent fashion. We want to get the value for the money and I think we are at that level. Dr. Keyworth's letter was written when we were at twice that amount in the program.

Mr. GREGG. But, if the gentleman will yield further, Dr. Keyworth's letter is to the specific issue of the su-

percomputers and asks that they not be approved.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Budget, I wanted to respond to one of the comments made for this amendment, that the budget can be cut by approving this amendment. This is an authorization, not an appropriation. There is plenty of room in the appropriation for the Committee on Appropriations to expend this money if the Committee on Appropriations so chooses.

The budget ceiling is already set. This is not an issue of whether or not we are cutting the budget; it is an issue of what kind of priorities we want to set in the authorization.

That, then, goes to the second point, the issue raised so well by the chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA). What we are talking about here is not authorizing a lot of new computers; we are saying who is to have access to the existing computers.

Under the administration's program, the Government itself has access; DOE has them, Department of Defense has them, NASA's highly specialized aviation needs have access. But the university community overall does not have access. As the NSF's advisory committee has pointed out, biologists, chemists, specialists in atmospheric and oceanographic sciences, engineers of all disciplines, everybody else also ought to have access to supercomputers and that is what this money is for.

The networking that Chairman FUQUA talked about is providing access to universities and scholars all over the country to supercomputers. Should they have access, or should just the Government have access? That is the issue at stake here. I think they should all have access, and to maintain that kind of access, we should turn down the amendment.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIRTH. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the two points, first, my point on the reallocation of moneys was that last year we did the same thing. We initiated a new program essentially in math, science, elementary school education, which I know the gentleman is a strong supporter of, and the Committee on Appropriations, in funding that program, ended up transferring funds around which impacted on the research directorates, which are the core of the NSF, and they did it as a result of our creating new authorization levels which I happen to support, but I think it was unfortunate to see research impacted that way.

I think if we do this we run the risk, again, of doing that with really no great return, because I do not think NSF is going to be able to handle the funds.

On the gentleman's second point, NSF is right now doing the networking with the private sector. They are spending several million, actually $6 million right now, that they have out in grant applications to do exactly what the gentleman requested that they do, which is to bring in the networking RFP's in order to get some private access into Federal computer time.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. I think that the priorities that we are arguing for on this side are simply to expand that networking and make sure that it is available to many, many more disciplines than it is now. We believe that is possible and conforms with the priorities set by the NSF Advisory Board. I would defer to what the scientific community has said, and the scientific community has asked that we support this particular amendment.

So I understand the gentleman wanting to cut that down and we just disagree on what those priorities ought to be. If we want to network, let us turn down this amendment.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIRTH. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the best evidence on what the scientific community recognizes as the proper course in this area would be the Advisory Committee for Advanced Scientific Computing Resources of the National Science Foundation. Their report received March 2, 1984, says, and I quote:

> We urge the National Science Foundation to do everything possible to see that funding for the initiative reaches the threshold level to achieve full cooperation from the rest of the community in elevating the total program to full equality with experimental and theoretical science.

Then when one looks in the report for what the threshhold level is, it indicates that they cite again the Bardon-Curtis report, citing a level of $180 million, and state:

> We agree that immediate needs are of this order.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIRTH. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I might further point out that Dr. Lewis Branscomb, the chairman of the National Science Board, when asked——

Mr. WIRTH. The chief scientist for IBM.

Mr. FUQUA. The chief scientist for IBM, when asked before the Appropriations Subcommittee, if he felt that $20 million was adequate, he said it was not adequate; that they did need more money for the very things the gentleman talked about, not to buy computers, even though they may have to purchase some, but really to buy access time, access charges, pay copyright fees, networking costs, so that we can broaden the accessibility of this program to a broader spectrum, rather than just the select few that have access to this.

The Government, as I pointed out, has plenty of access to their programs, but the universities and the people who train the people they need do not have it. We are choking off the source of future scientists.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG), as modified.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALKER) there were—ayes 7, noes 9.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 92]

Akaka	Boland	Conable
Albosta	Boner	Conyers
Anderson	Bonior	Cooper
Andrews (NC)	Borski	Corcoran
Andrews (TX)	Boucher	Coughlin
Annunzio	Breaux	Courter
Anthony	Britt	Coyne
Applegate	Brooks	Craig
Archer	Broomfield	Crane, Daniel
AuCoin	Brown (CA)	Crane, Philip
Badham	Brown (CO)	Daniel
Barnard	Broyhill	Dannemeyer
Barnes	Burton (IN)	Darden
Bartlett	Byron	Daub
Bateman	Carney	Davis
Bates	Carper	de la Garza
Bedell	Carr	Dellums
Beilenson	Chandler	Derrick
Bennett	Chappell	DeWine
Berman	Cheney	Dickinson
Bethune	Clarke	Dingell
Biaggi	Clay	Dixon
Bilirakis	Clinger	Dorgan
Bliley	Coats	Dowdy
Boehlert	Coleman (MO)	Downey
Boggs	Coleman (TX)	Dreier

Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
English
Erdreich
Erlenborn
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frank
Franklin
Frenzel
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Gramm
Gray
Green
Gregg
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen (UT)
Harkin
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Hertel
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach
Leath
Leland
Lent
Levin
Levitas
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ottinger
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Porter
Price
Pritchard
Quillen
Rahall
Ratchford
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Roukema
Rowland
Rudd
Sabo
Savage
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Simon
Sisisky
Skeen
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Vander Jagt
Vandergriff
Vento
Volkmer
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weber
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Winn
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

□ 1720

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana). Three hundred and fifty-three Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This vote will be reduced to a limit of 5 minutes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 180, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

AYES—175

Anderson
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
AuCoin
Badham
Bartlett
Bateman
Bates
Bethune
Bilirakis
Billey
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Burton (IN)
Byron
Carney
Carper
Chandler
Cheney
Clinger
Coats
Coleman (MO)
Conable
Cooper
Corcoran
Coughlin
Courter
Craig
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Philip
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Daub
de la Garza
DeWine
Dickinson
Dreier
Duncan
Dyson
Edwards (OK)
English
Erlenborn
Evans (IA)
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Franklin
Frenzel
Gaydos
Gekas
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Gramm
Gregg
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Sam
Hammerschmidt
Hansen (UT)
Hartnett
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hyde
Jeffords
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Kasich
Kemp
Kindness
Kolter
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Livingston
Loeffler
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
McCain
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
McGrath
McKernan
Michel
Miller (OH)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (WA)
Murphy
Nielson
O'Brien
Olin
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan
Penny
Petri
Porter
Pritchard
Quillen
Ray
Regula
Ridge
Rinaldo
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Roukema
Rudd
Schaefer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Slattery
Smith (NE)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Stangeland
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Vander Jagt
Vandergriff
Walker
Weber
Whitehurst
Whittaker
Whitten
Winn
Wolf
Wortley
Wylie
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zschau

NOES—180

Akaka
Albosta
Andrews (NC)
Annunzio
Anthony
Barnard
Barnes
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Biaggi
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Breaux
Britt
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Carr
Chappell
Clarke
Clay
Coleman (TX)
Conyers
Coyne
Crockett
Darden
Davis
Dellums
Derrick
Dingell
Dixon
Dorgan
Dowdy
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flippo
Florio
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frank
Fuqua
Garcia
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gore
Gray
Green
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Harkin
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Hertel
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hutto
Ireland
Jeffords
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Kastenmeier
Kildee
Kleczka
Kostmayer
Lantos
Leath
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin
Levitas
Lloyd
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lowry (WA)
Luken
Lundine
MacKay
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McHugh
McKinney
Mica
Mikulski
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Mollohan
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Ottinger
Owens
Panetta
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Price
Rahall
Ratchford
Reid
Richardson
Roe
Rose
Rowland
Sabo
Savage
Scheuer
Schumer
Seiberling
Sharp
Shelby
Sikorski
Simon
Smith (FL)
Smith (NJ)
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Stark
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Vento
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Wheat
Whitley
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Wirth
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Young (MO)

NOT VOTING—78

Ackerman
Addabbo
Alexander
Aspin
Bereuter
Bevill
Bonker
Bosco
Boxer
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Campbell
Chappie
Coelho
Collins
Conte
D'Amours
Daschle
Dicks
Donnelly
Dymally
Edwards (AL)
Emerson
Ferraro
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frost
Gephardt
Guarini
Hall (IN)
Hance
Hansen (ID)
Harrison
Heftel
Hightower
Jacobs
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kazen
Kennelly
Kogovsek
LaFalce
Lehman (CA)
Levine
Lipinski
Markey
Marlenee
Marriott
McDade
McNulty
Miller (CA)
Minish
Nowak
Ortiz
Patman
Patterson
Paul
Pickle
Pursell
Rangel
Robinson
Rodino
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roybal
Russo
Sawyer
Shannon
Skelton
Smith (IA)
St Germain
Stokes
Valentine
Vucanovich
Weiss
Wilson
Wright

□ 1730

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Emerson for, with Mr. Addabbo against.

Mr. Edwards of Alabama for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Marriott for, with Mr. Guarini against.

Mr. Paul for, with Mrs. Collins against.

Mr. Chappie for, with Mr. Levine of California against.

Mr. Robinson for, with Mr. Lehman of California against.

Messrs. BIAGGI and SIKORSKI changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

So the amendments, as modified, were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOEHLERT

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOEHLERT: On page 3, after line 3, insert the following new subsection:

(d) In the obligation, use, and expenditure of the amounts authorized under subsection (a)(3) for Biotic Systems and Resources and the amounts authorized under subsection (a)(4) for Atmospheric Sciences, emphasis shall be placed on basic scientific research to support a better understanding of the environmental processes that contribute to acid rain.

Mr. BOEHLERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simple. It would insure that we are attacking acid rain with the sense of urgency the problem demands.

Each new study on acid rain brings forth alarming new evidence about the extent and severity of the acid rain problem. We cannot afford to just sit back and ignore this growing threat to our lakes, farms, and forests.

That point was brought home more forcefully than ever in a report just issued by the National Wildlife Federation—the largest and most conservative environmental group in the country.

The report opens with the bold declaration that "acid rain is not just New England's problem any more." The report then goes on to document the presence of, and damage done by acid rain in 21 States, covering every region of the country.

Indeed, if Woody Guthrie were alive today, he could easily rewrite "This Land Is Your Land" into a protest song about acid rain. We have the hard facts to prove that "from California to the New York Island, from the Redwood Forest to the Gulf Stream waters," this land is being destroyed by acid rain.

Let me just cite a few of the stark statistics compiled by the Wildlife Federation.

In my home State of New York, the average rainfall is 25 times more acidic than unpolluted rain. And rainfall has been measured that is as much as 40 times more acidic as unpolluted rain. The resulting level of sulfates deposited in Adirondack lakes is twice the level needed to begin destroying aquatic life.

It is no wonder, then, that almost 200 lakes in the Adirondack Mountains are now devoid of life. An additional 256 lakes in this once-pristine region are in need of hospice care.

But the effects of acid rain are hardly limited to fish. The federation report is just the most recent of several studies to point to acid rain as a cause of the dramatic deterioration of forests all up and down the eastern seaboard. Thanks to acid rain, we are potentially facing what one leading scientist has called the ecological catastrophe of the century.

Acid rain also hits closer to home. Drinking water supplies have been polluted by toxic wastes that acid rain leaches out of the soil and plumbing. A reservoir just north of my district has become so acidified that lead concentrations in drinking water exceed the maximum limit for human consumption.

All told, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation has estimated that acid rain could be costing New York and New England as much as $2.5 billion a year in agricultural, industrial, and other losses.

But what is most significant, as I stated at the outset, is that New York's sad situation is far from unique.

I urge each of you to look up the details on your own State in the federation report. You will quickly see why acid rain has been called chemical leprosy and a sewer in the sky. I am afraid that for many the information in the report will be a rude awakening.

But such an awakening is much indeed. The report should be a sounding of reveille. It should wake us up to the responsibility of dealing with this major problem.

Now, I have long been an advocate of immediate action to stop acid rain. As a cosponsor of H.R. 3400, the Waxman-Sikorski bill, and of H.R. 4404, the New England Caucus' acid rain bill, I have argued vehemently that we know what causes acid rain, and that we know how to eliminate it at a reasonable cost. I believe more strongly than ever that the time to mandate a cut in sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions is right now.

I have pressed that point in speeches, at congressional hearings, in letters to the President, and in a private meeting with William Ruckelshaus, the head of the EPA.

But calls by me and other Members for prompt action have been drowned out by a Greek chorus chanting "More research, more research."

There is no question that more research is needed. But many of us fear that, as one pundit has put it, "If we just do more research, we're going to end up with the best documented environmental disaster in history."

However, conducting research is certainly preferable to doing nothing at all. Unfortunately, more often than not, congressional calls for more research have simply been a way to put off more decisive action.

The amendment I am proposing would give us a chance to put our votes where our mouths are. The amendment would not require us to spend more money, but it would put us on record as mandating the most comprehensive, the most rigorous, the most effective acid rain research program possible. If we are serious about learning more about acid rain, we have to require that our national research effort focus on the problem.

We have recently seen just how effective a concentrated national research effort can be. When the Government decided that AIDS was our No. 1 health threat, it made AIDS research a priority. As a result, in a remarkably brief period of time, scientists believe they have discovered the cause of the syndrome.

Well, the President declared last year that acid rain was our No. 1 environmental priority—as it should be. Acid rain's effect on the environment is just as wide ranging and debilitating as the effect of AIDS on the human body. Both break down the natural systems vital to life. But with acid rain, all of us are in a high-risk group.

The only way we are going to learn enough about acid rain to create a consensus for action is by making acid rain the primary focus of our national research effort. This amendment would simply make that priority clear to the National Science Foundation.

For too long, our response to acid rain has been hand wringing. Now it is time to do some alarm ringing instead. We have got to commit our financial resources to dealing with acid rain if we are going to preserve our natural resources.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I yield to the distinguished committee chairman.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, we had a chance on this side to review the gentleman's amendment. We think it contributes to the bill and addresses a very important issue that we feel must have additional emphasis. We are willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for his amendment. As someone who has been very active in the acid rain battle and who supports stronger emphasis, I join with the gentleman from New York in his battle because it so grievously harms his district and I strongly support the proposal and the amendment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: On page 3, following line 3, add the following new subsection:

"(d) Of the sums authorized pursuant to this section, each sum is hereby reduced by 3.9 percent."

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is strictly a 3.9-percent across-the-board reduction in the funding of the NSF programs.

What it does is it attempts to bring the program funding into line with the President's original request which was a 13.6-percent increase over last year's funding. This particular measure would not gut any program in NSF. As a matter of fact, it still allows an adequate funding for everything from engineering through the women and minorities programs to science education.

□ 1740

In other words, adopt this amendment and you are still adopting a 13.5-percent increase in the NSF budget. The House has already agreed to hold NASA to a very modest growth level. It seems to me that the National Science Foundation could also be held to a modest 13.6-percent increase in its funding.

When this bill came out of the committee, it did not come out unanimously. This bill came out of committee on a 24-to-14 vote. It seems to me if we want to exercise some fiscal discipline, if we want to stay true to what we claim in terms of deficits that we ought to be doing something about ending those deficits.

Let me suggest that if we cannot keep the funding of NSF under control, we cannot keep anything under control.

There are many programs within the National Science Foundation that are very worthwhile programs. I am going to talk about a few programs here for a moment that may be very worthwhile, but the question that this House had better answer now and you had better be able to answer out on the campaign trail this fall is whether or not these kinds of programs are the kinds of things we ought to be spending money on as add-on to the Federal deficit, because that is what we are talking about here; add-on to the Federal deficit.

The latest list of programs under the National Science Foundation that they have spent money for, taxpayers money for, includes such meritorious items as: The social ecology of the free-ranging coyotes.

Now, I would suggest that $6,000 of taxpayers money going to study the social ecology of free-ranging coyotes might be something that your constituents would have a little bit of trouble understanding why you voted for $58 million more to do that.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman.

How much money did the gentleman say was spent on that particular study?

Mr. WALKER. My information here was—I am sorry, I said $6,000 and that is wrong. It is actually three times that amount. It was $18,742 that was spent.

Mr. WEBER. Would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALKER. Glad to.

Mr. WEBER. I am glad the gentleman cleared that up. I would not want to see us financing an inadequate study of the social ecology of free-ranging coyotes, and I am glad to know it was $18,000 rather than a mere $6,000.

But I have a question. Does the gentleman know whether this was a comparative study? Was there also a study done on the social ecology of housebound coyotes?

Mr. WALKER. I do not think that study has been done yet. But it may be in this year's budget. They appropriate $58 million more.

Mr. WEBER. I see. I thank the gentleman. I am anxious to hear more on his list.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman would be interested to know that another meritorious project that we spent money on was the function and ontogeny of the leech nervous system. We not only spent money on that, $60,000 at one university, but we had two universities looking into that particular matter, the leech nervous system at $60,000 each; that is $120,000. The leeches are important to us, but I do not know that they are that important.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to have this cleared up if we can. Are these programs that are in the authorization measure that are before us now or are they programs that were in a previous authorization?

Mr. WALKER. The latest information that we have is 1982 and these are programs that NSF has seen fit to fund within the last couple of years.

This is the most current information we have. Some of these programs are ongoing.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. This is the most current information, so we have every reason to believe that the continuation of these studies may very well be in this bill.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is correct. And the thing is this is a pattern. I mean, I am reading from some current things. If you go back a couple of years, we find out they have sent money on things like an assessment of the social consequences of the adoption and use of citizen band radios in the United States. Now there is a dandy. That cost us $136,000.

We produced three films with this money; three films on the behavior of the ring dove; that cost us $193,000. We made a study on the crowding and its effect on humans. Maybe we ought to take a look at that study in this House. That cost us $52,000.

And we continue to spend. This is part of a pattern, this is what the taxpayers' money is being used for.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I thank the gentleman.

I just have to ask the question: Do you think that study on "An Empirical Approach to Automobile Industry Issues" is in this bill?

Mr. WALKER. It very well could be. We have already spent $60,000 for it, but we may well be wanting to spend a lot more. We are going over the budget here.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER) has expired.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DANNEMEYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I think, Members, that it is appropriate for us to understand some of the provisions that are in this piece of legislation. And if you want to go home and explain to your constituents at a

time when we are facing $180 billion deficit or more that this House is continuing the authorization for boondoggles that are described by this nomenclature, go right ahead.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman explain to me his determination of "boondoggle?" I was looking back at some program called the "Viruses in Monkey Cells." Do you know what? Some guy, I do not know whether he deserved it or not, won a Nobel Prize for that; because it helped develop polio vaccine by Dr. Salk.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. You know, I will reclaim my time.

Here's one, physical education in 19th century British universities: The Scottish universities. Now, I ask my colleagues, do you think it is realistic in that esoteric pursuit we are likely to discover yet another vaccine to alleviate human suffering? I do not think it is reasonable to expect.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I will be happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The point I would like to make to the distinguished chairman of the committee is this body has just voted down a very reasonable, targeted amendment by the gentleman from New Hampshire which would have succeeded in imposing some reasonable restraint on the budgets of the National Science Foundation without endangering other programs and repeatedly this body continues to vote down those kinds of amendments.

What the gentleman in the well, I think, is trying to illustrate is that if we cannot find some place to cut the NSF budget, then indeed, we ought to just pack up and go home, because we cannot cut anything.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because I started off by mentioning some of these may be worthwhile. I do not know. From the titles of them, you would have to question it. But I would suggest another study we are spending $55,000 for that is entitled the "Vocal Variables and the Nature of the Interviewer Respondent Interaction in Telephone Surveys" is something that our constituents would just as soon be without. They are tired of telephone surveys anyhow.

To spend $55,000 of their money to study them is something we can cut out and I do not think we are going to stop anybody from developing a polio vaccine by cutting out that kind of money.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I would be happy to yield to my colleague (Mr. PEASE).

Mr. PEASE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I used to serve on the Science Committee; I no longer do. I think it is very appropriate for questions to be raised on the floor about whether we are exceeding the budget resolution, whether we are authorizing more than the President recommended and so on.

But I hope that we would not reduce the level of the debate to the level of ridiculing scientific research. If there is anything we need in our country today, it is scientific research. We are engaged in a battle with the Japanese and others, and I hope we will not go through this know-nothingism that I see on this floor today.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I will reclaim my time from the gentleman.

No one, I will respond to my colleague, nobody in this Chamber objects to the legitimate pursuit of science for science's sake and what it may bring to our attention in years to come.

But now I ask you, the adaptive strategies of Georgia farmers. What is that; a rehash of the Carter campaign? What possible good could come from that?

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. WALGREN. Is there an implication in what the gentleman raises that this money that we are authorizing in this bill would fund that study? I would think not. The truth of the matter is that these titles that are being raised are being raised from times past; not times future.

□ 1750

The National Science Foundation and the Director thereof, which is an appointment of President Reagan, has absolute control over what the specific funding is that will be given to these projects.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I am reclaiming my time and yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct that these are past studies. What we have here though is a whole series of years and years and years of this type of performance out of NSF.

What I am suggesting is that if the Members want to bust the budget—and that is what you are doing you are busting the budget to $58 million and you have been busting the budget on NSF for years and years and years—what you are getting for all the additional money you are spending are programs that are very, very hard to justify to the taxpayers out there.

This is a taxpayer argument. You can make all the intellectual arguments you want to make, but the question is whether the taxpayers of this country deserve better than they have been getting out of this money. I think they deserve far better than some of the programs that we have had come out of NSF over a period of years.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, so many times we get into arguments here about that if we try to reduce the level of authorization for some particular agency that we are against that particular agency. I happen to be a supporter of the National Science Foundation. They do a lot of good research work, but that does not mean that we give them an unlimited amount of money.

I think that the amendment is good and it is proper to bring it back to the level that the National Science Foundation asked for. The committee went ahead and put more money in because they wanted to do so. But, as a matter of fact, the amount is what NSF has asked for.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that our debate does not degenerate into one of fancy titles and so forth that some researcher may have dreamed up because you can generally get a pretty good belly laugh when you read some of them until you better understand what the results were.

I live in Florida. It is a very humid area. I remember as a kid the devastating effect of the screwworm fly. And somebody had the audacity to apply to somebody for a study of the sex life of the screwworm. Now that total menace has been eliminated from all of those Southern States where it was such a terrible thing.

Somebody starting talking about the skin grafts in rabbits. Now I am sure people go around and want to do a lot of skin grafts in rabbits, but the Nobel Prize was awarded for immune responses and opened the door to organ transplants because of some work that was done on skin grafts in rabbits.

There was another one about the excretion of urine in a dog. Now that is a subject that I hope we do not degenerate into that type of talk, but Dr. James Shannon, a former Director of NIH, later won one of the highest awards in this country, the National Medal of Service, for his research in

this area. It led to the function of understanding human kidneys in relation to hormones and kidney functions.

So I think we had better be extremely careful, Mr. Chairman, as we come out with some of these so-called ridiculous sounding names.

Sometime go to a college graduation and look at the titles of some of the research papers, yet, we have produced some very outstanding scientists.

Let us get back to the subject of the amendment. The amendment cuts across the board almost 4 percent. Many of the requests that the administration has made that they feel are very important are such as in the field of mathematical and physical sciences and engineering, even in our Antarctic program. Many of the others are cut across the board by this amendment. And I would hope that the Members of this body and the committee would act in the same prudent fashion they did on the previous amendment and reject this amendment overwhelmingly.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I would simply like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee a question. I agree that scientific research is important. My question would simply be that in light of some of the expenditures that have been enumerated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, could the chairman tell us, for example, what in regard to physics education in 19th century British universities: The Scottish universities, what relation does that have to scientific research?

I think there are some questionable items in the list that has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Well, there is a category in the National Science Foundation relating to biological, behavioral, and social sciences, trying to understand behaviors of certain things from a scientific basis. I am not familiar with the study. I am not standing here to defend it or condone it. But I might say that we will be happy to try to find the purposes of the research and where it came from for any Member of Congress. They are entitled to that. They have access to the National Science Foundation. Dr. Knapp, who is a very find scientist, was appointed by this President, approved by the Senate, and I think he does a very good job in prudently spending the taxpayers' money.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think it is possible to explain a study in 19th century Scotland on the question of physics in terms of what cultural tendencies are present when certain discoveries are made at certain times. I think it is entirely possible to explain that kind of research as reasonable and appropriate.

I want to support the chairman's comment about the screwworm. It seems to me that a few years ago if a proposal had been offered to study the sex life of the fruit fly, for example, either the Oriental or the Mexican fruit fly, that we could have ridiculed that as well.

But clearly it has provided us with the primary nonpesticide control of these flies through the sex cycle understanding and the use of Malathion.

I think the point I would like to make, however, is that I believe the rejection of reasonable amendments, as I believe the Gregg amendment to have been, only promotes the kind of action that we have here where we get into the ridiculous examination of various projects.

And what I would ask the Members to do is examine reasoned offerings to limit the amounts of money, to provide for necessary research, but rational reasonable limitations. I believe that was rejected.

Therefore, I think the fault lies on both sides of the aisle in terms of the degeneration of this discussion.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make the point to my colleague from California, who just spoke, that his point is absolutely well taken, were it not for the fact that the committee has proven now, 4 years running, that it is incapable of doing precisely what the gentleman from California just suggested. Republican members of the committee have suggested reasonable amendments to reduce funding in all those years and they have been rejected.

So we are forced to take this approach.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because I think it is important to understand that a few minutes ago I rose in strong support of the Gregg amendment and said that it was a targeted approach that should be accepted by the House because that was the way in which to reduce this particular budget.

I also suggested at that time that if we could not take that targeted approach that you can take an across-the-board approach. When you take an across-the-board approach it seems to me it is entirely reasonable then to take a look at how we are spending the money within that agency at the present time.

Some of the ways in which we are spending money in that agency at the present time cannot be justified on this House floor. The Members know it and they are very sensitive to the fact that these points get raised.

I would prefer not to raise these points. For 3 years running I have not raised these points on the House floor for that reason.

But I think that it is high time that we recognize that every time we vote to bust the budget around here, we are busting the budget to spend taxpayers' dollars on wholly irresponsible kinds of things out in the countryside. It is high time that that irresponsible spending be brought under control. This would be a good start to cut this budget by 3.9 percent.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER.)

The question was taken, and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 183, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

AYES—170

Andrews (NC)	Daub	Holt
Applegate	Davis	Hopkins
Archer	DeWine	Hubbard
Badham	Dickinson	Hughes
Bartlett	Dreier	Hunter
Bateman	Duncan	Hyde
Bethune	English	Johnson
Bilirakis	Erdreich	Kasich
Bliley	Erlenborn	Kemp
Breaux	Evans (IA)	Kindness
Britt	Fiedler	Kolter
Broomfield	Fields	Kostmayer
Brown (CO)	Fish	Kramer
Broyhill	Franklin	Lagomarsino
Burton (IN)	Frenzel	Latta
Byron	Gaydos	Lent
Carney	Gekas	Livingston
Carper	Gingrich	Loeffler
Chandler	Goodling	Lott
Cheney	Gradison	Lowery (CA)
Clinger	Gramm	Lujan
Coats	Gregg	Luken
Coleman (MO)	Gunderson	Lungren
Conable	Hall (OH)	Mack
Corcoran	Hall, Sam	Martin (IL)
Coughlin	Hamilton	Martin (NC)
Courter	Hammerschmidt	Martin (NY)
Craig	Hansen (UT)	McCain
Crane, Daniel	Hartnett	McCandless
Crane, Philip	Hefner	McCollum
Daniel	Hiler	McEwen
Dannemeyer	Hillis	McGrath

Michel	Roberts	Stump
Miller (OH)	Roemer	Sundquist
Molinari	Rogers	Tallon
Montgomery	Roukema	Tauke
Moore	Rudd	Tauzin
Moorhead	Schaefer	Taylor
Morrison (WA)	Schulze	Thomas (CA)
Murphy	Sensenbrenner	Vander Jagt
Myers	Sharp	Vandergriff
Neal	Shaw	Walker
Nielson	Shumway	Watkins
O'Brien	Shuster	Weber
Oxley	Sikorski	Whitehurst
Packard	Siljander	Whitley
Parris	Sisisky	Whittaker
Pashayan	Skeen	Williams (OH)
Penny	Slattery	Winn
Petri	Smith (NE)	Wolf
Porter	Smith (NJ)	Wortley
Pritchard	Smith, Denny	Wylie
Quillen	Smith, Robert	Yatron
Ray	Snyder	Young (AK)
Regula	Solomon	Young (FL)
Rinaldo	Spence	Zschau
Ritter	Stenholm	

NOES—183

Akaka	Gibbons	Natcher
Albosta	Gilman	Nelson
Anderson	Glickman	Nichols
Andrews (TX)	Gonzalez	Oakar
Annunzio	Gore	Oberstar
Anthony	Gray	Obey
AuCoin	Green	Olin
Barnard	Hall, Ralph	Ottinger
Barnes	Harkin	Owens
Bates	Hatcher	Panetta
Bedell	Hawkins	Pease
Beilenson	Hayes	Pepper
Bennett	Hertel	Perkins
Berman	Horton	Price
Biaggi	Howard	Rahall
Boehlert	Hoyer	Ratchford
Boggs	Huckaby	Reid
Boland	Hutto	Richardson
Boner	Ireland	Ridge
Bonior	Jeffords	Roe
Borski	Jenkins	Rose
Boucher	Jones (NC)	Rowland
Brooks	Jones (OK)	Sabo
Brown (CA)	Kastenmeier	Savage
Carr	Kildee	Scheuer
Chappell	Kleczka	Schneider
Clarke	Lantos	Schroeder
Clay	Leach	Schumer
Coleman (TX)	Leath	Seiberling
Conyers	Lehman (FL)	Shelby
Cooper	Leland	Simon
Coyne	Levin	Smith (FL)
Crockett	Levitas	Snowe
Darden	Lewis (CA)	Solarz
de la Garza	Lewis (FL)	Spratt
Dellums	Lloyd	Staggers
Derrick	Long (LA)	Stark
Dingell	Long (MD)	Stratton
Dixon	Lowry (WA)	Studds
Dorgan	Lundine	Swift
Dowdy	MacKay	Synar
Downey	Madigan	Thomas (GA)
Durbin	Martinez	Torres
Dwyer	Matsui	Torricelli
Dyson	Mavroules	Towns
Early	Mazzoli	Traxler
Eckart	McCloskey	Udall
Edgar	McCurdy	Vento
Edwards (CA)	McHugh	Volkmer
Evans (IL)	McKernan	Walgren
Fascell	McKinney	Waxman
Fazio	Mica	Weaver
Feighan	Mikulski	Wheat
Flippo	Mineta	Whitten
Florio	Mitchell	Williams (MT)
Foley	Moakley	Wirth
Ford (MI)	Mollohan	Wise
Frank	Moody	Wolpe
Fuqua	Morrison (CT)	Wyden
Garcia	Mrazek	Yates
Gejdenson	Murtha	Young (MO)

NOT VOTING—80

Ackerman	Bevill	Burton (CA)
Addabbo	Bonker	Campbell
Alexander	Bosco	Chappie
Aspin	Boxer	Coelho
Bereuter	Bryant	Collins
Conte	Jacobs	Pickle
D'Amours	Jones (TN)	Pursell
Daschle	Kaptur	Rangel
Dicks	Kazen	Robinson
Donnelly	Kennelly	Rodino
Dymally	Kogovsek	Rostenkowski
Edwards (AL)	LaFalce	Roth
Edwards (OK)	Lehman (CA)	Roybal
Emerson	Levine	Russo
Ferraro	Lipinski	Sawyer
Foglietta	Markey	Shannon
Ford (TN)	Marlenee	Skelton
Fowler	Marriott	Smith (IA)
Frost	McDade	St Germain
Gephardt	McNulty	Stangeland
Guarini	Miller (CA)	Stokes
Hall (IN)	Minish	Valentine
Hance	Nowak	Vucanovich
Hansen (ID)	Ortiz	Weiss
Harrison	Patman	Wilson
Heftel	Patterson	Wright
Hightower	Paul	

□ 1810

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Emerson for, with Mr. Addabbo, against.

Mr. Paul for, with Mr. Guarini against.

Mrs. Vucanovich for, with Mr. Lehman of California against.

Mr. Marriott for, with Ms. Kaptur against.

Mr. Chappie for, with Mrs. Collins against.

Ms. MIKULSKI changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. KOLTER and Mrs. JOHNSON changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, according to your committee report, you strongly recommend that the National Science Foundation support and use television for science and math education. I believe that this is an extremely important and timely issue for strong Federal support particularly given that recent reports on education indicate that our country is falling behind in these areas. In fact, a recent National Science Board report calls television "the most pervasive medium of informal education," and recommends increased Federal support for science and math programing for children.

Mr. Chairman, public television has had several important successes in the area of science education. Programs such as "3-2-1 Contact," "Nova," "Discover: The World of Science," "Innovation," "Science in Action," and others have played a critical role in educating our children. Yet, while NSF has supported some of these programs, funding for these important shows has often been very limited.

Public television witnesses have testified before Congress that increased funds are needed to continue to produce new shows, such as 20 new episodes for "3-2-1 Contact," and to develop and produce a new companion math series for children. These two activities alone will cost about $10 million during the next fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, does this authorization bill include sufficient funds to expand NSF's role in funding science and math programs for children?

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIRTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALGREN. As the committee report on H.R. 4974 makes clear, we strongly urge that NSF expand its commitment to math and science programing for children. Programs such as "3-2-1 Contact" have achieved remarkable results in science education in the home and in the classroom. They are an extremely cost-effective way to enhance the education of children.

In addition, WQED, our public television station in Pittsburgh has developed Project Prism to produce more science programing, and involve the entire community—teachers, parents, businesses, and other institutions—in science education. This is an extremely innovative and worthwhile proposal which could greatly enhance the public's understanding of science.

NSF has made an important contribution to some of these efforts, but I agree that a much greater proportion of funding should go toward public television for science and math education.

Mr. WIRTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would also like to ask Mr. GREGG for his thoughts on NSF's role in supporting this math and science programing for children.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I agree with Mr. WIRTH, and with you, Mr. Chairman, that NSF should expand its role in supporting public broadcasting. Given that the average child spends some 10,000 to 15,000 hours in front of the television set before he or she graduates from high school, the quality of the programing offered is critical. As our committee report outlines, I strongly concur that NSF should offer increasing support for television programing for science and math education. Further, support for innovative technologies, such as computers and interactive video discs should be encouraged.

Mr. WIRTH. I thank my colleagues, and compliment you on this legislation. I look forward to working with both of you to increase the funding for public television for science and math programs for children.

□ 1820

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to section 2? If not, the Clerk will designate section 3.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remain-

der of the bill be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The remaining text of H.R. 4974 is as follows:

SEC. 3. Appropriations made under authorizations provided in sections 2 and 5 shall remain available for obligation or obligation and expenditure for periods specified in the Acts making the appropriations.

SEC. 4. From appropriations made under authorizations provided in this Act, not more than $3,500 may be used for official consultation, representation, or other extraordinary expenses at the discretion of the Director of the National Science Foundation. His determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

SEC. 5. In addition to the sums authorized by section 2, not more than $2,800,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1985 for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside the United States, to be drawn from foreign currencies that the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

SEC. 6. If the total amount of appropriations made by any Act for the fiscal year 1985 for program activities included in sections 2 and 5 is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for those activities by sections 2 and 5, the amount available from such appropriations for any particular program activity shall bear the same ratio to the amount authorized to be appropriated for that activity by sections 2 and 5 as the total amount of the appropriations made by such appropriation Act for all included program activities bears to the total amount authorized to be appropriated for those activities by sections 2 and 5 (with the minimum amounts required by section 2(b) being reduced in the same ratio), except to the extent specifically otherwise provided in the text of the Act making the appropriations for the program activities involved.

SEC. 7. (a) Funds may be transferred among the categories listed in section 2(a) so long as the net funds transferred to or from any category do not exceed 10 per centum of the amount authorized for that category in section 2.

(b) In addition, the Director of the Foundation may propose transfers to or from any category exceeding 10 per centum of the amounts authorized for that category in section 2; but an explanation of any such proposed transfer must be transmitted in writing to the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, and the appropriate authorizing committees of the House and Senate, and the proposed transfer may be made only when—

(1) thirty calendar days have passed after the transmission of such written explanation, or

(2) the chairman of each of the appropriate authorizing committees of the House and Senate has notified the Director in writing that such committee has no objection to the proposed transfer.

SEC. 8. (a) The last sentence of section 4(e) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "by registered mail or certified mail mailed to his last known address of record".

(b) The text of section 9 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. (a) Each special commission established under section 4(h) shall be appointed by the Board, and shall consist of such members as the Board considers appropriate.

"(b) Special commissions may be established to study and make recommendations to the Foundation on issues relating to research and education in science and engineering.".

(c) Section 12 of such Act is amended by striking out subsection (b), and by striking out "(a)" after "SEC. 12.".

(d) Section 14 of such Act is amended by striking out subsection (b).

(e) Section 6 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1978 (Public Law 95-99), is repealed.

(f) Section 10 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1978 (Public Law 95-99), is repealed.

SEC. 9. (a) Section 3(a)(1) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended—

(1) by striking out "engineering,"; and

(2) by inserting after "other sciences," the following: "and to initiate and support research fundamental to the engineering process and programs to strengthen engineering research potential and engineering education programs at all levels in the various fields of engineering,".

(b)(1)(A) Section 3(a)(3) of such Act is amended—

(i) by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific"; and

(ii) by inserting "and engineers" after "scientists".

(B) Section 3(a)(4) of such Act is amended by inserting "and engineering" after "sciences".

(C) Section 3(a)(5) of such Act is amended by inserting "and fields of engineering" after "sciences".

(D) Section 3(a)(6) of such Act is amended by striking out "technical" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering".

(E) Section 3(a)(7) of such Act is amended by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific".

(2) Section 3(b) of such Act is amended by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific" each place it appears.

(3) Section 3(c) of such Act is amended—

(A) by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific" in the first sentence; and

(B) by inserting "and engineering research" after "applied scientific research" in the second sentence.

(4) Section 3(d) of such Act is amended by striking out "basic research and education in the sciences" and inserting in lieu thereof "research and education in science and engineering".

(5) Section 3(e) of such Act is amended by inserting "and engineering" after "sciences".

(6) Section 4(c) of such Act is amended—

(A) by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific" in clause (3) of the first sentence;

(B) by inserting "and engineering" after "scientific" in the second sentence; and

(C) by inserting "the National Academy of Engineering," after "National Academy of Sciences,", and ", engineering," after "scientific", in the third sentence.

(7) The first sentence of section 10 of such Act is amended by striking out "scientific study or scientific work in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, social, and other sciences" and inserting in lieu thereof "study and research in the sciences or in engineering".

(8) Section 11 of such Act is amended—

(A) by inserting "or engineering" after "scientific" each place it appears in subsections (c) and (i); and

(B) by inserting ", engineering," after "scientific" where it first appears in subsection (g).

(9) Section 12 of such Act is amended by inserting "or engineering" after "scientific".

(10) Section 13 of such Act is amended—

(A) by inserting "or engineering" after "scientific" each place it appears; and

(B) by inserting "or engineers" after "scientists" in subsection (a).

(11) Section 14 of such Act is amended—

(A) by inserting "or engineering" after "scientific" each place it appears in subsection (f); and

(B) by striking out "technical" in subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering".

(12) Section 15(b) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "technical" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "engineering"; and

(B) by inserting "or engineering" after "scientific" in paragraph (2).

(13) Section 2(b) of Public Law 94-86 is amended by inserting "or engineering" after "science" each place it appears.

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be effective on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA) having assumed the chair, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4974) to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for fiscal years 1985 and 1986 pursuant to House Resolution 480, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 99, not voting 82, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

AYES—252

Akaka	Garcia	Moody
Albosta	Gaydos	Moore
Anderson	Gejdenson	Morrison (CT)
Andrews (NC)	Gibbons	Mrazek
Andrews (TX)	Gilman	Murphy
Annunzio	Gingrich	Murtha
Anthony	Glickman	Myers
Applegate	Gonzalez	Natcher
AuCoin	Gore	Neal
Barnard	Gradison	Nelson
Barnes	Gray	Nichols
Bateman	Green	O'Brien
Bates	Hall (OH)	Oakar
Bedell	Hall, Ralph	Oberstar
Beilenson	Hamilton	Obey
Bennett	Harkin	Olin
Berman	Hatcher	Ottinger
Biaggi	Hawkins	Owens
Boehlert	Hayes	Panetta
Boggs	Hefner	Pease
Boland	Hertel	Penny
Boner	Hillis	Pepper
Bonior	Holt	Perkins
Borski	Horton	Porter
Boucher	Howard	Price
Breaux	Hoyer	Pritchard
Britt	Huckaby	Quillen
Brooks	Hughes	Rahall
Brown (CA)	Hutto	Ratchford
Byron	Ireland	Ray
Carney	Jeffords	Regula
Carper	Jenkins	Reid
Carr	Johnson	Richardson
Chandler	Jones (OK)	Ridge
Chappell	Kastenmeier	Rinaldo
Clay	Kildee	Roe
Clinger	Kleczka	Rose
Coleman (MO)	Kolter	Rowland
Coleman (TX)	Kostmayer	Sabo
Conyers	Lantos	Savage
Cooper	Leach	Scheuer
Coughlin	Leath	Schroeder
Coyne	Lehman (FL)	Schulze
Crockett	Leland	Schumer
Darden	Lent	Seiberling
Davis	Levin	Sharp
de la Garza	Levitas	Shaw
Dellums	Lloyd	Shelby
Derrick	Long (LA)	Sikorski
Dingell	Long (MD)	Simon
Dixon	Lowery (CA)	Sisisky
Dorgan	Lowry (WA)	Skeen
Dowdy	Lujan	Smith (FL)
Downey	Luken	Smith (NJ)
Duncan	Lundine	Smith, Robert
Durbin	MacKay	Snowe
Dwyer	Madigan	Solarz
Dyson	Martin (NC)	Spratt
Early	Martin (NY)	Staggers
Eckart	Martinez	Stratton
Edgar	Matsui	Studds
Edwards (CA)	Mavroules	Swift
English	Mazzoli	Synar
Erdreich	McCloskey	Tallon
Erlenborn	McCurdy	Tauke
Evans (IA)	McGrath	Tauzin
Evans (IL)	McHugh	Thomas (GA)
Fascell	McKernan	Torres
Fazio	McKinney	Torricelli
Feighan	Mica	Towns
Fish	Mikulski	Udall
Flippo	Mineta	Vander Jagt
Florio	Mitchell	Vandergriff
Foley	Moakley	Vento
Ford (MI)	Molinari	Volkmer
Frank	Mollohan	Walgren
Fuqua	Montgomery	Watkins
Waxman	Williams (OH)	Wylie
Weaver	Wirth	Yates
Wheat	Wise	Yatron
Whitehurst	Wolf	Young (AK)
Whitley	Wolpe	Young (FL)
Whitten	Wortley	Young (MO)
Williams (MT)	Wyden	Zschau

NOES—99

Archer	Gunderson	Oxley
Badham	Hall, Sam	Packard
Bartlett	Hammerschmidt	Parris
Bethune	Hansen (UT)	Pashayan
Bilirakis	Hartnett	Petri
Bliley	Hiler	Ritter
Broomfield	Hopkins	Roberts
Brown (CO)	Hubbard	Roemer
Broyhill	Hunter	Rogers
Burton (IN)	Hyde	Roukema
Cheney	Kasich	Rudd
Coats	Kemp	Schaefer
Conable	Kindness	Schneider
Corcoran	Kramer	Sensenbrenner
Courter	Lagomarsino	Shumway
Craig	Latta	Shuster
Crane, Daniel	Lewis (CA)	Siljander
Crane, Philip	Lewis (FL)	Slattery
Daniel	Livingston	Smith (NE)
Dannemeyer	Loeffler	Smith, Denny
Daub	Lott	Snyder
DeWine	Lungren	Solomon
Dickinson	Mack	Spence
Dreier	Martin (IL)	Stangeland
Edwards (OK)	McCain	Stenholm
Fiedler	McCandless	Stump
Fields	McCollum	Sundquist
Franklin	McEwen	Taylor
Frenzel	Michel	Thomas (CA)
Gekas	Miller (OH)	Walker
Goodling	Moorhead	Weber
Gramm	Morrison (WA)	Whittaker
Gregg	Nielson	Winn

NOT VOTING—82

Ackerman	Frost	Ortiz
Addabbo	Gephardt	Patman
Alexander	Guarini	Patterson
Aspin	Hall (IN)	Paul
Bereuter	Hance	Pickle
Bevill	Hansen (ID)	Pursell
Bonker	Harrison	Rangel
Bosco	Heftel	Robinson
Boxer	Hightower	Rodino
Bryant	Jacobs	Rostenkowski
Burton (CA)	Jones (NC)	Roth
Campbell	Jones (TN)	Roybal
Chappie	Kaptur	Russo
Clarke	Kazen	Sawyer
Coelho	Kennelly	Shannon
Collins	Kogovsek	Skelton
Conte	LaFalce	Smith (IA)
D'Amours	Lehman (CA)	St Germain
Daschle	Levine	Stark
Dicks	Lipinski	Stokes
Donnelly	Markey	Traxler
Dymally	Marlenee	Valentine
Edwards (AL)	Marriott	Vucanovich
Emerson	McDade	Weiss
Ferraro	McNulty	Wilson
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Wright
Ford (TN)	Minish	
Fowler	Nowak	

□ 1830

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Paul against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mrs. Vucanovich against.

Mr. Pursell for, with Mr. Marriott against.

Mr. Conte for, with Mr. Chappie against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year 1985."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on H.R. 4974, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I reserve the right to object because it would certainly be unreasonable for me, I suppose, to object to the request, but I am a little bit disturbed about the way that we have proceeded with debate around here today.

What this request is basically all about is to allow Members who never participated in the debate to put material in the RECORD as though they had participated in the debate.

When some of us on the floor today were trying to make points, some on the majority side decided that we should be shut off, that we should be in effect gagged. It is one more example of the kind of tyranny that we see more and more in this House, a tyranny of the majority that says that if you are saying things that they do not like on the House floor, you are to be shut off and gagged by Members on the majority side.

□ 1840

I suggest that that is not the way we ought to be proceeding in debate and some of the very people who are willing to engage in gagging Members of Congress are also the people who parade around the country talking about the need for free speech and talking about the need for extended debate on many, many subjects.

I was extremely disappointed in the character of the debate. I realize that there were some people who did not like the idea that some issues were being raised that they would prefer not to have discussed in some of these issues with regard to the science budget, but that is no reason, it seems to me, to try to impose gag procedures in the debate.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have reserved the right to object simply to inquire of the gentleman from Florida whether or not we can expect the same kind of pattern from the majority side when we debate another controversial bill tomorrow, the NBS. I know the gentleman from Florida did not engage in it. I am not accusing the gentleman from Florida, but it was people from his side who brought about the problem and he unfortunately was the floor leader of those people in this particular debate.

I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FUQUA. Well, I appreciate the gentlemen yielding and I appreciate the exoneration that I was not a participant in that and do not ever intend to be a participant in anything of that kind.

This is the usual procedure of routine so that tables and other things can be included. I know that the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) sought permission to include a letter.

Matters of that type, as the gentleman knows, must have permission in the House to include that.

I have no control over what Members may or may not include in the thing. It was only intended so that I could include some tables and so forth about funding as it related to this bill.

Of course, I granted that privilege to other Members, but if the gentleman would object, I would just ask permission for my own sake.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA)?

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, my question to the gentleman was whether or not as floor leader tomorrow, whether or not we can expect some change in the character of the debate which would assure those of us who have amendments to offer and have things to say on the bill that we might expect that his side of the aisle, with the gentleman from Florida as floor leader, would allow full participation in the debate by those of us on the floor and not to go to a debate that ends up being included in the RECORD as though it was actually taking place and Members just deciding what they will say and how they will say it by virtue of written statements.

Mr. FUQUA. Well, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. WALKER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FUQUA. Let me say that I have no intention to shut off debate. I think that every amendment anybody offered today was made. We offered no attempt to block it. It was an open rule.

I only know of one occasion when I think someone may have objected to someone extending their time beyond the allotted 5 minutes. I did not instruct the Member to do that. As the gentleman well knows, I do not control the Members on this side of the aisle or Members on that side of the aisle. Members are free to express themselves and to interdict the rules any time they choose, but it is not my intention to gag or to in any way engage in any fashion that would restrict the opportunity of Members to express themselves on any side of the issue tomorrow who are seeking to be recognized.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do so only to say that these matters of unanimous-consent requests that allow these procedures to take place are done within the comity of the House. It is within the comity of the House to be able to request extensions as long as they are not unreasonable extensions when you are debating from the floor of the House as well.

It was this Member who was cut off from debate because I was obviously saying things the majority side did not like to hear, so at that point I was gagged.

I would suggest that if that is going to be a pattern of performance around here, if that is the way in which we are going to behave from the majority side, that the minority side does have as one of its abilities to literally shut off all unanimous-consent requests for any purpose.

As I say, I do not intend to do so here, but I give this as fair warning that if we proceed with this kind of debate pattern in the future, there will be no unanimous-consent requests go through on the House floor and we will see how the House can operate without them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA)?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY CONCERNING THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY AND DEATH SQUADS IN EL SALVADOR

Mr. BOLAND, from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 98-709) on the resolution (H. Res. 467) directing the President of the United States to provide certain information to the House of Representatives concerning the Central Intelligence Agency and death squads in El Salvador, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 91, I am recorded inadvertently as voting "present."

I wish the RECORD to show that I intended to vote "aye" on S. 373, the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1983.

REPORT TO COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES REGARDING TRIP TO GRENADA

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Mr. GINGRICH, of Georgia, raised questions about certain Members' involvement in foreign policy.

In the course of the discussion, Mr. GINGRICH referred to me. He unfortunately failed to mention correspondence I had sent to him on the matter. He also failed to note that he had not read the report which was of such interest to him.

For the benefit of Mr. GINGRICH and the House, I am including these in the RECORD:

APRIL 24, 1984.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
U.S. House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR NEWT: I received your letter regarding Congressional involvement in foreign policy in a manner which you believe undermines the effectiveness of the United States.

In your letter, you specifically express your concern about a report about Grenada that I prepared and presented to the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I believe you might be interested in the factual situation that led to the production of that report.

Secretary of Defense Weinberger, in his 1982 Annual Report to Congress, stated the following: "The Cubans are constructing air and naval facilities on Grenada which far exceed the requirements of that tiny island nation. * * *"

In order to better and more fully understand these allegations, and the potential U.S. policies and options that might follow, I requested the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to send a delegation to Grenada to review the matter. I was authorized by the Committee to visit the island for a review. Unfortunately, no other Members were available.

I prefaced my on-site inspection with briefings by the Commander, Atlantic Fleet, USN, and the Air Defense Command at Homestead Air Force Base. These briefings occurred on April 7 and 8, 1982. I then went to Grenada with members of my staff, inspected the sites of the supposed Naval base and the commercial airway then under construction (the source of the Secretary's concern), and discussed the issues with Grenadian government leaders. The staff members paid their own way.

Upon my return, I prepared a report for the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. Given the extensive data in the report and with what you know to be my abiding interest in factual accuracy, I requested that one of my aides have the Grenadians verify the factual accuracy of the data included in the report. I assume that you have read the report and therefore are aware of the extent of the factual content. No changes were suggested, and none were made, to our draft. The report, an unclassified document, was then submitted to the Chairman of the Committee.

Since Member reports do not normally circulate, and given the importance of the issue, I had copies of the report made and sent to the Members of the Committee on Armed Services, and some members of the press, at my expense.

Having provided you with this information, which should assure you as to the bona fides of my report and the proper conduct of my staff, let me now turn to what I believe to be a matter of far greater and broader significance. Your special order, whether intended or not, has a frightening-

ly chilling impact upon our democratic heritage of public discourse and debate, both on the individual Members of Congress and the institution.

The Congress is a co-equal branch of government. It has a moral and constitutional responsibility to look behind the pronouncements of the executive branch and independently to ascertain the facts. Error unchallenged remains error. To neglect our responsibility is to neglect the Constitution itself.

My views on Grenada are public and well known. My public and private expressions, whether to my colleagues, the executive branch, the press or the public, have been consistent and honest. We, you and I, disagree on this issue, but we have the right to disagree. It is a fundamental prerogative of citizens and indeed our duty as Members of Congress, charged with the responsibility for guiding this nation, to air our various views in the development and pursuit of our policies.

I trust this is of assistance. Candidly, I have found the repeated questions and assertions regarding the matter unworthy of response. In response to your inquiry, however, I will make this letter public.

Sincerely,

RONALD V. DELLUMS,
Member of Congress.

REPORT TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES BY RONALD V. DELLUMS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, CONCERNING CONGRESSMAN DELLUMS' TRIP TO GRENADA FROM APRIL 13 THROUGH APRIL 15, 1982

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 14, 1982.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is with pleasure that I submit the following report for your review, consideration and acceptance. My recent trip to Grenada proved not only rewarding but also successful and beneficial. This report is intended to give an overview of the military questions and concerns of the United States as well as an objective assessment of factual information regarding Grenada and the building of the new international airport.

It is my hope that, when printed, every member of the Committee will consider this material valuable and will refer to it as a precedent to seek the truth and present constructive arguments against many misconceptions regarding our relationship with Grenada.

Thank you in advance for your continued cooperation. Should you have further questions and/or comments, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

RONALD V. DELLUMS,
Member of Congress.

To: Honorable Melvin Price, Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.
From: Ronald V. Dellums, Member, Committee on Armed Services.
Subject: Fact finding mission—Grenada.

INTRODUCTION

In my capacity as a Member of the House Armed Services Committee, I conducted a fact finding mission to the Eastern Caribbean Island of Grenada from April 13 through April 15, 1982. Accompanying me were the following members of my staff: Mrs. Barbara Lee-Chisom, Ms. Carlottia Scott and Mr. John Apperson. Prior to departing on April 7, 1982, I traveled to Norfolk, Virginia, the Atlantic Fleet Command Headquarters. Ms. Marilyn Elrod and Mr. Robert Brauer of my staff accompanied me to this briefing. In addition, prior to departure for Grenada, I was briefed on April 8, 1982 by the Air Defense Command for the Caribbean at Homestead Air Force Base.

PURPOSE OF TRIP

Secretary of Defense, Caspar Weinberger, in his 1982 Annual Report to the Congress stated the following: "Cuba has not only been active in Nicaragua and El Salvador, but has also coordinated clandestine support organizations in Honduras, Costa Rica and Guatemala. In fact, convincing evidence of Cuban subversion has surfaced in virtually every Caribbean Basin country. In Grenada, Cuban influence has reached such a high level that Grenada can be considered a Cuban Satellite. The Cubans are constructing air and naval facilities on Grenada, which far exceed the requirements of that tiny island nation." Mr. Weinberger makes these comments in the context of the challenge to the western hemisphere that he alleges is posed by the USSR, Cuba, Grenada, and Nicaragua. Given this statement, I journeyed to Grenada to meet with government and airport development officials to discuss the purpose and nature of the proposed airport. In addition to discussions and site visits to the airport, I looked at the site of the alleged submarine base which, according to British sources, is being developed as a military harbor for use by the Cubans.

BRIEFINGS: THE MILITARY SITUATION

In an effort to better understand the specific situation regarding Grenada, on April 7, 1982, I visited the headquarters of the Atlantic Fleet. The Atlantic Fleet Commander has authority over U.S. and NATO units in the Atlantic and Caribbean area. Following an extensive and comprehensive briefing I came away with the absolute impression that nothing being done in Grenada constitutes a threat to the United States or her allies. There is particularly, no concern regarding the new international airport currently under construction in Grenada.

The Atlantic Fleet Commander stated that the new international airport is a Military non sequitor.

On April 8, 1982, in continuing my effort to better assess specifics regarding the U.S. military position with respect to the construction of the airport in Grenada, I visited Homestead Air Force Base, home of the Air Defense Command. I was briefed by high level officials and was again assured that that the airport in Grenada is of no consequence to the United States and has not now or ever presented a threat to the security of the U.S.

MEETINGS

On Tuesday, April 13, I met with the Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and the Deputy Prime Minister, Bernard Coard. Our discussions centered around the aforementioned issues.

Regarding the proposed naval base, I was told that the site in question was the Calivgny Inlet (see appendix 1) which has a tightly restricted area called Egmont Harbor. It is the area which is said to be off limits to all but Cuban technical advisors due to the construction of a possible submarine base.

The Prime Minister indicated to me that the inlet is too shallow to admit or accommodate large boats, and the only restricted area was Egmont Harbor where Camp Feldon, a military installation is located. My request to visit this site was granted and my observations are noted.

During this meeting, the Prime Minister also indicated to me that since 1955, studies have been conducted which conclude that the current airport retards the potential economic growth of the island. Tourism is the island's second largest industry and is greatly impeded by the current airport which has a 5,000 foot runway, cannot accommodate large planes and has no night landing. In addition, I was told that the airport is needed for trade purposes. Mr. Bishop indicated that Point Salines, the site of the airport now under construction, is the only site on the island where such an airport can be built due to the mountainous terrain of the country.

In sum, the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister reiterated Grenada's position with regard to the new international airport. It is needed for the economic development of the island and not for military uses as has been stated by the Department of Defense, Department of State and the CIA.

AIRPORT BACKGROUND

Grenada is one of the smallest independent nations in the Western Hemisphere. It has a total land mass of only 133 square miles, 344 square kilometers, a population of 110,000 and a per capita GDP of $400 (US). The state of Grenada consists of the island of Grenada and a number of offshore islands known as the Grenadines, Carriacou and Petit Martinique.

Geologically, Grenada is not endowed with any known mineral resources. Its economy has evolved around agriculture and tourism. Chief exports are nutmeg, bananas and cocoa. As one of the most beautiful islands of the Caribbean, the development of tourism is the second largest earner of foreign exchange next to agriculture.

With such limited natural resources, Grenada seeks development through the building of an international airport, which is considered the most important project in the country's economic history. The construction of the new airport is the largest and most important project thus far undertaken by the Peoples Revolutionary Government.

The idea of an international airport dates back to British colonial rule when the British economic experts first suggested such an initiative in 1954. Feasibility studies were subsequently carried out (by the British) in 1969. Studies by the World Bank, 1976 and 1977 confirmed that Grenada needed a modern airport and that the best site would be the southern peninsula or Point Salines, site of current construction. It should be noted that previous governments, before the present government, the PRG, ignored these studies and no attempts were ever made to construct a new and more modern airport of Grenada.

The existing airport, Pearls, the only airstrip on the mainland of Grenada, is situated on the east coast of the island, 2.5 kilometers north of Grenville, the second largest population center. The distance, by road, to St. Georges, the Capital, is approximately 45 minutes to one hour by car (20 miles). The airfield was opened to traffic in January, 1943; extended in 1948 to accommodate DC 3 passenger Dakota aircraft; widened and lengthened in 1964/65 to accommodate the 50 passenger Viscount aircraft; strengthened in 1973/74 to accommodate the BAC-111, 100 seater jet aircraft which was then flown by Court Lines of the

United Kingdom. LIAT (Leeward Island Air Transport), prior to the introduction of the BAC-111 and since the demise of Court Lines, flies an HS 748, 48 passenger craft and is the main carrier used to make connections to Grenada. Pearls runway has paved length of 1,600 meters, 5,250 feet and is oriented 08-26 magnetic, with take off and landing predominantly in 08 to the east. The airport is surrounded by heavily wooded and hilly terrain except to the east where it is open to the sea. The site is marginally suitable for daylight hours and under good weather conditions. This runway does not meet ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization) standards. The most notable deficiencies are as follows: The width of the airstrip is 300 ft. vs. the recommended 500 ft.; the approach slope to the runway 08 is approximately 1:11 vs. the recommended 1:20 for daylight operations; and the longitudinal slope exceeds the recommended 1 percent for a class B runway.

In addition, the hills surrounding this site make night landing and/or instrument approach operations an impossibility. The lack of night landing facilities and the lack of potential for further development identify Pearls as a major constraint to air traffic and tourism development in Grenada. The basic problems with this airstrip is the steep curved approach path that an aircraft must fly to maintain adequate terrain clearance over the hills. As there are no approved procedure for such an approach, pilots must assess flight situation on an individual basis.

Recognizing the potential impact of the airport, the PRG began seeking funding for the project in September of 1979, approaching the U.S., European, Arab and Caribbean countries for assistance. In a gesture of friendship and solidarity, Cuba gave vital aid, providing technical expertise, construction equipment, skilled labor and materials such as steel and concrete. Help also came from the Arab countries which contributed $50 million (EC) and Venezuela which gave 10,000 barrels of diesel fuel. The EEC held a co-financing conference to seek funds. Only the U.S. refused to assist and to date still remains silent. Cuban assistance made the project a reality and construction teams of Cubans and Grenadians work and live together at the airport site. Statistics for the new international airport are as follows:

Proposed runway length: 2,743 meters (9,000 feet), Proposed width: 45 meters (150 feet).

Aircraft design: B 747.

Worked Commenced: January 1980.

Target Dates for completion (Operational runway only): 1,500 meters (5,000 feet), 1983 First Quarter; 2,740 meters (9,000 feet), 1984 First Quarter.

Estimated Total Cost: $192 Million (EC) ($71 Million (US)) (see attach. IV).

Number of workers: Cuban: 250, Grenadian 360.

During the April 13, 1982 meeting in which I discussed with the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister the purpose of my visit to Grenada, I asked and given permission to inspect and observe the construction of the new international airport at Point Salines. The Prime Minister expressed his desire to afford me every opportunity to evaluate the nature and purpose of the airport. He also expressed his desire to ally any and all misconceptions regarding its construction stating that "this is the most important undertaking in Grenada's economic history" and is only for the potential development of Grenada's second largest source of foreign exchange, tourism.

The following outlines aspects of the full impact of the development potential of the new international airport as was explained by the Deputy Prime Minister, who is also the Minister of Finance and Trade:

Grenada possesses the greatest potential for tourism development in the Caribbean today. Various independent sources including the World Bank have confirmed this potential. The World Bank's Tourism Sector review and Project Identification Visit of September 11-22, 1976, states:

"Grenada is one of the most attractive islands in the Caribbean. Its excellent beaches are backed by spectacular mountain scenery, rich with lush vegetation. Its harbour at St. George's, the Capital, is rated the prettiest in the islands and serves both as a port-of-call for cruise ships as well as a centre for yachting in the Grenadines. The climate is warm with a pleasant seabreeze throughout the year. In short, Grenada fulfills most people's image of a tropical paradise."

This image is supported by the European Tourism Demand Study conducted by Steinenberger Consulting on the Caribbean Product of 1980. It should be pointed out that Grenada possesses ideal hotel sites on numerous white sand beaches yet to be developed—in close proximity to the proposed international airport and main shopping centre.

Today, however, it has been very difficult, if not impossible, to begin to realize the full tourism potential because of the following handicaps:

(i) The present inadequate airport facilities which can accommodate no passenger aircraft larger than the Avro 748 Turboprop with a maximum capacity of 48 passengers;

(ii) The absence or lack of night-landing facilities. This means that all flights into Grenada must arrive before darkness falls thereby limiting or restricting the number of flights into Grenada;

(iii) Because most International airline flights into the Caribbean arrive at our two major connecting points, Barbados and Trinidad, in the very late afternoon or early evening, passengers bound for Grenada are forced to overnight at either of these two points. This factor causes these passengers great inconvenience and extra unnecessary expenditure. Estimates show that approximately 50% of annual visitors overnight at these points at an approximate cost of US $85 per person resulting in the loss to Grenada of US $1.3 million (EC$ 3.5 million);

(iv) Because of the extreme difficulty experienced by Travel Agents and tour Operators in obtaining confirmed bookings for their clients between Barbados and Grenada, many of them have discontinued selling Grenada as a destination to their clients. This is especially true in countries where Consumer Protection Laws hold the Travel Agents liable for confirmed travel arrangements sold that did not materialize;

(v) Despite being the only country among twenty-six Caribbean countries given top ratings (in the European Tourism Demand Study 1980) on natural attractions, Beaches and Climate, yet in that study Grenada was designated a Touristically Disadvantaged Destination as a result of "Accessibility problems; no gateway airport for flights . . ."

Furthermore, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) in its Circular Report 141-a-46 of 1978 states:

"Caribbean traffic growth and changes in aircraft technology require the continued expansion of existing facilities and raise the problem of financing such development. In general terms it can be said that the absence of at least one runway of not less than 3,000 m (9,800 ft.) in a country restricts the operation of long-haul international services with modern equipment and is a potential limiting factor on the development of a pattern that fully meets the transport requirements of a country."

Trends in the airline industry (including deregulation of airlines) are resulting in a change to wide-bodied jet aircraft and other Caribbean destinations have had to upgrade their facilities to keep abreast of these developments, and as a result they have experienced a marked increase in stay-over visitors every year while Grenada with its limited and restricted airport facilities have shown very little increase if any, as can be seen by the following:

STAY-OVER VISITORS STATISTICS

Grenada: 30,426; 37,933; 33,490; 32,336; 29,434.

St. Lucia: 29,529 42,399; 45,809; 69,300; 85,000.

It should be noted that St. Lucia's International Airport at Hewanorra came into operation in 1972.

It is believed, that the establishment of an international airport in Grenada will bring many benefits to the country and its people. Such benefits would include:

New Hotel Development.—On information from the Deputy Prime Minister, investors have expressed and some have actually submitted proposals for the development of new hotels on the numerous beach sites on the island. This would mean more employment for people of Grenada both skilled and unskilled during the construction period and also more permanent employment for the people required to service the hotels and their guests after their completion. He also stated that is significant to note that present local hotel owners and other local entrepreneurs have already presented concrete proposals to the Government for expansion of existing facilities as well as the establishment of new ancillary projects.

In continuing Mr. Coard explained that just as interesting is the fact that seven proposals to the government of Grenada for the establishment and operation of "Air Grenada" and preliminary approaches from five major international airlines for landing rights have been made contingent on the establishment of an international airport.

Explaining further, he stated that separate and distinct offers from many different groups of investors from the United States, Canada, Britain have been submitted, proposing the establishment of a national carrier to bring large numbers of tourists from Western Europe, and North America, directly into Grenada.

This is apart from five major international airlines which have made preliminary approaches with respect to the question of landing rights when the international airport comes on stream—Airlines which do not have planes for landing on a strip of only 5,000 ft. or 1,500 m. but are interested in landing rights only on the completion of the full international airport of 2,750 meters or 9,000 ft.

Agricultural and Fishing Development.—With the increased number of hotel guests expected to come to Grenada there will be provided a ready market for the development of agricultural products and fishing industry in order to feed these guests and so the inter-sector linkages and the multiplier

effects within the economy would be felt as a result to the expansion of the tourism sector.

Cultural Development.—The increased activity in tourist development would create a demand for entertainment at hotels and other establishments. This would serve as an incentive to our people to fully realize their cultural potential and establish a truly national identity.

Ancillary Development.—Other areas of development which the international airport will generate substantial and significant economic activity include the restaurant business, yachting and other water sports, taxi service and overland tours, shopping both specialized and general, and to a very large degree dealers in foodstuffs, liquor, craftwork and other commodities used directly and indirectly in the tourist industry.

With the establishment of an international airport projected to open in 1983 and with the increased marketing and promotional efforts by the Grenada Department of Tourism, it is anticipated with good justification that there will be a significant increase in stay-over visitor arrivals and are projected as follows:

Year	G'da optimistic projections	G'da pessimistic projections	Percent of Caribbean total
1981	34,800	33,200	0.4
1982	36,400	34,000	.4
1983	57,600	52,800	.6
1984	60,600	54,600	.6
1985	84,800	74,400	.8
1986	88,800	76,800	.8
1987	117,000	99,000	1.0
1988	122,000	120,000	1.0
1989	129,000	105,000	1.0
1990	135,000	108,000	1.0

In addition to the construction of an international airport, concrete steps have been taken by the government to stimulate the development of a viable tourist industry.

The restructured Tourist Organization creates for the first time a Department of Tourism budget from (EC $150,000 to EC $700,000 in a space of one year representing an increase of approx. 500 percent with the emphasis in that budget placed on aggressive marketing and promotion.

The establishment of tourist offices for the first time in two major tourist markets—North America and Europe.

Conscious of the extreme difficulty of getting visitors to Grenada from connection points in the Eastern Caribbean, the Government has recently purchased a Banderanti Commuter aircraft at a cost of (US) $1.5 million which has been leased to LIAT.

A Grenada Interline desk has been established at the Grantley Adams International airport in Bardados to facilitate Grenada bound passengers interlining from international flights.

The Prime Minister went on to explain the existing facilities at Pearls Airfield much as are outlined in the background section of this report. He further stressed the need for the new airport given the adverse conditions and deficiencies associated with Pearls.

PROPOSALS FOR AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT

The Deputy Prime Minister detailed proposals for airport development which date as far back as January 1955, when the Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Partners, a British firm in their report on "Airfields for Grenada and St. Vincent" recommended strongly in favour of the Point Salines site in view of the need for a site which would cater for aircraft of the size and class of Viscount (55 passenger) aircraft and larger.

He stated that in July 1960, the now defunct federal government of the West Indies appointed a Commission to report on Civil Aviation in the West Indies. In their report, the Commissioners identified Point Salines as the logical choice for future airport development in Grenada and recommended that "construction be started as soon as conveniently possible."

In 1960, he continued the governments of UK, USA and Canada established a "Tripartite Economic Commission" to carry out a survey of the Windward and Leeward Islands, including Grenada, then referred to as the "Little Eight" islands, in order to "identify the obstacles to economic growth in the islands and the priorities in terms of expenditures and policies required to remove them."

As a follow-up to the Tripartite Economic Survey of UK, USA and Canada, the Department of Transport of the Canadian Government undertook a "Study Paper on Airports for Leeward and Windward Islands" and published their report in March 1967. Following on recommendation for the more northerly of the Islands the Department indicated that "the proposed jet airports on St. Lucia and Grenada have also been assigned top priorities." The report recommended development of the airport in three stages,

Stage 1 Viscount, BAC-111, DC-9, B-737 type operations—5,500 ft.

Stage 2 Jet operations—medium range, extending the airport of Point Salines to 7,500 ft.

Stage 3 jet operations—long range, extending that airport of Point Salines further to 9,000 ft.

Of the juncture, it is important to appreciate that the idea, for an international airport at Point Salines, did not come from the present Government of Grenada, but has been the dream of successive Governments of Grenada, for 26 years.

It is important also to note that the concept of an airport of 9,000 ft. long is not some idea first conceived by the present Government in the last years, but has come up repeatedly in different reports of different countries that have studied this problem, including the United States. The report from the Canadian government Transportation Department suggested three stages for the development of Point Salines Airport.

The Deputy Prime Minister went on to explain that in January 1969, Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Partners jointly with the Economist Intelligence Unit, both of London were commissioned by the British Ministry of Overseas Development at the request of the government of Grenada to carry out an Economic and Technical Feasibility Study which was produced in 2 volumes.

The report, entitled "An Economic and Technical Feasibility Study", four possible alignments were studied, and the results of soil and topographic surveys including marine borings were presented. It was a well-executed study and while these investigations were repeated in considerably greater detail by the Cuban/Grenadian team in late 1979/80, nothing emerged during the investigations or in the sixteen-month of construction work to date, at Point Salines which is in conflict with the findings of the 2969 feasibility report.

The engineering feasibility study—including all of the soil and rock samples, and marine borings by the Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Partners team which were executed as a study, and throughly documented and detailed, but in addition, 9 volumes intensive and even more comprehensive and detailed engineering feasibility study undertaken by a team of more than 20 Cuban and Grenadian technical experts in this field confirmed all of these findings. The summary of the report of Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick and the Economic Intelligence Unit confirmed once more that the "most likely alternative existed in the construction of an airport on a new site at Point Lanines."

Like the Canadian study, this report envisaged a stage development, a first stage of 5,800 ft., a second stage of 7,800 ft. which was stipulated for the Lockheed L1011, and the possibility of development to 9,000 ft. in a later stage.

The report, too, looked at the development of Point Salines airport into an international airport in three stages ending with the final stage of 9,000 ft.

Earlier in 1968, the Operational Services Overseas Branch of the Board of Trade, London, which body then exercised responsibility for the flight operational aspects of airports (at that time Grenada was a colony of Britain), reported on Pearls Airport and on the proposed new airport at Point Salines.

They reported on all the operational aspects related to Point Salines and Messrs. Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Partners in their 1969 feasibility report on Point Salines record that "Advice was sought throughout from the Operational Serves Overseas Branch of the Department of Civil Aviation of the Board of Trade on all operational matters likely to affect the physical standards to be adopted for the airport layout and the proposals put forward comply with their recommendations."

In 1970/71—Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Partners undertook an Engineering Feasibility Study of the Pearls crosswind runway proposal. This reported favorably on the crosswind runway but the results of the report were considered doubtful when assessed by Crown Agents (UK) Engineers, Airline pilots, and Grenadian Ministry Engineers who were experienced in this field. Ultimately, it was identified that the wind data made available to the consultants had been faulty because of faulty instrumentation and that the proposal for a crosswind runway was not a sound one.

In 1972, yet another study of Grenada's airport was commissioned by the British Overseas Development Ministry. This was in fact, an updating of the economic feasibility aspects of the 1969 report.

In May/June 1976, proposals for nightflying at Pearls, Grenada and Arnos Vale, St. Vincent were prepared by the Civil Aviation Authority, London, and presented to local authorities. The regional airline LIAT, and the Airline Pilots Association, accepted the proposals for the lighting of the airport at St. Vincent, but rejected the proposals for Pearls airport, Grenada because of safety considerations bearing in mind the unfavorable topography and the need to use a steep curved approach path for landing.

In other words, no possibility whatever of Grenada being able to have even night-landing, even without an international airport, but just night-landing with the existing 5,000 ft. at the present airport at Pearls.

In September 1976, and again in December 1976, the World Bank sent an Identifica-

tion and Appraisal Mission to Grenada to look specifically at the Airport Development Project. The team comprising of an aviation engineer, an aviation economist and a general economist, reviewed the various alternatives possible, and concluded:

"That the existing runway at Pearls acted and would continue to act as a constraint on the development of air transport and tourism growth" and

"That taking into consideration the country's needs, constraints and development potential, the Point Salines site for a new airport would best serve Grenada's needs and further study should concentrate on this site to determine its overall technical, economic and financial feasibility."

The World Bank team recommended that yet, another technical and economic feasibility study be undertaken.

Finally, in late 1979, the Government of Grenada acting on advice from a panel of Caribbean Technical experts who had been invited to advise on the matter meteorological experts from Barbados, civil aviation experts from the region, in charge of airports of the region, of the Caribbean routes, Venezuelan engineers, Cuban engineers, Grenadian engineers experience in building airports, including the engineer who built St. Vincent's airport, pilots from BWIA from LIAT another airline, a panel of people representing all the different fields, and who had studied all these former reports. It is this team of experts which finally advised the Government of Grenada to end the studies and start the work. Therefore the decision to proceed with runway construction at Point Salines was taken. Initially, a draft master plan updating the proposals contained in the 1969 Joint Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Partners and Economist Intelligence Unit (UK) feasibility study was prepared by a Joint Cuba/Grenada team and construction commenced based upon this in January 1980.

The master plan envisaged a runway construction in two stages, the first being to have a runway 2,400 m (7,800 ft.) long with the Boeing 727 as the design aircraft and with the feasibility of extending to 2,750 m (9,000 ft.) to accommodate DC-10, L-1011 and Boeing 747 when the demand warranted it. This was, essentially, the 1969 UK Consultants Proposals displaced by the 10 year intervening period.

However, airline operators servicing the routes on which the bulk of the tourist traffic and potential for growth lie—Europe and North America—are replacing the aircraft currently in use (B 707 class aircraft) and they are replacing that type of aircraft with wide bodied jet aircraft, eg B-747, DC-10, L-1011, and this has been the current experience in St. Lucia, Antigua and Barbados. As a result, in mid 1980, Government took the decision to construct the full length of 2,750 m during the present phase of construction.

Although it is to be in two stages, nevertheless there will be an element concurrent between stages 1 and 2, so that upon completion the entire 9,000 ft. would be available in order to accommodate the shift-over by most airlines away from the B-707 class of aircraft to the larger the more wide-bodied long-haul jets of the 747, DC-10, L-1011.

The runway will be approximately 2,750 m long, 1,500 m of which will be open to traffic, including night operations, during the 1982/83 tourist season.

A 2,750 m runway when completed is intended to provide facilities recommended by ICAO up to the level of an Instrument Approach runway.

In the provisional stage, the 1,500 m runway will accommodate aircraft of the class of the US-748 turbo-prop currently operated by LIAT, while a 2,750 m runway will be generally to ICAO Code letter A specifications.

International Airport site visit

Following my meeting with the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister, I was driven to the construction site of the new international airport. Upon arrival, my staff and I were met by Mr. Ronald G. Smith, International Airport Project Manager, who introduced us to an assistant who was engaged in negotiations with a group of contractors from Great Britain, France and Finland. We were told that the negotiations were for the installation of equipment and systems for the airport.

As we viewed a model of the completed airport site which was enclosed in glass, Mr. Smith explained to use the process of developing this site. As Point Salines was identified as the only viable site on the island which could be developed into an airport with nightlanding and flying facilities and capable of accommodating wide bodied aircraft, this site had to undergo quite a physical transition. The runway, currently under construction, had to be built across a body of water, Hardy Bay, which is approximately 425 meters wide and approximately 8 meters deep. The bay had a layer of unstable material which had to be removed by suction dredge and discarded, then pumped and deposited between two dykes which were built after the removal of much material. The dredging process, one of two major phases of the site, cost approximately $3 million (US). The firm contracted for this dredging project in Lane Dredging, Co., a United States firm of specialists based in Miami, Florida. (photos attached)

It was explained that the site comprises a promontary on which a number of extremely steep sided spurs ran at right angles to the required and only feasible center direction of the runway. The soil, organic clay and clay stratas, was hard and had to be loosened with explosives. It is interesting to note that the explosives used to blast the terrain were made of molasses and nitro. From the photographs shown us of the site in its various stages of development, it seems, in my estimation, to be a project of great undertaking and great potential.

My staff and I were escorted by Mr. Smith and other project personnel to the runway which is slated to be operational by the Spring of 1983. It is hoped that the first 5000 ft. will be ready for use for normal LIAT flights within the next nine months. The runway will, upon completion be 2743 meters in length. Mr. Smith stated that the actual length needed to accommodate a 747 is 3000 meters according to International Aviation specifications standards. He further explained the phases of the construction activity of the project. The dredging process as was mentioned earlier in the airport background and the surfacing of the runway. A third activity, related to these phases he explained is putting into operation a Quarry, Rock crushing Plant and Asphalt Plant which is necessary to produce the asphaltic concrete for paving the runway. The Asphalt Plant was officially opened during the March 13th Anniversary Celebrations this year.

Surfacing of the runway began in September 1981. A total of five layers of varying layers of thicknesses have already been completed and work has begun on the aircraft parking apron where future passengers will embark and disembark aircraft. Plans for the terminal have been prepared and are under consideration.

While viewing the airport construction site, it was particularly interesting to note a medical student from the nearby Medical University jogging in the area, as well as a busload of children visiting the site from a Parish school in addition to many visitors simply observing the beautiful view of the sea. (The Western end of the point at which the Caribbean and Atlantic oceans meet and from where we stood was quite a lovely view). Mr. Smith explained that with the University so near the construction site that all blasting which was conducted to level to site was done so in a manner to ensure no damage to either buildings or individuals.

Upon departing the runway site we were then driven to a training school which was established on the airport site and is operated by a team of Cuban and Grenadian instructors. It was explained that recruits for driving, mechanic, drill operator and equipment operator are given instruction in safety and theory for a period of 2 to 6 weeks after which practical training commences. Truck drivers are required a minimum of 6 weeks training and are required to have a Grenada drivers license and minimum of three years driving experience before they are accepted.

Mr. Smith stated that there are currently 250 Cuban workers and 360 Grenadian workers employed on the entire airport project:

(1) Contractors; Plessey Airports, Ltd., United Kingdom; Tompson, CSF, France; Metex, Ltd. Finland.

Items being negotiated: radio and communications equipment; navigational aid equipment; lighting facilities for the runway; fire engines; fitting for the terminal.

Calivigny Inlet site visit

I personally visited the site of the proposed submarine or naval base. I rode up the dirt road for about 1 mile prior to reaching the restricted area. Camp Feldon, a military installation, is located in this restricted area. The camp is where firing practices, a public announcement is made over the local radio station to warn fishermen to stay out of the area.

On the eastern side, I noticed a paved road leading to the point, Ft. Jeudy. On the western side, I noticed several members of the Peoples Revolutionary Army alongside the road as well as what appeared to be army barracks.

My visit to the site, the Calivigny Inlet, showed no construction nor shipping. The area has an unrestricted sea coast with no posted restricted area, except for the west side of Egmont Harbor, into which the inlet runs, which again, is the location of Camp Feldon. I rode alongside Egmont Harbor and noticed many well-kept homes with views of this entire area. It clearly isn't hidden. This inlet was too shallow to admit boats larger than schooners. I was told that the government may develop this area as a yacht marina.

Upon my request, I was driven up the paved road to Ft. Jeudy and noticed several large homes owned by both Granadians and foreigners. I stood at the point of Ft. Jeudy and could see with no obstacles, the entire Calivigny Inlet, including Egmont Harbor and Camp Feldon. The residential areas of Lans Aux Pines and Westerhall were both visible.

There were no signs of any construction or naval activity, nor did my findings and

observations conclude that this is a tightly restricted area for use by the Cubans or Soviets. Factual information about this area was readily available.

My staff and I departed Grenada on April 15. Upon our arrival in Barbados I had an opportunity to pay a courtesy call to our representative to the Eastern Caribbean. In the absence of Ambassador Milan Bish, Deputy Ambassador Ludlow Flowers and I had an extremely stimulating and interesting exchange on the important events and issues regarding the region: the President's recent visit to Barbados, the Caribbean Basin Initiative and the state of United States-Grenada relations.

VIEWS—UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

During the past 5 years, the Caribbean has become a region of increasingly political and strategic interest. In his statement to members of the board of Trustees of the Caribbean Central American Action in 1980, former President Jimmy Carter stated that the economies of this area are quite vulnerable to the intrusion of alien forces which have created an open avenue for Cuban adventurism. President Reagan, in his February 24, 1982 speech to the Organization of American States stated "The well-being and security of our neighbors in this region are in our own vital interest".

The Caribbean Basin Initiative is the United States response to the political, military and economic needs of the Caribbean. It is my contention that this response was totally inappropriate and did not speak to the economic and social needs of the region. It spoke to the military and security needs of Central America, specifically El Salvador. The Congressional Black Caucus, of which I am a member, presented testimony to the subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade and the subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs which outlined specific issues which require critical examination in this initiative. Specifically, of extreme concern was the exclusion of certain Caribbean countries, including Grenada, due to ideological differences.

With regard to Grenada, President Reagan characterized it as a totalitarian left government and while in Barbados during his recent vacation, stated that Grenada "now bears the Soviet and Cuban trademark, which means that it will attempt to spread the virus among its neighbors." According to press accounts, the President indicated that Grenada's inclusion in the Caribbean Basin Initiative would require a change in policies and behavior.

As I have stated before in this report, of extreme concern to the United States is the construction of a new international airport in Grenada. Official and unofficial reports have stated that this airport is being built by the Cubans for military rather than tourism purposes.

Taking the above views of the United States goverment into account, I believed that it was critical that the Armed Services committee and the United States Congress be presented a factual report on Grenada and its perceived military threat to this country.

Although the Grenadians consider this the most important project in their history, the United States response came swiftly and angrily, denouncing the new airport as a military project, the brainchild of Cuba who would wish to use it as a Soviet launch site. In the fall of 1980 the Reagan Administration cited the Grenada Revolution as indeed a case of Soviet-Cuban aggression in the Western Hemisphere when the Grenadian-Cuban cooperation on the airport project began. According to the Administration this was a cooperation of "Cuban expansionism." The State Department and the Pentagon have described the airport as "airfield much larger than the small islands' tourist industry will require" and assert that "with its strategic location, the airfield could serve as a staging area and refueling stop for Cuban troops on the way to Africa or South America and another Soviet base in the Western Hemisphere capable of servicing Soviet bombers, including the new supersonic backfire." (1. film "Attack on the Americas," produced by the American Security Council Foundation; quotes by State Department and Pentagon experts). There was no mention, however, that six Eastern Caribbean islands have airports of equal or greater size or that Cuban troops have been reaching Africa since 1975 without any assistance from Grenada. (Attachment I and IA airport lengths of other islands).

The United States government also attempted to levy pressure on its western allies to boycott a co-financing conference held in Brussels in April 1982. However, all scheduled representatives attended the meeting and most of the requested funds for further development of the airport were pledged by Scandinavia, Nigeria and the EEC (European Economic Community). Claude Cheysson, Commissioner for Developing Countries, described Grenada's request for aid as "entirely normal". The only abnormal thing is the American interest. . . . This decision is a decision for the EEC and Grenada." (See attachment II—list of contributors) (See attachment II-A—list of contributors).

The Administration's attempt to economically squeeze Grenada has drawn criticism from diverse sectors. The Caribbean Conference of Churches as well as the 12 countries of CARICOM of the English speaking Caribbean issued statements of strong condemnation against the United States. Also, 61 member countries of the African, Caribbean and Pacific States (ACP) endorsed a resolution supporting construction of Grenada's international airport and denounced United States pressure against the project.

Based on my own experience while in Grenada, the most determined supporters of the airport are the Grenadian people themselves, who have purchased $850,000 (EC) worth of airport bonds to help finance the construction and have formed local airport development committees to help raise funds. Pledges have come from every sector of the society: unions, farmers, women, youth, and the Church and community groups. (Attachment III—airport bond) Members of my staff attended a fundraiser sponsored by the Women's Airport Development Committee on Sunday, April 11. They noted, during a briefing session afterward, that a broad based and diverse sector of the population participated in this event. Of particular interest to the staff was the active participation of Grenada's elderly ie. selling tickets, serving food, greeting guests, and accompanying newcomers around the airport complex.

OBSERVATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on my personal observations, discussions and analysis of the new international airport under construction in Grenada, it is my conclusion that this project is specifically, now and has always been for the purpose of the economic development of Grenada and IS NOT intended for military use as has been stated by United States Administration officials. Given the facts and figures as presented by our own military experts and by the Grenadians as well, it is my thought that it is absurd, patronizing and totally unwarranted for the United States Government to charge that this airport is for military purposes and a threat to our national security. Moreover, the use of such allegations by the United States as the basis for a foreign policy of confrontation toward Grenada is counterproductive. Inasmuch as the United States has not and does not intend to contribute financially or otherwise to the construction of the airport and given that this airport does not and will not threaten the United States or her allies (within the hemisphere or elsewhere), it is my contention that our government should be officially unconcerned with the airport in Grenada.

The economic and social development of this tiny, poor island nation will depend in large on the completion of this airport and the United States should in no way attempt to undermine Grenada's pursuit of further development. The long range impact of this project for Grenada's economy far extends the short term rhetoric that is exhibited toward the initiative. Having witnessed the construction process and the commitment of the workers and that of the Government and peoples of Grenada I am convinced of its economic importance. I am, further, in agreement with others of the international community, the EEC, the World Bank and all who have studied, at length, the feasibility of this project, that this new airport is a priority undertaking for the survival of the country. It in addition, in my opinion provides the greatest development potential for Grenada.

President Reagan in his February 24 statement to the Organization of American States stated that Grenada is a "totalitarian left regime" and while in Barbados during the same period as my fact finding trip to Grenada, stated that Grenada is a country that "now bears the Soviet-Cuban trademark, which means that it will attempt to spread the virus among its neighbors". It is my contention that such rhetoric is apparently used to enhance the validity of the allegations regarding military development. Based on my briefings by both the Commanders of the Atlantic Fleet and the Air Defense Command who emphatically assured me that the airport under construction in Grenada is of no military consequence to the United States, my question to my colleagues is why then the continued rhetoric against Grenada? It seems obvious that there are far more underlying circumstances that surround the issue of United States-Grenada relations than meet the eye.

It is my sincere hope that my colleagues of the Armed Services Committee and of Congress at large will read, assess and evaluate this report and use it as a basis for a critique of the Administration's hostile and hegemonistic policy toward Grenada. More importantly, I hope it will be used as a foundation for a more constructive, conciliatory policy toward a tiny island nation that is deserving of not only the assistance and cooperation of the United States but also of our friendship.

I wish to thank the Chairman, the Commanders of the Atlantic Fleet and Air Defense Command, the Government and People of Grenada for providing me the opportunity to fully evaluate the military aspects and concerns regarding the construction of the international airport in Grenada. Further, I appreciate the opportunity to present my findings and analyses and more

importantly hope that this mission will serve as a precedent for others to seek the truth, present fair and constructive arguments against unfounded and unwarranted misconceptions, and attempt to educate the American public on all aspects of the issues.

[Attachment No. 1]

ANNOTATED DATA ON SELECTED CARIBBEAN AIRPORTS

Destination	Area (square miles)	Population	Runway length	Runway width
Antigua	108	70,000	9,000	150
Aruba	70	66,000	8,997	148
Bahamas	4,405	210,000	11,000	150
Curacao	210	156,000	11,187	197
Dominican Republic	18,817	4,836,000	11,000	197
Guadeloupe	530	327,000	11,499	148
Jamaica	4,411	2,072,000	8,565	150
Martinique	1,100	325,000	10,827	148
Puerto Rico	3,500	3,210,000	10,002	200
St. Lucia	238	120,000	9,000	150
Trinidad	1,980	1,100,000	9,500	150
Venezuela	352,140	12,361,000	11,483	148
Barbados	166	259,000	11,000	150
Grenada	133	120,000	[1] 5,250	NA
			[1] 9,000	150

[1] New.

Source: Caribbean tourism demand study (1980)—Steinenberger.

ANNEX I

It is clear from the examples of Caribbean territories quoted that a definite correlation exists between access to international flights, direct connections to major markets, and accelerated growth of tourist arrivals to those territories.

All of the islands quoted have had direct connections from international airlines from their major markets, who have the necessary airport facilities to service tourist arrivals adequately.

On the other side of the coin, as detailed below, are the TDD's (touristically disadvantaged destinations)—as they have been designated in volume I of the European Tourism Demand Study "Accessibility: No gateway airports for flights" in the common denominator which identified a TDD. These statements are borne out by the figures quoted hereafter.

Country	Size (square kilometers)	Population	Tourist arrivals 1979	Transportation
Antigua	280	70,000	99,536	"International airport with 9,000 ft runway of sufficient capacity and adequate service quality with international connections."
Aruba	182	66,000	185,141	"Very attractive international airport (9,000 ft runway) with ground-handling facilities and terminal."
Bahamas	11,405	225,000	1,129,430	"International airports in Nassau (11,000 ft runway) and Freeport additionally 25 smaller airports and airstrip air taxi services. Good air connections to U.S., Canada and Europe."
Barbados	430	250,500	370,915	"Large international airport with 11,000 ft runway * * *." "Direct connections from Europe and North America."
Bonaire	311	9,000	19,696	"Airport expansion * * * with construction of extended runway to 2,483 for direct access to U.S. markets. Quality and capacity of the facilities are excellent * * *." N.B. It may be of interest that Bonaire possesses a foot of runway for every member of its population.
Cayman Islands	264	14,000	100,527	"* * * airport with 6,000 ft runway. * * * new airport in planning."
Curacao	544	158,000	[1] 200,000	"International airport with 11,200 ft runway accommodating wide bodied aircraft. Terminal facilities sufficient."
Dominican Republic	48,734	5,000,000	342,578	"Two international airports provide good accessibility to North American market and to Europe via Madrid."
Guadeloupe	1,373	327,000	[1] 225,000	"Large international airport with a runway of 11,500 ft suitable for all aircraft with good capacity and standard in terminal for passenger and luggage handling."
Jamaica	11,425	2,000,000	426,540	"Two international airports (Kingston and Montego Bay) and 5 smaller airports provide good air accessibility and facilities."
Martinique	2,849	325,000	159,379	"Large international airport with 11,000 ft runway for all aircraft with full technical navigational equipment. The large terminal meets capacity and quality demands."
Puerto Rico	9,065	3,200,000	1,661,971	"International airport at San Juan with 10,000 ft runway. Seven national airports provide intra-Puerto Rico scheduled service and additionally there are four general aviation airports and eight private airports for taxi services."
St. Kitts/Nevis	262	49,000	25,074	"International airport with runway of 8,200 ft and a new modern terminal building."
St. Lucia	617	120,000	[1] 80,000	"International airport with 9,000 ft runway on southern tip and a regional airport north of Castries."
Trinidad and Tobago	5,128	1,100,000	[1] 200,000	"International airport in Trinidad with a 9,500 ft runway equiped for wide-bodied aircraft. Smaller airport in Tobago with 6,000 ft runway * * *."
Venezuela	912,041	12,300,000	[1] 850,000	"International gateway airport with 11,500 ft runway and good connections to South America, North America and Europe. Airport facilities are modern and adequate."
Touristically disadvantaged destination:				
Grenada	345	110,000	29,300	"Regional airport in North-East with a runway of 5,250 ft suitable for smaller planes and day-time operations only." "Regional carrier has booking, reservations and re-confirmation difficulties."
Dominica	790	77,000	20,111	"Small airport for regional travel in North-East of island with 4,800 ft runway. Carrier experienced reservation, booking and re-confirmation difficulties."

[1] Estimate.

[Attachment No. 2]

AID CONTRIBUTORS FOR INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

(1) Cuba, (US) $33.6 million (material and technical aid).

(2) Libya, (US) $4.0 million (cash).

(3) Syria, (US) $2.0 million (cash).

(4) Iraq, (US) $2.0 million (cash).

(5) ECGD, (US) $12.0 million (loan). (Consortium of Export Credit Agencies approved by the British Government.)

(6) Venezuela, (EC) $0.4 million (petroleum products, 10,000 barrels of diesel fuel, asphalt.

(7) Algeria (US) $6.0 million.

NOTE.—Airport bonds bought in both England and the U.S. by Grenadian nationals, $108.0 mil. (EC). Airport bond sold locally in Grenada—$850,000 (EC)

[Attachment No. 3]

PROSPECTUS

The List of Applications will be opened at 10 o'clock on 1st December, 1979 and will remain open until the issue is subscribed or until further notice.

GRENADA GOVERNMENT—INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT

6% Bonds 1999/2000.

Issue of $10,000,000 U.S. Authorized under the Loan (Development) Act, 1974. Interest payable on 31st May and 30th November of each year. Price of issue—100 percent.

The Government of Grenada invites applications for Grenada 6% development bonds as indicated above.

Purposes: The proceeds of the loan will be applied for the purposes set out hereunder namely: Schedule, Section 5(1): Construction of International Airport—EC $30,000,000.

Denominations: The bonds will be of the denominations of $10, $50, $100, $500, $10,000, $25,000, $50,000 and $100,000.

Interest: Interest will be payable half-yearly by bearer coupons (attached to the bonds) on 31st May and 30th November of each year.

Coupons will be encashed on presentation at the Treasury, St. George's.

The principal and interest thereon will not be subject to any taxes, duties or levies of the Government of Grenada.

[Attachment No. 4]

AIRPORT AT POINT SALINES

MISCELLANEOUS ESTIMATES OF COST

[Excluding cost of land]

Year and report	Estimated cost
1955—Report on new airport for Grenada and St Vincent by Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Partners, consulting engineers: Runway 4,800 ft. long	£600,000
1967—Study paper on airports for Leeward and Windward Islands by Department of Transport, Canada:	
A. Runway, 5,500 ft. runway	Can$4,940,000
B. Runway, 7,500 ft. runway	Can$8,741,000
C. Runway, 9,000 ft. runway	Can$11,042,000
1969—Grenada airport, economic and technical feasibility study by Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick & Partners and the Economist Intelligence Unit:	
1st stage, 5,800 ft	£4,523,000
2d stage, 7,800 ft.	£4,073,000
Subtotal	£8,596,000
1981—Point Salines International Airport project: EDC Consultancy, SOFREAVIA, Paris	[1] US$70,988,800

[1] Including cost of land.

[Attachment No. 5A]

STATE DEPARTMENT BRIEFING MATERIALS

U.S. RELATIONS WITH THE EASTERN CARIBBEAN

Our relations with all of the democratic governments of the Eastern Caribbean (EC) are friendly and range from good to excellent. The islands are generally supportive of

our basic interests in the region which include the maintenance of democratic, friendly governments and the denial of influence in the EC to powers hostile to the U.S. We maintain a policy of distancing ourselves from Grenada, the only Marxist-oriented, totalitarian government in the Eastern.

As the islands are gaining independence, the UK is steadily withdrawing from the region. Barbados, the most stable, prosperous and democratic of the mini-states, has repeatedly affirmed its desire to work closely with the U.S. to develop an effective security capability and a regional economic program.

Beginning in December 1979, the Eastern Caribbean witnessed a series of elections which brought to power moderate-to-conservative, pro-U.S. governments. These elections clearly were a rejection of leftist parties embracing closer ties with Cuba and Grenada. They were also a reaffirmation of West Indian support for moderate, pro-U.S. parties reflecting recognition of the increased level of U.S. aid and attention to and support for the region. The principal questions regarding our relations with the Eastern Caribbean are whether this relatively stable political environmental will endure and what policy options can most effectively be utilized to ensure continued, if not enhanced, stability in the area.

[Attachment No. 5B]

EASTERN CARIBBEAN: ECONOMIC OVERVIEW

The Eastern Caribbean islands of St. Kitts-Nevis, Anguilla, Antigua, Montserrat, Dominica, St. Lucia and St. Vincent vary in population from 12,000 to 120,000. The largest island (Dominica) has a land area of 750 square kilometers.

The Eastern Caribbean islands differ considerably in their stages of development, but share a common British Commonwealth tradition, and seek to work together in such areas as common government services to minimize inherent smallness of scale difficulties.

Unemployment, approaching 50 percent among young adults in some islands, is a chronic problem throughout the Eastern Caribbean. Private sector production is hampered by small domestic markets, expensive and irregular transport, the emigration of skilled workers, and a paucity of medium-to-long-term financing for new productive enterprises. As a result, insufficient revenue has been generated to fund basic recurrent government services. In some of the islands, infrastructure deficiencies, and the difficulty of maintaining existing infrastructure, are a factor in developing the domestic private sector and attracting foreign investment. Domestic policies in such areas as interest rates, and land tenure have also been important constraints. The perilous state of the islands' economies has fueled political instability.

Fortunately, some of the islands have recently shown some success in attracting non-traditional export industries, in part due to favorable low wages and tax holidays granted by the Eastern Caribbean governments. Their ability to attract further such industries, and to reverse a decade-long decline in agricultural production, is regarded as key to addressing the pressing economic problems of unemployment and a heavy reliance on imported-foodstuffs. In addition, the islands do possess considerable tourism potential which might be exploited with greater promotion efforts and better transportation facilities.

Recognizing the serious economic difficulties of the Eastern Caribbean islands, they have recently drawn increased foreign donor focus, particularly by the US, the UK, Canada and the EEC. While this donor activity has helped to buttress the democratically-elected Eastern Caribbean governments, it has just begun to stimulate the private sector, which is vitally needed to generate employment and sustained growth.

[Attachment No. 5D]

U.S. 1980 IMPORTS FROM CARIBBEAN BASIN COUNTRIES

[In millions of dollars]

Country	Total	GSP actual	Dutiable	(1)	(2)
Netherlands Antilles	$2,537	$4	$2,432	$4	$4
Trinidad and Tobago	2,385	4	2,306	2	1
Bahamas	1,373	6	1,323	61	61
Dominican Republic	790	51	397	397	308
Guatemala	431	87	83	64	56
El Salvador	426	19	117	117	98
Honduras	418	63	103	103	90
Jamaica	379	29	35	35	21
Costa Rica	357	56	114	114	75
Panama	330	62	43	28	27
Haiti	253	35	174	174	102
Nicaragua	214	15	102	102	88
Guyana	120	34	8	8	5
Suriname	109	19	0.2	0.2	0.2
Barbados	96	42	52	52	36
Belize	58	33	19	19	9
St. Christopher-Nevis-Anguilla	12	8	4	4	2
British Virgin Islands	10	2	8		
Saint Lucia	7		7	7	6
Turks and Cayman Islands	6	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Antigua	3		3	3	
Dominica, Grenada, Saint Vincent, Montserrat	2	0.1	0.5	0.5	0.4
Totals	10,314	570	7,330	1,293	989
Percent of total imports	100.0	5.5	71.1	12.5	9.6

[1] Dutiable excl. petroleum.
[2] Dutiable excl. petroleum and textiles.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, April 1980.

(Following are remarks by President Jimmy Carter at a White House reception, to members of the board of trustees of the Caribbean/Central American Action, April 9, 1980.)

We have before us an exciting and extremely important new enterprise. I know you've spent time today discussing what might be accomplished in the future and some of the elements that comprise the circumstances under which we will be working together, not only among ourselves but with literally thousands of other Americans who share our interest in the Caribbean region, including the islands and the countries of Central America.

Tonight marks what I think will be a significant new effort to forge bonds of friendship between the people of the United States of America and our neighbors to the south. Bob Graham has named this group Caribbean/Central American Action, and the emphasis, as you well know, is on the word "action." This is important to us, because what we do will go far beyond good intentions or even good speeches or public statements. We're looking for results, exemplified by lasting friendships both between nations and between people.

This action group represents a coming together of two concerns: first, our shared concern about the vital importance of the entire Caribbean region—that concern and interest has been growing lately—and secondly, a recognition that the friendship on a people-to-people basis must be the foundation for any progress that we envision taking place.

Let me say just a few words about each one of these aspects of our interest. The United States is one of large number of nations and peoples who are washed by the waters of the Caribbean. We are a Caribbean nation just as surely as we are an Atlantic nation or a Pacific nation. Geographically, it's not only the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, but it's also other States as well; Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas are Caribbean States.

The cultures of our regions enrich one another—language, shared music, a common interest in sports, a common historical background, a common realization of the opportunities for the future. The ties of blood kinship are very strong, and this can be a basis on which we predicate future progress. Members of the same immediate family share citizenship and residence here in our country and citizenship and residence in every other one of the nations in the Caribbean region.

We recognize the extreme strategic importance of the region. This is not of importance only to the United States, but every one of the nations in whom we are interested also must share that common strategic interest and importance. Our security is related one to another.

The waters of the Caribbean touch more than 20 independent nations and more than a half-dozen dependencies. And as you know, the formation of new nations has been an almost explosive and a very exciting event in the last few years, and in the next few years as well. Except for us and Venezuela, Mexico, and Colombia, the other nations are relatively small, but each one is important in its own right.

The economies of this area are quite vulnerable to international or global price structures and actions taken on a multinational basis outside the region. Many of these countries are heavily dependent on one or two or very few commodities. And when the prices for their products are set outside the borders of their own country, there is a tendency to blame all domestic problems on outside forces. This causes people to want to lash out or to distrust outsiders. It creates instability, and it also makes possible the intrusion of alien forces into a country who do not have the best interests of the people as a prime consideration.

The exploitation of dissatisfaction and the desire for change is a recognized fact. These factors have created an open avenue for Cuban adventurism—a Cuba supported by and encouraged by, financed by the Soviet Union. We tend to misunderstand the threat of Cuba. Certainly they contribute to violence and instability in the Caribbean region, but the real threat of Cuba is that they claim to offer a model to be emulated by people who are dissatisfied with their own lot or who are struggling to change things for the better. Cuba's promise, as you well know, is an empty one, just as Cuba's claimed independence is a myth. The inability of Cuban leaders to breathe one critical word of Soviet imperialism, even refraining from criticizing the Soviets' actual invasion of Afghanistan, shows a total absence of independence on the part of Cuba.

As you know, the Soviets prop up Cuba's bankrupt economy with an infusion of several millions of dollars every day. Moveover, Cuba is the only nation on Earth, I believe, that is more dependent on one major commodity now than it was 20 years ago. The stagnation there is debilitating indeed. And we see the hunger of many people on that

island to escape political deprivation of freedom and also economic adversity. Our heart goes out to the almost 10,000 freedom loving Cubans who entered a temporarily opened gate at the Peruvian Embassy just within this week.

We have a concern, yes, about Cuba's threatening role in the Caribbean, but our overriding interest is not to respond to threats of this kind. Our overriding interest must be the well-being, the unselfish relationship between Americans of all kinds and the people who live in that troubled region, but important region.

They're not the only ones who are troubled. Our country, as you well know, shares the same problems, the same troubles of excessive dependence on outside energy, on excessive inflation rates, on relatively high unemployment rates, on a common desire for security, on a struggle to exemplify in our own lives the principles and ideals which we hold so precious. We're not a big brother setting a perfect example in a perfect society for others who are less fortunate than we. We share with our neighbors to the south the same basic problems and also, most importantly, the same basic opportunities.

This is a time when people who suffer under dictatorships of the left and the right want a free voice to express their displeasure and their urging for change, and we are concerned when they're deprived of a right to speak or to act in their own best interest.

Democracy is a vital force in the Caribbean region. We want to encourage that vital force. We've seen tangible evidence in the Caribbean and the South American region of an improvement in the turning toward democracy by many peoples there; in the Dominican Republic, for instance, in the 1976 election—first time in the history of that country when there had been a peaceful change of administration brought about by open and free elections. In Saint Vincent and Saint Kitts/Nevis, the recent elections have also demonstrated that democracy works. In some, there've been temporary setbacks—in Suriname and in Grenada, for instance—but we hope that that interruption will be temporary.

I'd like to say that Central America, as contrasted with the Caribbean, is going through an even more turbulent time right now, when political polarization increases. The advocates of peaceful and democratic change become the targets of both extremes from the right and the left. This is happening in El Salvador. We're deeply concerned about occurrences there. It could happen in other places. The Government of El Salvador is struggling with some very significant reforms in land ownership—one of the most sweeping land reform efforts that I have ever witnessed. And of course we know that this is an effort that both extremes of the right and left would like to see fail.

The challenge to us is to refrain from unwarranted intervention in the internal affairs of any other country, but in a completely proper and open way to help those who want to improve their own lifestyle, their own freedom, and their own economic well-being.

We ourselves are undergoing very rapid change. We're trying to reverse our dependence on imported oil. We are one of the players on the international scene, along with other countries. We're seeking to alter our ideas and develop better relationships with countries in the developing world. Throughout my own Presidency, we have increased our interest in democratic principles, human rights, and the individuality and the recognition of the importance of each particular country in this troubled region.

Since I was inaugurated, we have more than doubled aid to the Caribbean region. When the Congress completes action on the present aid program, which I think will pass, we will have nearly quadrupled our aid to Central America. And as you all know, this is a time of extraordinary budgetary restraint.

In addition to these bilateral efforts, we have encouraged the formation and worked very closely with 30 other nations and 15 international institutions to provide additional economic help for the Caribbean region—working with the World Bank and others. Multilateral assistance has increased fourfold between 1976 and 1980, from $110 million to more than $400 million in that brief period of time.

In short, we have put a high priority on a better aid program for the Caribbean region and for Central America. Our values and our concerns require that we play an active role in this region. We've done a lot as a government. I need not go down any more details, but I would like to say that the relationship between our countries is shaped very slightly by actual, tangible, definite government action.

In many nations of the south, the "U.S. Government" itself is at least partially suspect—likely without good reason, on occasion with reason. And that's what makes it so important for us to expand what the Government can do in a limited way at the Federal level and encompass other elements of American life who can act more definitively and more effectively to magnify the beneficial influence of our great country among the nations and the peoples in the Caribbean region.

The talent, the scientific knowledge, the eductional ability, the wealth, the technology of our country is not focused in the Federal Government. It's focused in farmers and workers and businesses and universities, in local governments; it's focused in churches; it's focused among civic groups who have a benevolent character. This is where the real strength of our country lies, and this is an opportunity for tapping the treasure of what the United States is to reach the goals that you are defining in this new entity. That's why we're here today.

I might say that we don't want to supplant the outstanding groups already devoted to similar purposes. We are not going to create a new bureaucracy. We're going to try to coordinate, as best we can, those groups already doing such a wonderful job, build on them, and bring in other thousands of Americans to help us with this common purpose. We're interested in dignity, development, and democracy.

Dignity, to be derived in the hearts and minds of hundreds of thousands of our neighbors who know for a fact, because we are sincere, that we value them, that we want them to have a better life, that we want them to trust us with good reason, not because we have any selfish intent to exploit them as a customer or even as a political ally, but because we know for certain that they and we share common opportunities and common purposes.

Development, not in the form of huge projects perhaps, but community-type interrelationships that can be derived only with a clear understanding of their opportunities and their needs—here again, there is no way to separate the mutuality of benefit to be derived.

And democracy, not trying to foist on others an exact replica of our own government, but to demonstrate by how we act and what we do that our way of life, based on freedom, based on the value of the individual, is worthy of free adoption by others through their own exercise of their own judgment.

Many of you have spent a good part of the day discussing these issues; I know that. But we ought not to forget that everyone here ought to be the core of an enlarging group to encourage diversity of ideas and actions. Each one of you can very quckly think of 10 different organizations or 100 different people that might very well be interested in a particular aspect of people-to-people relationships that would build on friendship, or a business or other relationship that would give us mutually a better life. And I hope that the universities and the churches and the professional groups and others will search diligently for new opportunities for the future.

I happen to be particularly interested in the Friendship Force, because Rosalynn and I organized it while I was Governor of Georgia. We had a sister state in Latin America, and we would send back and forth every year two or three hundred Georgians to live in private homes, and that same state would send two or three hundred of their people to live in the private homes in Georgia. It never got a nickel of any government money, and it provided an exciting new dimension of knowledge of one another. And we've tried to bring that now to the Federal level.

Obviously, there are many other ideas that can be built upon or created. The Partners of the Americas have tremendous experience that can permeate this entire organization, all aspects of what we do, for the better. And of course, the Sister Cities program is another than can be expanded rapidly to encompass the people who live in the Caribbean region. A mission on agriculture is now underway, with Dr. E. T. York heading it up. And I hope that all these groups and many others will make a beneficial impact among our people and to the south.

The last point I want to make is this: We ought always to remember and let our thoughts and our actions exemplify the fact that the benefits to be derived are reciprocal. We're not embarking on this effort to do other people a favor as a handout from a more rich and more powerful neighbor. We should remember that this is a two-way street or a three-way street. We could get many people involved in these kinds of programs. It's a mutual exchange. If we are to speak to others, then we must be equally eager to listen. If we are to teach, we must be equally eager to learn. And if we are to deliver, then we must also be willing to receive, which may perhaps be the most difficult of all.

I've written every one of the heads of state in this region. I've met with several groups here at the White House and over in the Cabinet Room. The response has been very enthusiastic. I think the Caribbean, including us and other nations, are ready for accomplishment of these goals. We want to reach out and make sure that we don't fail.

This is a time when we can let this effort exemplify the finest aspects of American life. And if and when our effort is successful, then it can serve as a pattern, modified considerably or slightly, for the beneficial extension of American hands of warmth and hearts of friendship to other people throughout the world. It's kind of a test

case. With your leadership and your support, with full participation by me when you request and the entire administration here, I have no doubt that we will succeed.

This is not a government program; it is your program. And I hope that each one of you will feel equally as responsible for leadership and for inspiration and for innovation as I myself feel or as your leader, Bob Graham, feels. There is no limit to what we can achieve together, and I stand ready and eager to help in any way possible.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 20, 1981]

U.S. PRESSES EEC TO REFUSE AID FOR LEFTIST GRENADA

(By Karen DeYoung)

The Reagan administration has made a second attempt to persuade the European Economic Community to withhold aid from a Third World country because of U.S. political and strategic concerns.

In an action that has irritated some of the 10 member countries of the Common Market, a U.S. official was sent to the organization's headquarters in Brussels last week to try to head off possible community assistance to Grenada, a small Caribbean island whose government has close ties to Cuba.

Possible differences of view with the Reagan administration on Central American policy were also apparent in a decision announced Tuesday by the Common Market countries to resume aid to El Salvador through the International Red Cross after a month-long break triggered by a U.S. request to shut off supplies that might fall into the hands of guerrillas fighting El Salvador's government.

Asked about the approach to Europe on the issue of Grenada, a U.S. official said that the United States, although not an EEC member, can express its views to the organization on "something which, because of its implications, [involves] more than just economic interests." A number of the European allies, the official said, share the U.S. view, and "we're not the only ones to be concerned."

The official declined to be identified and would not comment on the level at which the diplomatic presentation was made.

U.S. relations with Grenada have been cool since shortly after a group of young leftists ousted the island's longtime autocratic ruler two years ago. The level of bilateral rhetoric has increased over the past year. The United States has charged the government of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop with curtailing civil rights and turning the country into a militarized Cuban pawn. Bishop has accused Washington of trying to destabilize the island through economic warfare and the promotion of counterrevolutionary forces.

Although some EEC members are known to disagree with the U.S. assessment of the situation, others particularly the British, who maintain active involvement among former colonies in the region, have consulted closely with the administration on problems in the Caribbean. But the organization feels that such bilateral concerns should not enter into decisions that, under its own regulations, are strictly economic.

More important, administration efforts to influence EEC decisions are viewed as unseemly attempts at intervention that are likely to create strains across the Atlantic by compromising the Common Market's relation with the Third World.

Last month, in what was described as a virtually unprecedented request casting doubt on the independence of the Common Market's aid channels, the administration asked the organization to free more than $1 million in emergency food and medical shipments to El Salvador on grounds that it might fall into the hands of leftist guerrillas there.

The EEC imposed a month-long moratorium on such shipments, but resumed funding for aid to El Salvador after seeing a Red Cross report that indicated the aid would be delivered to the intended recipients.

While there is no war under way in Grenada, a small island northwest of Venezuela, the administration maintains that EEC assistance on an airport construction program would help further what it says are Cuba's "expansionist" aims in the Caribbean basin.

Grenada is a signatory to the Lome Convention, a trade and aid pact that joins the Common Market to 60 Third World countries in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific. Under the terms of the pact, the EEC guarantees fixed amounts of development assistance to member nations that propose feasible economic development projects.

The Grenadan government has asked for EEC help in completing a new airport, now under construction.

GRENADA—THREAT TO AMERICA'S CARIBBEAN OIL ROUTES

(By Timothy Ashby)

The repudiation of Cuban-style Marxism by Jamaica and other Caribbean mini-states in their 1980 elections has stimulated a reappraisal of this region's strategic importance by American defense and political analysts. Although the general pro-Western political shift has eased State Department fears about a galaxy of Castroite satellites in America's "back yard", Washington should not be lulled into ignoring a Soviet/Cuban bastion of growing importance in the southern Caribbean just ninety miles off the coast of Venezuela. This Cuban-controlled base is the island of Grenada—strategically placed in the heart of one of the richest oil-producing regions in the Western Hemisphere.

CUBAN-BACKED REVOLUTION

Grenada, with a total land area of 120 square miles and a population of 110,000, became independent from Great Britain in 1974. In March 1979, a successful coup d'etat was mounted by thirty members of the New Jewel Movement—a Marxist political party led by Maurice Bishop and Bernard Coard, two native lawyers who held Opposition seats in the Grenadian parliament. Their new regime was named The People's Revolutionary Government.

The revolutionaries had been trained and equipped by the Cuban intelligence agency DCI, and several Cuban operatives took part in the putsch. Within two weeks of the overthrow, Soviet Antonov An-12 transport aircraft had landed three thousand stands of AK-47 rifles. SA-7 Grail surface-to-air missiles and tons of other military equipment to outfit the newly formed People's Revolutionary Army and People's Militia. The PRA and PM were organized along textbook Soviet lines by Cuban military instructors who remained in Grenada following the initial training program, to become permanent officers and NCO's.

In December 1979, a 250-man Cuban construction battalion arrived on the island to begin work on what was publicized as a "new International Airport" to be built at Point Saline, a peninsula on Grenada's south coast. The Cubans were accompanied by 103 pieces of new Soviet construction and earthmoving equipment, including KrAZ seven-ton trucks, T-100M3 tractors and GAZ-66 mobile command post vehicles—the latter serving as offices at Point Saline.

Under the direction of Soviet and East German engineers, the Cubans constructed a military-style camp on the airport site consisting of 18 Pre-fabricated wooden barracks designed to house forty men each. The "International Airport" has 2,800-meter runways that could be extended to 3,300 meters. After clearing and leveling the "international Airport" site, the Cubans directed their efforts towards the construction of a 1,600-meter airstrip some two miles away. Grenada's only surviving newspapers, the Free West Indian and the New Jewel—both owned by the People's Revolutionary Government and seemingly written by propagandists from Granma and Pravdo—originally announced that this short airstrip was to be the site of "government housing for the poor." Two weeks later it suddenly became a "new highway to our International Airport" (paralleling the two-lane, dual-carriageway True Blue road some fifty meters away). The latest press releases refer to the nearly completed Cuban construction as "an executive airstrip for government officials and businessmen."

Executive airstrip? The only government or private aircraft permanently based on Grenada are a Cheyenne II loaned to Prime Minister Maurice Bishop by Fidel Castro and a Beechcraft owned by St. George's University Medical School. These are parked at Pearls Airport on Grenada's northeast coast—a perfectly adequate strip for smaller aircraft which has served as Grenada's tourist airport since World War II.

NAVAL BASE

The two airfields are not the only Cuban construction projects. There is also a maritime facility going up along the shores of Egmont Harbour, a deep-water hurricane haven two and a half miles north of Point Saline. Yachting and naval experts consider Egmont Harbour one of the finest protected anchorages in the southern Caribbean. Here, the Cubans have erected six barracks, a machine shop, a large bunker, and a new road connecting the facility to Grenada's coastal highway. A pile-driving barge is at work building a substantial jetty.

Egmont Harbour is surrounded by Calivigny Point, the site of Grenada's main military base. The encampment houses some four hundred personnel, including two platoons of Soviet Army "advisers" who are rotated bimonthly from their parent brigade in Cuba. The approaches to Egmont Harbour are commanded by well-camouflaged batteries of 240-mm mortars and quadruple ZU-23 23-mm antiaircraft guns.

STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE

For all of Grenada's miniscule size, it is viewed as an important addition to the Soviet hegemony by Warsaw Pact strategists. Within a five-hundred-mile radius of the island are oilfields and refineries which currently supply 56 percent of the oil consumed on the eastern seaboard of the United States. During the period January to June 1980, U.S. imports of crude oil alone from Latin America and the Caribbean was 6,011,000 b/d (barrels per day). Individual refined oil production figures of countries falling within a five-hundred-mile radius of Grenada are as follows:

Venezuela, 1,013 thousand b/d;

Netherlands Antilles, 588 thousand b/d;

U.S. Virgin Islands, 504 thousand b/d;
Puerto Rico, 786 thousand b/d;
Trinidad, 235 thousand b/d.

In the Netherlands Antilles, the island of Aruba has an Exxon subsidiary refinery which produces 480,000 b/d. Shell operates a refinery at Emmastaad in Curacao with a capacity of 370,000 b/d, which in turn supplies a Shell one million b/d transshipment terminal on the same island. A second terminal with a capacity of 450,000 b/d is operated in Bonaire by Northville Industries and Paktank.

On St. Lucia, one hundred miles north of Grenada, Amerada Hess has constructed a transshipment terminal with a storage capacity of 15 million barrels; a 250,000 b/d refinery may be added. Hess also operates a 700,000 b/d refinery on St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands, which produces fuel oil chiefly for export to the U.S. east coast.

In 1979, Trinidad imported 141,455 b/d of crude oil for refining and subsequent reexport. The bulk of this crude came from Saudi Arabia (103,840 b/d), all of which was destined for the U.S. market.

In the event of war, this region would be of vital strategic importance to the United States. The destruction of refineries and transshipment terminals coupled with the severing of tanker lanes could cause rapid economic and social chaos in the eastern United States. The Soviets have perceived this for years, along with the fact that their air and naval bases in Cuba, over a thousand miles from Grenada are beyond the range necessary for effective offensive operations in the southeastern Caribbean.

There are currently ten squadrons of Soviet aircraft based in Cuba, including the excellent MiG-27 (NATO designation "Flogger D") and the older Ilyushin II-28 "Beagle" tactical strike aircraft. None of these aircraft have the combat range (600 miles for the MiG-27; 684 miles for the II-28) to allow them to carry out missions against strategic targets in the southern Caribbean from Cuban bases. Even if fuel drop tanks were to be carried, the distance is so great that American and Venezuelan fighters would have ample time to intercept Cuba-based raiders before they could reach their targets.

Grenada provides the perfect solution to this strategic quandary—a mountainous, easily-defended bastion commanding the heart of this rich oil-producing region.

WARTIME HYPOTHESIS

In the event of escalating U.S.-Soviet tensions, which experts on both sides would view as inevitably leading to a military confrontation . . . aircraft could be pre-positioned at Grenada's new "Executive" and "International" airports, both capable of Soviet strike aircraft. This would be in keeping with that facet of current Soviet military strategy which relies on the "Pearl Harbor" principle of simultaneous surprise attacks on key installations to cripple the enemy and cause a scattering of his forces to far-flung defensive positions.

MiG-27's operating from Grenada could strike the totally unprotected refineries in southern Trinidad within ten minutes, based on their operational speeds of 770 to 1,055 miles per hour; the same length of time would be required to destroy the vast Hess oil storage complex in St. Lucia. Similarly, the major Venezuelan oil fields are only seventeen to twenty-five minutes' flying time away, and the essential refineries and storage facilities in the Netherlands Antilles could be reached in about 35 minutes.

Grenada's Egmont Harbour would provide a superb small naval base protected by the nearly encompassing hills from both offshore surveillance and attack. * * *

GRENADA SEEKING CUBAN SYSTEM AND U.S. TOURISTS

(By Barbara Crossette)

ST. GEORGE'S, GRENADA.—The crowd clapped rhythmically and began to sing.

"When the Yankee soldiers come,
When the Yankee soldiers come,
I want to be in the front line,
When the Yankee soldiers come."

Nearly a thousand people had gathered on the waterfront of this island nation's capital to commemorate the death of a local hero. But the occasion rapidly turned into an anti-American rally, reinforcing the belief here that Washington is on the verge of military action against Grenada.

It has been almost three years since a group of young rebels overthrew the government of Sir Eric M. Gairy and began to build a new society, radical in domestic policy and stridently pro-Cuban in foreign affairs.

UNITED STATES WON'T EXCHANGE ENVOYS

Since the coup on March 13, 1979, the United States, under both Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan, has demonstrated its displeasure with events in Grenada by refusing to exchange ambassadors with the Government of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and his New Jewel Party. The State Department says that when Grenada shows signs of returning to democratic principles, better relations can be discussed.

In public speeches, both Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig, Jr. and Thomas O. Enders, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, have portrayed Grenada as a client of Havana and a bad example to the Caribbean.

Meanwhile, the Government here, while continuing to seek normal relations with Washington, has used Washington's policy of "distancing" itself as a basis for the belief that the Reagan Administration is seeking its overthrow.

Information Minister Don Rojas said in an interview that Grenada "takes very seriously" the threat of invasion, citing American military exercises off Puerto Rico last year as evidence that the attack has already been rehearsed.

AN ARMY OF 1,000

As in Nicaragua, whose revolutionary Government is praised and emulated by the New Jewel Party, the breach with Washington has provided the justification for the creation of a large armed force. According to Government figures, the Grenadian Army has about 1,000 soldiers—similar in size to that of Trinidad and Tobago, which has a population 10 times larger than Grenada's 110,000.

In addition to a regular army, Grenada is also arming a civilian militia that numbers, the Government says, in the tens of thousands. Despite the buildup, however, there is no military presence in Grenada's clean and relaxed capital city. Government offices are unguarded and easily accessible, and no hostility was shown to an American visitor.

Grenadians are urged, in public speeches and in a totally controlled press, to feel "solidarity" with Cuba and Nicaragua. The local Government crafts shop sells a poster of Mr. Bishop shoulder to shoulder with Fidel Castro and Daniel Ortega Saavedra, the Nicaraguan leader.

At the recent rally, Phyills Coard, head of the island's women's organization, told the crowd that the people of El Salvador were being bombed "on a daily basis" with napalm. She also told the audience that South African troops were "all over" Angola.

Rejecting the idea that the British-style parliamentary system of government did anything for the people of Grenada in the two decades of transition from British rule to independence in 1974 and on through the Gairy years, Mr. Rojas said that the Peoples Revolutionary Government was building "participatory democracy at the grass-roots level" through zonal and parish councils and several Government-sponsored social organizations. There are no plans for elections.

The New Jewel Movement, with its Soviet-style politburo and central committee ruling a one-party state, has closed down all opposition newspapers, allowing only its own paper and another weekly publication it subsidizes and controls to publish. Jewel stands for Joint Endeavor for Welfare, Education and Liberation.

Paradoxically, the Government has expropriated no private companies and plans no action, apart from higher taxation, against the private sector. Several Grenadians in private business told a visitor, however, that they feared that increased tax rates and service charges proposed by the Government to pay for its extensive public spending, such as public corporations in the fisheries industry, tourism and Grenada's new airport, would sooner or later force them to close.

COMMITTED TO A MIXED ECONOMY

Clairemont Kirton, the island's chief economic planner, said that 'the Government is committed to a mixed economy."

"No displacement of the private sector is taking place," he said.

Grenada recently hired a New York public relations company to promote American tourism here, where hotels operate at only about 30 percent capacity. It is also building a new airport to handle large jets, a project that has fallen well behind schedule.

The international airport, being built by Cubans, is one of the sources of friction between the island and the State Department in Washington, which sees it as suspiciously large for Grenada's tourist industry and as a potential military base to handle what Secretary of State Haig has termed "every aircraft in the Soviet-Cuban inventory."

While Grenada's leaders insist that they have not completely ruled out elections, there seems little chance, judging from Mr. Bishop's public statements, than any organized opposition will be allowed on the island.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 12, 1982]

THE LESSON OF GRENADA'S SWING TO MARXISM

(By Lee Martin)

ST. GEORGE'S, GRENADA.—What El Salvador can expect if Marxists win power in that strifetorn nation clearly is seen on this tiny Caribbean island nation that already is being run Cuban style.

Since the March 13, 1979, coup by Prime minister Maurice Bishop and his Havana-oriented regime, the Cuban presence has taken over.

For the most part, the swarms of Cuban workers, technicians and teachers keep a

low profile. Yet a favorite saying here is that Grenada's real government can be found in the Cuban Embassy.

Some of the Cubans are building a new airfield with a 9,500-foot runway—ostensibly for planes packed with tourists. But U.S Secretary of State Alexander Haig has said the installation could handle "every aircraft in the Soviet-Cuban inventory."

Other Cubans work on a project so secret that even Grenadians are locked out. Rumors abound that it is to be a submarine base.

The tourist trade once was the backbone of the economy. No longer. North Americans bypass Grenada's famed beaches for other islands.

Even the St. George's University School of Medicine, which enrolls Americans turned down by medical schools at home, may leave.

Grenada, never rich, is poorer than ever, largely because prices for major crops—nutmeg, cocoa, bananas—are unprofitably low.

Calypso dogma. Despite poverty, Grenadians still have a zest for life and music. But calypso now is the voice of revolution. Here's what visitors hear, set to a rhythmic beat—

On majority rule for all peoples: "China for the Chinamen; Syria for the Syrians; Europe for Europeans; righteousness must win."

On Cuba: "People yearning, people learning, about the Cubans in Grenada, about Cubans in Jamaica."

The Bishop government campaigns to convince everyone that the U.S. is about to invade the island. Youths wearing Ché Guevara berets chant: "Tell them one sweet Grenada. Tell them one revolution. When the mercenaries come, we go use the AK [Soviet assault rifle] on them."

The U.S. refuses to exchange ambassadors until the government returns to democratic ways. Bishop uses this refusal to justify his military buildup. The Army—1,000 strong—is equivalent to that maintained by next-door Trinidad and Tobago, with a population 10 times larger than Grenada's. A civilian militia is to be armed.

Socialism does not yet dominate the economy. Shops and restaurants are privately run. But British-style democracy, inherited with independence in 1974, has given way to one-party control. Opposition newspapers have been closed down.

The move toward a Marxist society has not wiped out corruption that tainted the earlier government. The new rulers drive expensive cars, and their children attend Grenada's best private school.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Dec. 1, 1980]

WHERE CASTRO STILL THREATENS IN CARIBBEAN

(By Dennis Mullin)

ST. GEORGE'S, GRENADA.—Despite setbacks for Cuban-style Marxism elsewhere in the Caribbean, Fidel Castro's drive for revolution has forged a solid foothold in Grenada—posing a major challenge for the administration of Ronald Reagan.

Since seizing power in a virtually bloodless coup 20 months ago, Prime Minister Maurice Bishop has parlayed police-state tactics and substantial Cuban-assistance into an English-speaking outpost of international socialism in America's back yard.

Castro, thwarted in attempts to plant his brand of Communism in the other fledgling island nations, has thrown down the gauntlet to the U.S. in Grenada. He proclaims the coup here "a large revolution in a small country" that could serve as a showcase of socialist development for the Caribbean. Grenada already backs revolutionary opposition groups in Haiti and the opposition party in democratic Barbados and is demanding independence for Puerto Rico.

How Washington responds to Castro's challenge could determine whether the recent election defeat of a Castro-backed administration in Jamaica or the installation of a Castro-backed government in Grenada is the sign of the future in the Caribbean.

Revolutionary fervor has been the rule in Grenada since March 1979, when Bishop's New Jewel Movement toppled the unpopular regime of Sir Eric Gairy. A firm believer in the existence of unidentified flying objects, Gairy had ruled the country since Grenada won its independence from Britain in 1974.

Cuban involvement is apparent everywhere on the island. The first thing visitors see when their turboprop airliners touch down at Grenada's small Pearls Airport is a large billboard offering "revolutionary greetings." A reception hall is adorned with Cuban posters pledging "revolutionary victory."

Throughout this harbor capital are other billboards with revolutionary slogans. A large mural of Cuba's revolutionary hero, Ché Guevara, has been painted on a hillside. Large portraits of Fidel Castro, Nicaraguan leaders and Libya's Mu'ammar Qadhafi decorate the Prime Minister's office, where everyone is referred to as "comrade."

About 350 Cuban engineers are building an international airport south of the city—a project that had been badly needed for years but which many Grenadians believe will be used as a transit stop for Cuban troops en route to join Castro forces in Africa.

A Soviet presence, too. Cuban doctors and technicians have fanned out over the island's 133 square miles. A revolutionary Army is being formed by Cuban advisers. A Soviet fishing trawler lies at anchor in the harbor, while its crew assists the Grenadians in building a fishing industry. Moscow has delivered some new police cars.

Cuba also is helping to expand the radio station so that Grenadian officials can send their message of revolution throughout the Caribbean.

Bishop has made some social improvements. Inexpensive housing-repair loans have been instituted. He has provided schoolchildren with milk produced by state farms converted from 30 estates totaling more than 4,000 acres of land that Gairy had accumulated.

About 200 students are abroad on scholarships, mostly in Cuba, Hungary and other Eastern European countries.

The British-educated Prime Minister also has retained a private economy in a socialist state. Industries have not been nationalized. Foreigners' rights and investments have been protected. Businessmen are working with the regime on various projects.

But despite the gains, Bishop's popularity has been steadily waning since the heady days when a broad parliamentary coalition supported his takeover and pledged to work toward reforms and new elections.

The promised elections have been delayed, alienating many of Bishop's moderate supporters. He explains that he has postponed a vote because the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency might undermine the elections, as he claims it did in Jamaica. Critics contend that early elections would only lead to the Prime Minister's defeat.

Elections: A luxury? Real reason for the delay, according to a government official: "Elections are a luxury of the petty bourgeoisie. We are moving toward a Cuban-style dictatorship of the proletariat. But that will take time."

Bishop's slide toward Marxism has antagonized many Grenadians. Typical is a comment by one government worker: "I backed the revolution and support the reforms. But I never expected that we would become a full-fledged Communist dictatorship."

Widespread Cuban involvement has angered many residents in this traditionally British-oriented, capitalist nation. "Grenadians have a high sense of propriety and tradition," explains a longtime resident. "They don't understand the need for a revolution and are offended by the changes that the Cubans represent."

Evidence exists that Bishop's New Jewel Movement had been working with Castro's agents long before the coup. Some Grenadians say that a Cuban ship unloaded weapons here just three days after Bishop seized power.

Many islanders now are bracing for what may turn out to be years of Cuban-style government. Newspapers on this English-speaking island are teaching Spanish words. Businessmen tape their own telephone conversations to avoid being framed. Mail is opened.

Opposition is emerging, although at this point it lacks a leader of sufficient stature to challenge Bishop. About 125 political prisoners occupy the imposing Richmond Hill Prison overlooking St. George's picturesque harbor.

Several antigovernment bombings have occurred, including one explosion in June under a podium from which the Prime Minister was speaking. On November 17, five Bishop supporters were killed in two separate attacks by unidentified gunmen. "The people will fight," says a Grenadian. "They're alienated from their government."

But a businessman worries that violent opposition to Bishop's regime will only invite Cuban military intervention. "Something has to give. Grenada is more important to Cuba than Jamaica was. Once they finish the airport, I don't think it will be possible to force the Cubans to leave."

A tighter grip. In the face of challengers to his regime, Bishop is solidifying his hold. More than 1,000 supporters get an hour a day of political indoctrination from Cuban advisers. On militia night each Wednesday, hundreds of other young people are being trained and armed by the government.

The state-controlled press daily calls upon the people to stop "counterrevolutionaries" and to report them to the police. Says one Grenadian: "The government is asking the children to spy on their parents and friends."

All this political turmoil seems out of place on such a beautiful island. Known as the Island of Spice, Grenada still exports nutmeg, high-quality cocoa, mace and bananas.

Tourism vital. The island is such an attraction that in a good year 110,000 people will visit on cruise ships and 32,000 more will stay longer—pumping millions into the economy. About 60 percent of Granada's hard currency once came from tourism.

Whether that will continue remains uncertain. Hoteliers report that business is off by some 50 percent, as North American

tourists avoid the politically troubled island. The government is trying to stem the loss by sending promotional teams abroad.

But the political climate no longer is conducive to tourism. Reports one Grenadian: "Bishop has canceled elections, closed the free press, brought in the Cubans, and the economy and the repression are getting worse."

Grenada's appeal to North Americans may wane even more as relations with the U.S. continue to deteriorate. Bishop accuses Washington of "back yardism" for allegedly trying to influence Grenada's choice of allies. He also charges that the U.S. has failed to respond to his request for weapons to safeguard his revolution.

What happens on Grenada would go a long way in deciding the outcome of a larger battle going on across the Caribbean, where a generation of young radicals hopes to exploit unrest over slow economic growth, double-digit inflation and 25 percent unemployment.

Supporters of pro-Western governments contend that if the conservative tide that has surfaced recently in Jamaica, St. Vincent, St. Kitts-Nevis. Antigua and Dominica is to continue the U.S. must send more development aid.

Since 1975, U.S. aid had grown slowly, from 35 million dollars to 115 million, in a region where the eastern Caribbean islands alone spend 500 million dollars a year just to import food. "We cannot become complacent and view the Jamaican election as a conclusive victory," says a U.S. diplomat. "It was just a respite. America must take an active role in Caribbean development."

When Christopher Columbus discovered this island in 1498, it was inhabited by cannibalistic Carib Indians. None survived colonial times, when British buccaneers hid from the Spanish Navy in the island's hurricane-free ports. The last 600 Caribs were forced to abandon their way of life and jump to their deaths from a cliff now called Caribe's Leap.

Today, Grenadians who oppose the new government fear that if they cannot halt Bishop's Cuban-supported march to socialism, they either will have to leave their island or suffer the same fate as the Carib Indians, who lost their homeland to a foreign ideology.

[From the Chicago Sun Times, Mar. 3, 1982]

GRENADA LOOMS BIG AS SOVIET AIR BASE

WASHINGTON.—A top Pentagon official says leftist-ruled Grenada, a tiny Caribbean Island Nation, "has become an air base available to the Soviet Union."

Fred C. Ikle, undersecretary of defense for policy, made that cryptic remark to the Senate Armed Services Committee in listing what he said were Soviet gains around the world.

Although Ikle did not elaborate in his recent testimony, it was learned that a new, secret U.S. intelligence report quotes Grenada's minister of national mobilization as saying a big new airfield—being built with major Cuban help—would be used by Soviet and Cuban planes.

U.S. intelligence sources said the statement by the government minister, identified only as "Strachan," was the first confirmation that the air base would be used for anything except the tourist trade, which is the way it was advertised when construction started in 1979.

Selwyn Strachan is Grenada's minister of mobilization. The U.S. intelligence report did not make clear when or where the remarks attributed to him was made.

Grenada is strategically located on the eastern rim of the Caribbean, north of Venezuela.

Although the Reagan administration has concentrated its public statements of concern of what it says are Cuban-backed guerrilla movements in Central America, this administration and the Carter administration have been worried about perceived Cuban efforts to establish footholds among small and impoverished island nations in the Caribbean.

Nearly three years ago, a coup by the leftist "New Jewel Movement," headed by Maurice Bishop, took control of Grenada, which became independent in 1974 after having been a British colony.

Within months of the coup, U.S. intelligence detected the arrival of Cuban military personnel, who were reportedly establishing training and security missions there.

One of the first visible signs of Cuban activity was the start of construction of an airport.

U.S. intelligence has been watching the progress of the airport and now says that it has a completed asphalt runway stretching nearly two miles and is capable of handling Soviet and Cuban troop and cargo transports and other large aircraft.

Supporting the belief that the new airfield is likely to be used by Soviet and Cuban aircraft is a report received by U.S. intelligence that a Soviet air defense system will be installed in the vicinity of that field.

ENTERPRISE ZONE A SUCCESS IN NEW BRITAIN

(Mrs. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in my home city of New Britain, the State urban enterprise zone program is being credited for bringing $14 million in investments to the central business district during the past year. This economic development is truly exciting for an area where plant closings and job losses have caused and continue to cause great suffering.

In view of the demonstrated success of New Britain's enterprise zone program, I am dismayed that the House has not acted to pass Federal enterprise zone proposals introduced 3 years ago. Indeed, it is ironic that the advocates of jobs legislation have not devoted themselves with equal energy to pushing enterprise zone legislation. While city officials in New Britain are talking about a "period of unprecedented growth" due to enterprise zone incentives, the House fails to acknowledge the potential of this program and stalls appropriate legislation.

I believe the story of New Britain deserves the attention of my colleagues and should be told around the country. How long must the American people wait for the passage of enterprise zone legislation which, in New Britain, is creating new jobs and helping to revitalize a once distressed city? In comparison, passage of "jobs bills" is a weak effort with what we know now is comparatively limited impact. I urge my colleagues to support Federal enterprise zone legislation and am submitting an article from the New York Times that presents the success of this program in Connecticut.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 22, 1984]

NEW BRITAIN CITES URBAN-ZONE GAINS

(By Pete Mobilia)

New Britain officials credit the state's Urban Enterprise Zone program with bringing $14 million in investments to the city's central business district in the last year.

"We really feel we're picking up momentum," said James T. Mahoney, executive director of New Britain's Municipal Action Council, a public-private partnership formed to encourage economic development.

"If you look at this year and last year, and compare it with a couple of years before that, this is really a period of unprecedented growth in the city, and our enterprise zone is a major part of that," he said.

Among the developments cited by Mr. Mahoney are the leasing of two long-vacant major stores in a shopping center, the announcement of a developer's plans to create offices from a 150,000-square-foot factory bulding and the expansion of a small bakery.

"We put up almost another 2,000 square-feet and were able to purchase up-to-date equipment that we needed," said Frank Napolitano, vice president of the bakery, Red Door Pizzeria, which manufactures frozen pizza products for institutional use. "It was a good opportunity."

New Britain's Urban Enterprise Zone is one of six created by the state's Department of Economic Development in 1982 under terms of a bill passed that year by the legislature. The zones are intended to attract economic development through incentives such as loans, grants, and tax abatements available to companies moving into a zone or expanding within it. The five other zones are in Hartford, Bridgeport, New Haven, New London and Norwalk.

"We're the only enterprise zone in a central business district," said Mayor William J. McNamara. Based on the recommendations of a consultant, officials have emphasized the cultural and recreational benefits of the zone's downtown location in marketing it to prospective developers.

"Besides not only being a good investment, it's a good place to live, work and enjoy yourself." said Mr. Mahoney.

The Municipal Action Council, he said, has also stressed New Britain's site in the center of the state and the zone's easy access to major highways.

The six-lane Route 72 passes through the area now, and the State Department of transportation recently announced plans to incorporate it into the Central Connecticut Expressway, which, when completed by 1989, is to link I-84 in Farmington with I-91 in Cromwell. The expressway is also to incorporate a long unused section of highway adjacent to Route 72 that has become known as the "road to nowhere." When built in 1979, the 1.37-mile-long section of pavement was intended as part of a planned I-291, which was later abandoned by the state in the face of opposition from environmentalists.

Transportation officials say the "road to nowhere" will open in 1986 when other segments of the new expressway are built, link-

ing it to route 175 in Newington and Route 72 in downtown New Britain.

"New Britain is prime for development now because of the highway access," said Mr. Mahoney.

John A. Doig, president of Munro, Jennings & Doig Associates, a real estate development company with offices in Farmington and Vermont, agrees.

"There's an old saw in real estate: There's three things that give real estate value, the first is location, the second is location, and the third is location," Mr. Doig said.

His company announced on March 26 that it had taken an option to purchase the Grove Street plant of the Fafnir Bearing Division of Textron Inc. The plant is to be vacated this year as the manufacturer consolidates its operations in the New Britain area.

"The building is one of the best mills we have walked into," said Mr. Doig. "It would support R and D activities, light assemblage and so forth, which many high-tech firms in particular are demanding in today's market."

Mr. Doig said that he expected to begin a $7 million renovation on the building within 90 days and that some sections could be ready for occupancy late this year. "It is to our knowledge one of the largest undertakings of first-class office space, whether rehab or not, in an enterprise zone in the state," he said.

Under the enterprise zone program, city officials are allowed to defer for two years 100 percent of the increase in real property assessments that result from renovations. In his case, Mr. Doig estimated those savings at $150,000 and said his company would be able to charge tenants less than $10 a square foot because of reduced taxes.

"It gives this project, from an operating standpoint, a tremendous advantage over any similarly constituted property" in this part of the state," he said.

In addition, New Britain recently enacted a three-year personal property tax abatement program.

"We feel this can be a major incentive for facilities that have a lot of personal properties, data processing facilities, high-tech research-and-development-type facilities," said Mr. Mahoney.

The enterprise zone encompasses 320 acres of New Britain's major industrial complex and commercial business district. A bill now before the Legislature would allow the inclusion in New Britain's zone of its last major urban-renewal tract, an adjacent area of about seven acres.

City officials said the only negative comment they had heard from business people about the zone was that some of them think it may be too small. Some businesses in other parts of the city, they say, have expressed interest in obtaining the benefits provided in the zone.

"New Britain has been one of the most aggressive communities in marketing and promoting their enterprise zone," said John J. Carson, the state's Commissioner of Economic Development. "I've been impressed with their efforts."

□ 1850

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE FRANK CHURCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order to the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, my wife, Annette, and I visited the late Senator Frank Church and his wife, Bethine. Frank Church was on the last leg. His body had aged beyond recognition. It was clear that the end was near.

And in a tragic, and moving, and unforgettable meeting, Frank Church spoke not of his own ailment as he was losing his fight against cancer, but he was speaking of his vision of America.

Along with a lot of my colleagues in this body, I would like to take a few moments this evening to remember Frank Church, a Senator for 24 years, a patriot, a scholar, a person of unique intelligence and integrity, He had a distinguished and dedicated record of public service.

He was born in Idaho. He went to school at Stanford and for 24 years served in the U.S. Senate, culminating his public service as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In 1976, he ran for the Presidency and it was my great and distinct pleasure, and honor, and privilege to lead the California delegation pledged to Frank Church to the Democratic National Convention in New York.

Although Frank is principally remembered for his historic contributions in the field of foreign policy, his range of interests covered the broadest possible spectrum. He was a champion of the elderly. He was a fighter for civil rights and human rights. He was one of the most effective spokesmen for our environment, for our wild and scenic rivers, for the nature he loves so much.

He began his adult career as an intelligence officer in the Burma/China/India theater, and it was probably his military experience that made him so profoundly conscious of the importance of fighting for peace.

He was the conscience of the Senate and indeed the conscience of the Congress. And he wrote his own truest epitaph when he spoke on the occasion of the passing of his friend and mine, Bobby Kennedy. I remember well what Frank Church said on that occasion:

> Too often men who would win elections tend to be followers, not leaders. They are inclined to go along in order to get along. They are specialists in telling the people what they want to hear. They are animated mirrors, styled to the fashion of the moment, bent to reflect current opinion.

Robert Kennedy, said Frank Church—and I am saying this today of Frank Church—was "a shining exception to that rule. He was no ordinary garden variety politician. He scorned conformity. He insisted on being himself and he sought to prod the conscience of America."

That basically was Frank's assignment in life, to prod the conscience of the Nation he loved so much.

This Nation and all of us who had the privilege of knowing Frank have been enriched by his presence on this planet. He became chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the apex of his career.

He should have been President and our Nation would have gained immeasurably by his leadership.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTOS. I would now yield, if I may, to my friend and distinguished colleague from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentleman from California and commend him for taking this time to discuss one of the truly great Americans of our time, certainly one of the greatest Members of Congress in our day.

Other speakers joining in this special order in memory of Frank Church will no doubt recall, as the gentleman from California has, his tremendous contributions in the field of foreign policy, and others will note the great significance and lasting value of his contributions to ending American involvement in the war in Vietnam and instituting greater accountability with regard to the intelligence agencies of the United States. Those were indeed areas where Senator Church made a tremendous contribution to the public interest and to the interests of those very principles on which our Government is based. And I join with others in taking this special order to salute Senator Church for those achievements.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like for a moment to concentrate on another aspect of Senator Church's career and public life, and that is the area of conservation. Here, too, his contributions were outstanding.

In fact, it would be safe to say that Senator Church never did anything in a small or petty way. He was always an achiever in the greatest sense of the word.

Few of us here today were in Congress in April 1963 when Senator Church was floor manager during Senate consideration of the Wilderness Act of 1964, what ultimately became the Wilderness Act of 1964. But history shows that Senator Church led the charge for Senate passage of the bill and was a key figure in defeating several weakening amendments during Senate debate of this measure.

In more recent times, Senator Church was instrumental in many

other conservation efforts involving resources and values of many parts of the Nation. More particularly, he was a tireless advocate of protection for some of the priceless wilderness areas of his native State of Idaho.

Earlier this year, Congress approved and the President signed legislation, S. 2354, designating the River of No Return Wilderness in Idaho as the "Frank Church—River of No Return Wilderness."

It was my pleasure to be able to call Senator Church when the House acted on that measure and to tell him of it, and he was really quite moved, and I am sure was very grateful at this tribute, a well-deserved tribute indeed it was. Such a special mark of recognition among areas that would have been designated wilderness by that bill was indeed appropriate to Senator Church. He had endeavored to protect those areas much earlier than the year in which it was enacted.

The Wilderness Act of 1964 would have included these in the act as wilderness areas, but they were downgraded in a House-Senate conference from wilderness to wilderness study status, and the opportunity at that time for wilderness designation was lost.

But Frank Church did not rest. Due to complications in the wilderness review process the River of No Return area was not again presented for congressional consideration until the late 1970's when Senator Church introduced new legislation to designate this as a wilderness area.

In the interim, Senator Church had enhanced his reputation as one of the Nation's foremost wildland conservationists by securing enactment of legislation to protect numerous areas nationwide, particularly the spectacular Sawtooth, Hell's Canyon, and Gospel-Hump Wilderness Areas in Idaho. But it was perhaps for central Idaho lands encompassed in the River of No Return Wilderness that Senator Church saved his utmost efforts.

As the Senator said of the area during Senate floor debate on the bill and the conference report, and I do not know whether the gentleman has time for me to read some of those words, but if the gentleman from California has the time, I would just like to read some of his words.

□ 1900

He said:

This superlative region of the Rocky Mountains is what Idahoans mean when they refer to our State as "God's country." For me, and for countless other people, the Salmon River—the famous river of no return—has become a symbol of life. Yesterday is a part of the river which we have already run; it is gone forever. Tomorrow is always unknown, a part of the river which lies around the next bend, obscured by the roar of the next set of rapids, and hidden from sight by the towering cliffs of the canyon. . . I have always believed that Idaho is big enough to leave some of the public land alone, as a refuge for fish and game, to protect our watersheds, and as sanctuary for those who, from time to time, feel the need to get away from it all. . . .

That, to me is what the battle for the River of No Return Wilderness is really all about. It is a fight to preserve for all time a part of the vanishing American frontier. . . .

As one who has spent many happy days amidst the mountains and streams of this wild region of Idaho, I can think of no finer patrimony for our grandchildren than to leave this region in the same untamed condition in which it was left to us by the Creator.

So Frank Church has passed to his creator, and yet I think his own language perhaps describes this next part of his adventure. And he said:

Yesterday is part of the river which we have already run. It is gone forever. Tomorrow is always unknown. A part of the river which lies around the next bend obscured by the roar of the next set of rapids and hidden from sight by the towering cliffs of the canyon.

Senator Church has gone around that bend, I am sure to further achievements and to further adventures. Frank Church, during his final term in Congress, did just that sort of thing. Undaunted by the fact that his reelection was fast approaching and that a very large wilderness area might cost him a few votes but secure in the knowledge that he was right and that many of the citizens of Idaho as well as people nationwide supported his efforts, Senator Church tirelessly held hearings, negotiations, markups and other meetings to help insure the passage of his wilderness dream and in the end, the Nation was made much wealthier through the preservation of a magnificient 2,239,000-acre wilderness, the largest by far in the lower 40 States.

I would like to say just one other thing, if the gentleman would yield further, and that is that during all this process, Senator Church came to me, even after the bill had passed the Senate and said:

You know, I found that this little community woud be affected if we put this particular area in wilderness because there is a saw mill there and I hope you will take action to make an adjustment to help those people.

He was constantly thinking about the welfare of those people even though they may be small in number; whom he had moral obligation to protect and to help and he did that and still managed to preserve this magnificent wilderness for those people and for all others to enjoy.

Let me just say one other thing, if I may.

Mr. Speaker, each generation has its own rendezvous with the land. Senator Frank Church was a leader for over 20 years of a nationwide movement to set aside public lands as natural areas and as wilderness, our country's highest form of land protection. The establishment of wilderness areas and leaving them in an untrammelded condition for the benefit of generations unborn is truly a measure not only of the man, but also of a civilized and free society.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I certainly join in praising all of the tremendous achievements in Frank Church's great record, I want to be sure that the American people are aware of and remember his special contributions with regard to the preservation of our country's wilderness treasures and I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. LANTOS. I am very grateful to my friend and colleague, who is one of our Nation's leaders in the field of protecting our environment for this very moving tribute to our friend, Frank Church.

You mentioned Idaho many times during the course of your remarks and there is no place that Frank Church loved more and appreciated more than his native Idaho.

He was a native of Boise; he grew up in a Republican household. And he became the magnificent orator by debating his father, arguing with his father after every dinner, on every conceivable issue.

It was fitting that the conservative people of Idaho, a State that is so often viewed as a Republican State, should elect this great Democratic leader as Senator four times. And I was with Frank in Idaho on many an occasion, meeting with his constituents, who told him that while they disagreed with him on many, many things, their admiration for his integrity and for his intelligence and for his patriotism was unbounded.

So I think it is appropriate if I may, Mr. Speaker, if I yield now to my Republican friend and colleague from Idaho to express his tribute to Frank Church.

Mr. CRAIG. I certainly want to thank my colleague from California for setting aside this time to pay tribute to former Senator Frank Church.

I think it is very fitting on this day that we do so.

"The great heart of the world is sad today * * * sad because a great voice has been stilled in death." With those words, mourners bade farewell to one of the most eminent statesmen Idaho ever produced. Forty-four years ago those words were used as the lion of Idaho, Senator William Borah, was laid to rest.

The heart of the world was again saddened—saddened because another great voice from the State of Idaho has been stilled in death. The memory of Senator Church will long endure as has the memory of Senator Borah. And it should because they shared the same aspirations, dreamed many of

the same dreams of greatness for America, and represented their State, Nation, and parties with an honor bestowed on every few who serve in public office.

Although Senator Borah was a Republican, he was Senator Church's boyhood idol. Both men served as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, both men were presidential candidates, and more importantly, both men are recognized as statesmen.

It would be inappropriate for me to extol the political stewardship of Senator Church without recognizing that we held few philosophical beliefs in common. Even so, I, Idaho, and the Nation mourn his passing because he was a man and a leader of deep commitment and a sincere personal resolve to pursue policies he felt were in the best interest of the Nation.

Many Members of Congress will come and go, but few will carve out of their tenures a place in history. Those that do, usually have done so out of their strength of commitment and statesmanship. The passing of Frank Church is the passing of one of those men.

The greatest strength of the American political process is the tolerance, integrity, and intensity of its deliberative process, where men and women of divergent positions seek to implement policies that will steer the country toward a peaceful, prosperous, and free future. Positions on the specific issues at the time define the political participants in that process, but history and force of personal commitment to the process define statesmen. On April 8, 1984, the Nation lost another statesman from Idaho.

Once again, I thank my colleague for the opportunity of remembering Frank Church.

Mr. LANTOS. I want to thank my colleague and friend from Idaho for his very moving tribute to Frank Church.

□ 1910

And I thought it was particularly appropriate that in paying homage to Frank the gentleman mentioned the great Senator Borah of the State of Idaho, because while Frank and Senator Borah did not share all views, they shared the greatness and the love for this Nation. I know that Frank Church had the highest admiration for Senator Borah of Idaho. He talked to me of Senator Borah many times in our discussions and walks.

I think it is the genius of Idaho and it is the genius of the Nation that it produces great Republicans and great Democrats equally committed to the service of our Nation.

I would like to yield at this time to the gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON), one of the most distinguished Members of this body, former Lieutenant Governor of the State of California, a man who has known Frank Church for a long time, who shared his views and philosophy in so many ways, and who would like to say his tribute to the late Senator Church.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California, TOM LANTOS, for arranging this special order, enabling us to reflect on the life and career of Frank Church, former Senator of Idaho. I was saddened, as all of us were, to hear of the death of this great man 2 weeks ago from cancer.

We are indebted to him for his outspoken words, especially on arms control, the environment, the elderly, and the Vietnam war. During his 24 years in the Senate, Frank left behind an impressive legacy.

Known as the "boy orator" in the Senate, Frank served for 8 years as chairman of the Senate Committee on Aging. In this capacity, he made significant progress in insuring adequate cost-of-living increases for the elderly. In 1975, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence was established under his chairmanship. The committee's final report, which documented numerous improper activities of the FBI and the CIA played an important role in curbing abuses of power by these Agencies. In 1976, he was a candidate for the Presidency.

However, he was to achieve his other major ambition when he became chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1979. Prior to becoming chairman, Frank made a number of major contributions as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. These included his strong backing for the 1963 Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and his floor leadership during ratification of the Panama Canal treaties in 1978. He is most renowned, though, for his early stand against U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war. In 1970, Frank coauthored the Cooper-Church amendment which placed the first limits on expanding the war in Cambodia and Laos. And, in 1972, he pushed for legislation to end all American military activities in Southeast Asia. After leaving the Senate in 1980, Frank continued to speak out on important issues, particularly arms control and world peace.

Frank Church will always be remembered as a fighter. In 1947, he was diagnosed with cancer and given only 6 months to live. However, after shrinking to only 80 pounds, a second doctor disagreed with the terminal diagnosis and prescribed surgery and radiation treatment that led to his almost miraculous recovery.

I join my colleagues in extending condolences to his wife Jean and his two sons, Forrest and Chase. Frank's leadership and companionship will be greatly missed by us all.

Mr. LANTOS. I want to thank my friend from California.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my good friend and colleague from the State of New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California, Mr. LANTOS, for coordinating today's special order and giving Congress the opprotunity to express its deepest sorrow on the loss of one of its most dedicated and hard-working servants of the people, the Honorable Frank Church of Idaho.

Many of us in the House of Representatives had the distinct privilege of serving and working with Frank Church during his service in the Senate, and had come to admire his sincerity and dedication in pursuing his goals. For 24 years he served the State of Idaho as an outstanding Member of the U.S. Senate and in the last 2 years of his distinguished career he chaired the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Senator Church was an eloquent and independent voice in the Senate for nearly a quarter of a century who pleaded for compassion at home and courageous commonsense abroad. Above all, Frank Church was a moral man, and a man of intergrity. His intelligence tempered with his sense of compassion led him to publicly demonstrate his outrage for the gross disproportion between means and ends in American foreign policy. He was convinced that America was strongest when it was true to its most generous and humane instincts.

Truly, Frank Church cared. He brilliantly represented Idaho in the Senate. He was a leading conservationist, an advocate for the elderly, a champion for arms controls, but he went beyond that, for he was a man with a national vision, one that allowed him the flexibility to champion principles which transcend State boundaries.

There can be no doubt that Frank Church left his mark on the country which he so passionately loved. We are today a greater Nation for his efforts and dedication. The Congress and the Nation as a whole will sorely miss the leadership and courage of Frank Church.

Mr. LANTOS. I want to thank my friend from the State of New York for paying his tribute to Frank Church.

Mr. Speaker, we already have on hand scores of tributes from colleagues from across this land, Republicans and Democrats, colleagues from small rural States and from large urban areas, a cross section of America.

As we say farewell to Frank Church, we speak on behalf of a grateful nation.

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my sorrowful voice to those of

the many who mourn the death of Senator Frank Church.

Senator Church succumbed to cancer 37 years after he was first stricken with that dread disease. At that time, he was given only 6 months to live. However, surgery, treatments, and his own indomitable will allowed him to fight off the affliction and live on to devote a life to service to his State and Nation, including 24 years in the Senate. While we mourn his death, we also give thanks that we could benefit from his intellect and leadership.

The qualities of character for which we admire Senator Church are well known: His grace, his civility, his courage and determination, his steadfastness in his convictions. He was a profound thinker, an eloquent orator. And the product of his work in the Senate speaks eloquently for itself and will long be remembered.

He was an early and outspoken critic of this country's policies in Southeast Asia at a time when such criticism, especially in his home State of Idaho, was not at all fashionable. Two pieces of legislation that bear his name—the Cooper-Church and the Case-Church amendments—were instrumental in finally extracting us from our bloody misadventures in Southeast Asia.

We are indebted to Senator Church for the work of the several panels he chaired.

One of his investigations in the early 1970's exposed links between a multinational corporation and the CIA, bribery of foreign officials by corporations and an Arab blacklist of pro-Israel businesses. Another revealed abuses of power by our intelligence agencies, disclosures that led to the creation of our intelligence committees and a closer liaison between the Congress and the agencies.

Senator Church was instrumental in yet another protection of congressional prerogatives. He was cochairman of a committee whose work resulted in legislation that limited a President's power to declare an emergency and exercise extraordinary power independent of the Congress.

As the influential chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Church was in the forefront of the major foreign policy issues of our time; as chairman of the Senate Committee on Aging, he worked industriously to protect the interest of the elderly. Indeed, he was a longtime champion of legislation to protect the civil rights of all Americans.

Senator Church was a true national leader, but he did not neglect the needs and interests of his Idaho constituency. It is most fitting that the Congress earlier this year, in recognition for his determined efforts to protect our environment and natural resources, named 2.2 million acres in Idaho in his honor: The Frank Church River of No Return.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Church's contributions and accomplishments will be a lasting tribute to his years in service of his nation. I want to join his long list of friends and admirers in expressing my condolences to Mrs. Church and the members of her family.●

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to our former colleague, Senator Frank Church of Idaho.

Senator Church served in the Senate for 24 years and spent much of his time and energy formulating our Nation's foreign policies. He served as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and he was a sensitive and articulate statesman who rendered true service to his State and country. His passing is a loss to us all.●

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Senator Frank Church of Idaho.

Frank Church had a career of distinction and accomplishment in the U.S. Senate. His was a voice of reason in a number of areas, and he was a particularly eloquent spokesman for the causes of peace and social justice. While perhaps best known for his work in foreign policy and his service on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Church also made important contributions to legislative efforts to safeguard the environment and to protect the rights of the elderly. He was a man of decency and compassion for whom adherence to principle was the standard of a lifetime.

As the chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Senator Church was the guiding force behind that committee's investigation into the scope and propriety of the activities of our intelligence-gathering agencies. The six-volume report that was issued in 1976 at the conclusion of the committee's inquiry remains a model of balanced and insightful commentary on intelligence functions, and particularly on the usefulness of covert actions. When the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence acted last year to recommend the termination of the covert operation in Nicaragua, the report of the Senate committee provided an important resource. The continued utility of that report is due in large part to the guidance and leadership of Frank Church.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States were well served by Frank Church's career in public life. He left his mark on the Senate and the history of his country, and he will not be forgotten. I want to extend my sympathies to his wife, Bethine, and his family.●

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join with my colleagues today to pay tribute to the memory of a distinguished colleague and devoted public servant—Senator Frank Church.

For 24 years, Senator Church served as a forceful and effective legislator on behalf of his constituents in Idaho. He began his career in the Senate in 1957 after defeating former U.S. Senator Glen Taylor by a mere 170 votes. At age 32, he was the youngest Member of the Senate.

As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Church took an early stand against excessive American military involvement abroad. In 1963, long before it was popular, he called for an end to U.S. military aid to South Vietnam if its Government continued repressing political opposition. Three years later, he joined 14 of his Democratic colleagues in asking President Johnson to continue his suspension of air strikes against North Vietnam, and in 1970 he coauthored an amendment designed to limit, for the first time, the expansion of the Vietnam war into Cambodia and Laos.

Through his work as chairman of the Senate Energy Research and Development Subcommittee, Senator Church was lauded for his considerable efforts to preserve our Nation's natural beauty. A recipient of the Idaho Conservation Award and numerous accolades from the National Wildlife Federation, the Senator worked to insure passage of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and other significant environmental legislation.

I first met Senator Church when I worked as a page at the Democratic National Convention 20 years ago in Atlantic City. His gracious manner and natural warmth, and that of his wife, left an indelible impression on me. It was readily apparent that he was a humanitarian, a man who fought against injustices in our socity, a man who supported social welfare programs and endorsed legislation dealing with fundamental human liberties such as civil rights and equal rights for women.

Senator Church first learned he had cancer while a student at Harvard Law School in 1948. Although doctors predicted he had but 6 months to live, he did not give up. His strong will and courage saw him through a painful series of x-ray treatments and surgery which eventually restored him to health. Almost 30 years later, recalling that period in his life, he said it made him more inclined to take chances that came his way. In many ways, Senator Church took those chances. He stood behind issues which were not always supported by others. He resisted sacrificing his principles and beliefs in the face of strong, sometimes persistent, opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues and citizens around our Nation

in honoring a truly courageous man, a leader of our Nation, Senator Frank Church, and in extending our sympathies to his widow, Bethine, and their two sons. Senator Frank Church has been missed from the Senate and he will now be missed by us all.●

● Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today we remember Senator Frank Church. Senator Church was well known beyond his native Idaho. He brought a perspective to the Senate which was heard throughout this land. Frank Church had the courage to publicly say that there were limits to America's role in the world. Some of what he said dismayed and angered many Americans. To others it was a word of caution as the Nation plunged into overseas ventures with the certainty that they were good guys and that that was the key to making America prevail over its perceived enemies.

I believe that we can best remember Senator Church's vision by recalling his warning in February 1965. At that time he said:

Head-in-the-sand isolationism died a generation ago. But the pendulum of our foreign policy can swing from one extreme to the other. Once we thought that anything which happened abroad was none of our business; now we evidently think that everything which happens abroad has become our business. In 30 years, an excess of isolationism has been transformed into an excess of interventionism.

Why have we spread ourselves so thin? What compulsion draws us, ever deeper, into the internal affairs of so many countries in Africa and Asia, having so remote a connection with the vital interests of the United States?

The answer, I think, stems from our intensely ideological view of the cold war. We have come to treat Communism, regardless of what form it may take in any given country, as the enemy. We fancy ourselves as guardian of the free world, though most of it is not free, and never has been. We seek to immunize this world against further Communist infection through massive injections of American aid, and, wherever, necessary, through direct American intervention.

Such a vast undertaking has at least two defects. First, it exceeds our national capability. Second, among the newly emerging nations, where the specter of Western imperialism is dreaded more than Communism, such a policy can be self-defeating. As a seasoned, friendly foreign diplomat recently put it: The United States is getting involved in situations where no one—not even a nation of saints—would be welcome.

Senator Church was defeated in his reelection bid in 1980. At that time he was victim of negative commercials. Looking back at his ideas, it is clear that Frank Church left the Senate as a man of principle who has contributed much to the national dialog. His ideas remain as a legacy to all who would seek balance and reason in a complex world that requires more than simple answers.●

● Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my fellow colleagues to mourn the recent passing of Senator Frank Church. With his death we have lost a great statesman, patriot, and more significantly a great man.

For 24 years as a Member of the Senate Frank Church was a presence on our national stage. He spent his long and illustrious career in service to the people of this native Idaho as well as the Nation—always exemplifying the virtues of dedication, wisdom and clarity of purpose.

His efforts in such diverse areas as foreign policy, social justice, and conservation were tireless. Frank Church was a leading and eloquent voice strongly supportive of civil rights protection, expanded benefits for the elderly, equal rights for women and other social service programs. He was also a leading conservationist. It was, however, primarily in the area of foreign affairs that Frank Church made his mark achieving in 1979 the goal of becoming chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

He leaves behind his mark and his vision. We will remember Frank Church for his belief in the worth and dignity of the individual; for his conviction that the United States has a moral mission in the world; and for his leadership in international affairs. As a charismatic leader who sought to translate visions into concrete realities Frank Church's accomplishments will live on as a warm and glowing testimonial to his energy and vision.

To his family I extend my prayers and condolences.●

● Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, Frank Church was a dear and wonderful man, his goodness of a magnitude rare among us.

He was a friend, a champion of issues of foreign policy, personal liberty, and natural resources on which our democracy rests and a man on whose strength we counted. He is so deeply missed by all of us.●

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, a vital voice of vision, reason, and integrity was lost to America with the recent passing of Senator Frank Church. A Member of the U.S. Senate for 24 years, Frank Church embodied that all too rare combination of courage, eloquence, and decency. During his service in the Senate and after his departure from that body, Frank Church elevated the quality of both thought and debate in the American political arena.

Perhaps Senator Church's most lasting contribution, and there were many, to his country was his understanding of and commitment to the fundamental American precepts of freedom and justice, and his dedication to applying those precepts to our Nation's policies toward the rest of the world.

Frank Church understood that poverty, injustice, and political repression contain the seeds of their own demise regardless of ideological machinations. He understood that the inexorable forces of history are best addressed peacefully, and that military force in the face of social upheaval is more often than not destined to fail.

Frank Church understood more deeply than most the words Horace, the immortal poet and philosopher of ancient Rome, "Force without wisdom falls of its own weight."

We should do Senator Frank Church the honor of heeding his words and his wisdom more diligently in his absence than we did when he was with us.●

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to acknowledge the death of former Senator Frank Church of Idaho. I would like to take just a few moments to note some important qualities of Senator Church.

During his quarter century of public service in the U.S. Senate, Frank Church stood out not only as a man of ideas, but more importantly, as a man of ideals. He consistently, fought for civil rights for all Americans, benefits for the elderly, and equal rights for women. However, above all else, Senator Church stood for a sensible and responsible foreign policy. He continually argued against the disproportion between the means and the ends in American foreign policy, first in the CIA excesses in Chile and Cuba, then in the war in Vietnam, and finally, in the undeclared war in Central America. It seems sad to me that only in death are many of his fears and warnings receiving the recognition they deserved years ago.

Yet, beyond all of these causes rises Frank Church, the individual. The tenacity and dedication he applied to his job gained him respect, if not genuine admiration from Republican and Democratic members alike. It is these qualities we should remember and take to heart, for long after the causes have faded, the ideals of dedication, perserverence, principle, and service Frank Church symbolized will stand as a goal few attain, but many strive for.●

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate this opportunity to join in remembrance of one of our Nation's most competent and compassionate legislators, the late Frank F. Church.

Though perhaps best remembered for speaking out against the war in Vietnam long before it was fashionable and for working to curb the excesses of past U.S. intelligence activities, Senator Church was also a tireless and effective champion of social justice and environmental issues at home.

During his remarkable 24-year tenure in the U.S. Senate, Frank Church demonstrated his courage time and again in taking the lead on issues obscured by controversy. His

leadership and the immense integrity with which he conducted himself earned Senator Church the lasting respect of his colleagues.

This house and, indeed, the Nation as a whole join in paying tribute to Senator Church—a statesman whose wisdom and clarity of purpose will be missed tremendously, but whose example shall forever inspire. We join in extending condolences to his wife Bethine, and their two sons.●

● Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know Frank Church for more than 30 years—before either one of us came to Congress. From the beginning, there was no question in my mind that this young man would make his mark in American public affairs. In those days, as in later years, he carried a reserve of impeccable civility, but behind that reserve was a warm, compassionate, and witty human being. Decency, independence, principle, and a courageous commitment to justice are the attributes I most closely associate with Senator Church. His eloquence was fueled by conviction and there was always substance in his message. In his private life, he waged a gallant fight against cancer; in his public career, he fought for peace and for policies of moral leadership by our Government in both foreign and domestic affairs.

He pointed out "America's inability to come to terms with revolutionary change in the Third World" but it is important to note that his vision was positive, not negative. Shortly before his untimely death, he wrote that he was looking to the day when the United States would stop "trying to repress the irrepressible" in the Third World and exchange "our unreasonable fear of communism for a rekindled faith in freedom." Frank Church left an indelible imprint for good on U.S. public affairs.

I am proud to have known him, and Bea and I extend our heartfelt sympathies to Beth and his family.●

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we have an opportunity today to honor the late Senator Frank Church of Idaho. I was privileged to know him personally, and he was a truly extraordinary man—a brilliant orator, a talented legislator on a broad range of national and internatonal issues, Presidential candidate, and a man who could relate easily to world statesmen and to all of the people of Idaho who he represented with such distinction from 1957 to 1981.

Frank Church was best known nationally for his role in foreign affairs, his chairmanship of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, his efforts to provide a proper constitutional and legal framework for the work of our intelligence agencies, and for his early and courageous opposition to the Vietnam war. His constituents in Idaho admired Frank Church for his convictions, even as they sometimes disagreed with him on issues. But he was also a local legislator in the best tradition, defending the interests of his State vigorously in committees and on the Senate floor.

One of the events I remember from my early interest in politics was Frank Church's keynote speech to the 1960 Democratic Convention. It was a remarkable oration, and confirmed that the man who had been the "boy wonder" of the Senate would be a powerful voice in the party for a long time to come.

Following his departure from the Senate, Frank Church was a valued elder statesman in the Democratic Party, and it is unfortunate that we will lack his counsel at this time, when so many of the major foreign policy issues which engaged his interest are before us.●

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleagues, it is with great sorrow that I rise to pay tribute to Frank Church. He showed the same courage and dignity in his death that he brought to his long career as a public servant. His strong character and his skills as an orator were consistently and successfully brought to the struggle for civil rights, the concerns of the aged and the basic needs of his fellow man.

Frank Church was looked upon with great respect, especially in the foreign affairs arena, because he was not afraid to stand up and challenge a decision he felt would adversely affect this Nation. Perhaps his most admirable crusade was his condemnation of our involvement in Southeast Asia. He denounced the executive branch's independent war-time operations and demanded that Congress be given proper jurisdiction over military involvement.

Frank loved this country and was a patriot in the highest sense because he placed the immediate needs of his homeland above any international concern. He demonstrated this through his strong support for social welfare programs. Even as a freshman Senator, Frank was an influential advocate of our social security system. And under President Kennedy he established himself as a supporter of public education, urban renewal, medicare and programs to eradicate poverty. Frank believed in providing all Americans with every opportunity to advance.

I extend my condolences to Frank's family. I know they will miss his companionship, dedication, and leadership, as will we all. But while we mourn the loss of this great Senator who served this Nation for nearly a quarter of this century, we must salute the fine example he set for us all.●

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn earlier this month of the loss of my good friend and former colleague from Idaho, Senator Frank Church. His untimely death is a loss to all Americans.

Throughout his 24 years of service in the Senate, Frank Church championed the rights of the common person. His leadership in fighting for civil rights, the rights of the elderly, equality for women, and conservation of our natural resources were fights born of wisdom and reason. His courageous stand against this country's presence in Southeast Asia and his efforts to curb abuses by U.S. intelligence agencies, while initially unpopular, proved visionary.

Frank Church's final battle, his toughest, was fought with the same tenacity and clarity of purpose as any of his floor fights. Frank's commitment to improving the quality of life stands as a model to us in these halls as well as in life.

The Congress, the country and I will miss Frank Church's intelligence, compassion and dedication to principles. I offer my condolences to his wife and sons.●

THE CONFLICT IN CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have called this special order today because I believe that this House must tell Turkey in no uncertain terms that we expect them to help us resolve the conflict on Cyprus.

It has been nearly 10 years since 40,000 Turkish troops invaded and divided that tiny island; 10 years since 200,000 Greek-Cypriots were driven from their homes; 10 years since thousands more were killed and captured by Turkish soldiers who were using American weapons in a manner prohibited by American law.

Today, Cyprus is still divided. Over 200,000 Turkish troops continue to occupy Cyprus, and they have been joined by 50,000 Turkish colonists who were lured from the mainland by the promise of land that had belonged to Greek-Cypriots. The Turkish lire is not the official currency of occupied Cyprus, and the Turkish Government subsidizes over 50 percent of Rauf Denktash's budget.

These unhelpful actions have been taken despite an increasingly generous program of U.S. foreign aid to Turkey. Since our aid embargo was lifted in 1978, we have sent close to $3.5 billion to Turkey, making that country our third largest aid recipient after Israel and Egypt. Administration officials have estimated that future assistance could top $1 billion a year for the next 10 years—more than the much-publicized Kissinger Commission requested for the war-torn nations of Central

America. All of this aid has been—and will be—provided under that clearly expressed condition that Turkey would cooperate fully in efforts to bring about a solution on Cyprus.

Last month, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed a measure which provides a positive incentive for Turkey to break the deadlock on Cyprus. The bill would provide Turkey with $716 million in military aid, but the Turkish Government would receive the $216 million grant portion of that package only if it returns the city of Varosha to the Republic of Cyprus under U.N. auspices. In other words, if Turkey withdraws its forces from Varosha, and makes a concrete contribution to a peace settlement on Cyprus, it will get as much military aid as last year. If not, it will get an amount equal to Greece, and $255 million below the administration's request.

This condition is a reasonable and attainable test of Turkey's good faith. It does not demand a total withdrawal of occupation forces or a derecognition of the Turkish-Cypriot regime—two conditions that would be consistent with stated U.S. policy. All it asks is for Turkey to carry out a policy it has agreed to many times: In 1978, Turkey suggested that the town would be returned if the arms embargo was lifted. It was, but Famagusta was not. One year later, Turkish-Cypriot leader Denktash signed a 10-point plan with Cypriot President Kyprianou, which included the return of Famagusta. But this also became a dead letter. And this Janaury, Denktash again said he would return Varosha to the United Nation. But nothing has happened.

We cannot wait any longer. The conflict on Cyprus must be resolved. At stake are some basic issues of international law and international morality that have a wider relevance for U.S. foreign policy. At stake are some key strategic interests. At stake is a small country's right to govern itself, free from outside pressures, threat, or blackmail. At stake is the basic belief that American aid should serve American interests and American values.

In sum, America has paid too much to Turkey for too little in return. It is time for Congress to take action.

Today, we have to ask if our taxpayers' dollars have been well spent. I submit that they have not. Turkey is working hard to partition Cyprus permanently and consolidate its control over the northern third of the island.

To get a clear picture of Turkey's designs, we can look back to last November 15 when the Turkish-Cypriots unilaterally declared their part of the island an independent republic. This act, done with the full advice and consent of the Turkish Government, occurred only hours after President Reagan signed a foreign aid bill granting nearly $1 billion to Turkey. Since then, Denktash has consistently rejected U.N. efforts to salvage a settlement with a number of provocative actions. In February, he unfurled a new flag; last month, he called for a constitutional referendum and elections; and just last week, his so-called republic exchanged Ambassadors with the Turkish Government in Ankara. Today, Turkey stands alone in its recognition of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

This Congress, President Reagan, and the international community have all condemned these moves by Denktash and his patrons in Ankara. But this administration's actions have failed to match its tough words. The State Department proposed to increase military aid to Turkey this year, rejecting the legislative mandate to link aid to Turkey to progress on Cyprus.

Clearly, we do have a strategic interest in maintaining good relations with Turkey. But we must not let one-sided support for that country undermine our broader interests in the eastern Mediterranean. Our unquestioning approach to Turkey is fueling a rising tide of anti-Americanism in Greece and Cyprus, and the logjam on Cyprus has strained relations between Athens and Ankara to the breaking point—a development that can only serve to weaken NATO's southern flank.

□ 1920

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), who has been a very consistent and a very reasonable voice of concern for the conflict that rages in Northern Cyprus.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and commend him not only for his statement but also for calling a special order here this evening to call attention to an issue which has been of concern to many of us here in the Congress for some time.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of Cyprus is again before us, as we approach the 10-year anniversary of Turkey's illegal occupation and partition of this independent and sovereign country. Along with many other Members of this body, I am deeply troubled by the continuing injustice and human suffering on Cyprus. In these 10 years a disturbing pattern has developed and, year by year, U.S. interests in the eastern Mediterranean have become increasingly imperiled.

Each year, just as Congress considers foreign aid legislation, there appears a sudden flurry of diplomatic activity; Turkey hints of an impending breakthrough in delicate negotiations. Always, there is the official rumor of an interim agreement over the vacant area of Famagusta and Varosha that would allow the return of its Greek-Cypriot inhabitants. Each year Congress approves increased aid for Turkey—not wanting to prejudice the chances for real progress. Suddenly the negotiations evaporate. Last fall, as Congress considered a continuing resolution containing aid for Turkey, there was talk of a summit between Greek-Cypriot and Turkist-Cypriot leaders and—of course—the return of Varosha and Famagusta. Three days after the legislation passed, Northern Cyprus declared unilateral independence with the support of Turkey.

The latest installment of this tired charade occurred last month. Due to the sincere efforts and hard work of Ed Derwinski our former colleague, and the Secretary General of the United Nations, the Turkish-Cypriot leader, Mr. Denktash, appeared to demonstrate new flexibility. Mr. Denktash talked of restarting the intercommunal talks and delaying the implementation of his unilateral declaration of an independent state on Northern Cyprus. Not surprisingly, the Foreign Affairs Committee was working on foreign aid legislation. Administration officials advised the committee not to cut back Turkish aid, or—if it did—to take the responsibility for upsetting delicate negotiations. Again, there were specific hints of an early return of Varosha.

Soon after the committee accepted increased economic aid for Turkey and improved terms for military aid, Mr. Dentask—upon consultation with Ankara—flatly refused the Secretary General's request that Varosha be returned as a good-will gesture. He then raised an independent flag the first time over Northern Cyprus.

There is no greater threat, ladies and gentlemen, to U.S. interests in the eastern Mediterranean than the present impasse on Cyprus. Turkey's costly occupation and subsidy of its enclave on Cyprus largely negates the effectiveness of U.S. aid, supposedly provided for Turkey's role in NATO. Greece, our other NATO ally in the eastern Mediterranean, increasingly questions our interest in seeking a resolution of the Cyprus conflict and drifts toward neutralism.

As long as the Cyprus issue festers, the dangerous situation in the eastern Mediterranean will only worsen. I am tired of misleading hints of progress offered up for the consumption of Congress, and I am tired of rewarding in advance empty promises. I believe it is time for the United States to begin taking positive action in the search for a solution on Cyprus, and to begin rewarding results. There are issues that still need to be resolved between the Turkish and Greek communities on Cyprus, but the underlying difficulty is the unwillingness of Turkey to alter its occupation force of 18,000 to 25,000 troops. There is still mistrust between the two Cypriot communities, but

Turkey has yet proved unwilling to support a demonstration of good faith even on the easily resolved issue of Varosha.

Awaiting scheduling in the Senate is a foreign aid bill that ties a portion of Turkey's aid to real progress on the issue of Varosha and Famagusta resettlement. There are many other incentives available to Congress. Some may still argue that if Congress were to take even the mild action being considered by the Senate, the sudden promise of some new negotiation might be threatened. Perhaps—somehow—even the imminent return of Varosha and Famagusta would be imperiled. Frankly, I have become numb to such arguments. It is time for this country to seek results, and no longer be diverted from its purpose by the whisper of promises. A lack of a legislative statement at this point will only perpetuate a situation that has gotten worse and has existed for more than a decade; and, if it is not rectified, it could lead to a permanent partition of the island of Cyprus. Frankly that is the most concern that I have about the present U.S. policy toward the problem on Cyprus.

Again I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for taking the leadership on what is a very important issue to many of us.

□ 1930

Mr. FEIGHAN. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Maine for her presentation which I think is a very accurate portrayal of the efforts that have been made, the failed efforts, over the past several years to reach a solution to the conflict in Northern Cyprus. More importantly, to point out the accuracy of your portrayal of the consequences of failure to reach a solution.

The gentlewoman from Maine, as I said, has been a very consistent and responsible voice on this issue; one that I think the House should listen to very clearly, and I thank the gentlewoman for her participation today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) for requesting this special order on Cyprus today. I believe this is a most worthwhile effort, and hope that our words will bring attention to the very serious problems which continue to exist on a long-troubled island.

I first want to state that today's remarks come at a most significant and important time, as we have just witnessed another reversal in the peace negotiations on Cyprus. Exactly 1 week ago yesterday, the nation of Turkey and its puppet government on Northern Cyprus exchanged Ambassadors—an action that has caused growing concern throughout the world and among many concerned individuals here in America.

In fact, a State Department spokesman was quoted as saying that the exchange of Ambassadors "has caused us deep concern because it could set back United Nations Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar's effort to win a negotiated solution." I, for one, am in complete agreement with this assessment, and would even go a bit further to predict that this action will definitely impede any progress in future attempts at negotiation.

I believe this action by Turkey, the only nation and I repeat and emphasize, the only nation to officially recognize the unilateral declaration of independence by the Turkish-Cypriot community, is a direct rebuke to the requests of the United States and other nations which have sought a reversal to the recognition of this illegal state. It appears that instead of willfully cooperating and working for a united Cyprus, Turkey has added another dimension to the already complex situation which dominates events on Cyprus.

For almost 10 years since the initial invasion of Cyprus by Turkey, I believe we have been patient, but that we have seen little, if any, progress. And to be quite honest, I believe the patience of this Congress and of many Americans has worn thin.

One area where I believe our patience is being stretched to the limit is in the provision of foreign aid and military assistance to Turkey. At a time when we are confronted by large budget deficits, it is difficult to understand why we should continue to indirectly support the Turkish-occupying forces through our financial and military aid programs.

In this regard, relevant committees in both the House and Senate have already taken initial steps to curtail U.S. assistance to Turkey. It is my hope that if progress continues to lag, the full Congress will act and send a clear message to Turkey and the Turkish-Cypriot community that we are tired of waiting and hearing false promises.

In addition, perhaps the time has also come for Congress to consider other measures to address Turkey's actions and the illegal state on Cyprus. Adding new conditions or limitations on U.S. assistance to Turkey is, in my mind, a viable option.

Altogether, I believe the important point is that action is needed now. Now is not the time to wait. Now is not the time for Congress to sit back, and approve full funding for military and economic assistance to Turkey—to act, in effect, as if nothing has happened in the past year.

Something has happened. An illegal state has been declared and Turkey has acted to accommodate the existence of this state. I would ask this Congress how we can possibly ignore these events and the continuing division of Cyprus. I would ask this Congress how can we pretend that there has been any progress, when, in fact, there have been new impediments constructed to a united Cyprus.

I do not believe we can sit idly by. Action is needed now. Otherwise, I am afraid that Cyprus will remain indefinitely divided, and that Turkey's act of neocolonialism will become a precedent for other nations to follow. In effect, if we do not act, we will be saying to the world that Turkey's actions are acceptable and that the United States will only engage in empty rhetoric.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank my colleague from Florida. I think that the gentleman really has captured the frustration and the impatience that is growing among Members of Congress and the American people generally as we are willing to allow the process, through the Secretary General's office, to proceed; as we are willing to allow the State Department to ask the Congress and the House Foreign Affairs Committee to withhold action as we did just several weeks ago on restraining or conditioning any aid to Turkey until a peaceful settlement could be reached or at least until the process could be underway and then defined as we have displayed that willingness for patience to see the Turkish Government to take the additional step that the gentleman referred to in exchanging Ambassadors with the new self-proclaimed government. One that can only exacerbate the tensions and the problems that exist in Northern Cyprus today.

I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) for organizing today's special order on Cyprus. Certainly, it has become evident over the last few years that this troubled sector of the globe remains a cause of great concern to all Members of Congress, to our Nation and to many other nations.

Almost 12 years have passed since the Turkish occupation of Cyprus. Since 1974 the Turkish Government has been illegally controlling a large section of Cyprus, and during this period hundreds of thousands of native Cypriots have been forced to flee their homes and villages and thousands of Cypriots have disappeared.

There are many facets to this complex situation, not least among them the humanitarian aspect. Because international security and political interests are motivated as well, it is important that the United States continue to press the Turkish Government

for removal of their troops from Cyprus as an important first step toward settling the issues of Cypriot unification and self-determination.

The other considerations that need to be taken into account include the need to reestablish NATO's superiority on its southern flank. The dispute currently raging between Greece and Turkey must not be allowed to overtake the region, since to do so would be to jeopardize the world's supply of oil. Furthermore, to continue this conflict only enhances the Soviet Union's goals in this region, as they closely monitor every move made by the parties involved.

This special order serves as a vehicle, not only in expressing our congressional concern that this conflict in the Mediterranean be expeditiously resolved, but also in restating our desire that the United Nations continue to probe every avenue for peace and reconciliation in this troubled region.

Just 1 year ago this month, Secretary General of the U.N. Cuellar announced his personal involvement in the Cyprus dispute. The following month, a resolution was adopted in the United Nations which called for the removal of all occupying forces. But the Turkish Government still remains, occupying Cyprus and in fact, responded to this peace initiative by introducing the Turkish lire as the new currency, and arranged for a new "Central Bank" to be set up in the northern part of Cyprus.

Secretary General Cuellar continued his efforts, and in July presented himself again as an arbitrator. While a favorable response was received from the Greek-Cypriots, the Turkish-Cypriots rejected these new initiatives, and called for a summit meeting, which was later contradicted by a rejection.

Mr. Speaker, it has become obvious over the years that the Turkish Government is not serious about resolving this serious conflict. Although still considered a Western ally, it is widely known that Turkey has become the largest recipient of Soviet aid outside the Eastern bloc. This one fact discloses more about the Soviet Union's designs on the region than many volumes of analysis of historical data could ever reveal.

Today's special order is an important reminder to our colleagues of the pressing need which remains in resolving this dispute. Our Nation and the United Nations should redouble all efforts to find a just and lasting peace in Cyprus.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I want to thank my colleague from New York for his statement on this issue this afternoon. He has been a very vocal and a very important voice on the House Foreign Affairs Committee on this issue for several years.

□ 1940

Mr. Speaker, this special order today is one that comes after much discussion with one of our colleagues who has been a very important voice on issues related to American foreign policy in the eastern Mediterranean area. That individual is our colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. YATRON) who unfortunately was not able to join us for the special order, although he has submitted a very important and provocative statement for the RECORD.

I really would like to stress my gratitude and I think the gratitude of the entire House to our colleague, Mr. YATRON, for the strength that he has provided on this issue. I think that no voice in the Congress in recent years has been more reasoned, has been stronger, or has been more effective than that of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. YATRON) in moving public opinion and in moving the House as well as various administrations to a responsible, reasonable American policy toward a peaceful solution to the conflict in Northern Cyprus.

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague ED FEIGHAN for requesting this special order on Cyprus, and to commend him for his outstanding leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for stronger action to help end the seething conflict in Cyprus.

On November 15, Turkish Cypriots unilaterally declared a "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus." This illegal declaration, recognized by Turkey and Turkey alone, has seriously aggravated tensions in NATO's southern flank. Turkey's support for the unilateral declaration of independence, and the continued occupation of Cyprus by Turkish troops, are serious obstacles to the improvement of relations among Greece and Turkey, our key NATO allies in southern Europe.

The State Department has rightly condemned the unilateral declaration of independence and Turkey's recognition of it. This Congress has also gone on record condemning this action. But it has become clear that words alone will not persuade Turkey to stop obstructing progress on the Cyprus issue. It seems that Turkey will continue to try to force its will on the Cyprus issue until we make clear that we will not accept a policy of settling disputes by faits accompli and military action. Turkey's unresponsiveness is particularly galling in light of the fact that the United States has given Turkey almost $1 billion in aid for fiscal year 1984.

It is time to take tougher action to convince Turkey to take a more responsive and conciliatory attitude toward the Cyprus issue and, by extension, to foster more harmonious relations within NATO's southern flank. That is why I have joined my good friend and colleague ED FEIGHAN in cosponsoring a resolution which would condition further military aid to Turkey on Turkish cooperation on the Cyprus issue.

I would again like to commend my colleague from Ohio for his leadership on this issue, and for arranging this special order on this pressing issue.●

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman FEIGHAN, for holding this special order on Cyprus. I have the privilege and honor of serving with the gentleman on the Foreign Affairs Committee. In the brief time the gentleman has been a member of the committee, he has gained the respect and admiration of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for his unwavering commitment and diligent efforts to bring about a just and lasting solution to the Cyprus dispute.

Mr. Speaker, this discussion today is of particular importance given our plans to consider the foreign assistance authorization legislation for fiscal year 1985 on the House floor in the coming weeks. At that time the Congress will be asked to approve an aid package, including almost $1 billion in military assistance for Turkey.

Over the last few years the Congress has complied with administration policy initiatives with respect to Cyprus. The situation, however, has worsened. Over the last 6 months, Turkish-sponsored actions on Cyprus make it clear that the Turkish Cypriots and their superiors in Ankara do not favor a peaceful solution to this 10-year tragedy. Moreover, the illegal declaration of independence by the Turkish Cypriot community last November and its recent exchange of Ambassadors with Ankara bring Turkey a step closer to realizing its ultimate goal: the annexation of Northern Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, what I find most frustrating is that no matter what Turkey does in Cyprus, U.S. policy remains unchanged. Turkey becomes more intransigent and we increase our military assistance program. I can only conclude that U.S. policy toward the Eastern Mediterranean is solely concerned with building Turkey's defense and not with resolving the Cyprus conflict. This policy is shortsighted and will only undermine U.S. security interests in the long term.

Given the tensions which now exist between our two allies, Greece and Turkey, the worsening situation on Cyprus could bring both countries to war. If, in fact, this were to occur, NATO would be in complete disarray and the Soviet Union would most certainly seize the initiative to extend its influence in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I support a strong Turkey but its illegal occupation of

Cyprus cannot and should not be accepted by the United States as a fait accompli. It is incumbent on the Congress to reassert its rightful role in the formulation of American foreign policy and pressure Turkey to remove its troops from Cyprus. The stability of the NATO alliance is at stake and the responsibility of the United States as the world leader of human rights and self-determination calls for no less.●

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) for inviting me to participate in today's special order concerning the very serious situation in Cyprus. As we here in Congress prepare to consider levels of foreign aid to be given to Turkey, now is indeed an opportune time to carefully review past and present developments in this strategically vital area of NATO's southern flank.

Mr. Speaker, July 20 will mark the 10th anniversary of the Turkish military invasion of Cyprus. On that fateful day in 1974, 40,000 Turkish troops began an operation which would result in the occupation of over one-third of the land area of the Republic of Cyprus.

The Turkish invasion forces gained a virtual stranglehold on the economy of the Cypriot nation. The extent of that control is far reaching; 70 percent of the gross output, 65 percent of the tourist accommodation capacity, 83 percent of the general cargo handling, 56 percent of the mining and quarrying output, 41 percent of the livestock production, 48 percent of the agricultural exports, and 46 percent of the plant production are all in the hands of the intruding Turkish forces.

When we consider that the Greek Cypriots make up over 83 percent of the population compared with less than 17 percent for the Turkish Cypriots, the injustice served on the Republic of Cyprus is even further underscored.

Clearly, the record of Mr. Denktash and the Turkish Cypriots is indefensible. This wrong must be righted.

In the area of human rights violations, the Turks have a similarly indefensible position/record. Since the invasion, over 4,000 Greek Cypriots have been killed—with another 1,600 listed as captured or missing. In addition, 15 American citizens fall under that latter category and remain unaccounted for. I would like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that for 10 years we have had people suffering. We have had people homeless. We have had people under a regime where they cannot practice their own democracy. How long will the Greek Cypriots be forced to endure these injustices before action is taken to prod Mr. Denktash to move toward alleviating this situation?

In the past, congressional action has created a measure of hope for Cyprus. An embargo on all arms and military assistance to Turkey was imposed by Congress after the Turkish invasion of 1974. Pressure from the Turkish Government of Mr. Denktash and the Turkish Cypriots led to the first of Denktash's dangling carrots, a promise to discuss the resettlement of over 40,000 Greek Cypriot refugees from the city of Famagusta and its Varosha suburbs. Unfortunately, the Congress took Mr. Denktash's promise on its face value and lifted the embargo in 1978. The result was that discussions never materialized. The carrot was gone.

I must point out that the Turkish sense of timing is no less than uncanny. Last year, 1 day after President Reagan signed an aid package of nearly $900 million to Turkey, the Turks, with their aid money firmly committed, gave Denktash clearance to declare the formation of his Turkish Cypriot rump state in Northern Cyprus.

This action was clearly an aggressive cohersion—a step of intimidation and confiscation—and morally and legally indefensible. We must not let this clear-cut violation of international law, with its total disregard for any measure of territorial integrity of the sovereign rights of an independent nation, be rewarded by granting another increased aid request for Turkey.

I urge my colleagues to support the levels of foreign aid to Turkey that have received approval from our colleagues in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Only when we agree to grant aid to Turkey contingent upon progress on the Cyprus situation, will we ever see results.

Let us keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that when we talk about the southern flank for the defense of the NATO alliance, Cyprus and Greece are also a part of that strategic flank. They are America's friends.

We must always remember that the security of the United States in the long run, will hinge upon our adhering to the principles and ideas concerning human rights, justice, and international law. I believe that if we set a precedent and compromise our ideals for the sake of strategic interests, we run the risk of losing respect for these ideals, and weaken the security and threaten the common interest of the free world.●

● Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, this evening we are gathered to focus attention directly on the illegal and unilateral declaration of independence by the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. All too often, unjustified takeovers of countries or territories are accepted by the international community after the passage of time. An immediate cry of protest may be issued, but with time, attention is diverted by other issues, and the original misdeeds are forgotten. When a smaller nation is involved, people forget all the sooner.

For these reasons, it is important tonight that we indeed try to focus attention on the attempt by Turkish Cypriots to declare themselves independent of the government which rightfully controls the island of Cyprus. In 1974, Turkish soldiers captured a portion of Cyprus illegally, and for years we have been waiting for them to return the land to the Government of Cyprus. Thousands of Greek Cypriots were uprooted from their homes and forced to flee, and 10 years later they still cannot return. Now, the Turkish Government wants to legitimatize their wrongful act by officially recognizing the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. The international community cannot allow this to happen. We cannot let time go by without doing something, so that this unilateral declaration will ultimately be accepted, as wrong as it is, by other nations of world in addition to Turkey.

Although this is my first term in the U.S. Congress, the problem of Cyprus has been on my mind for quite some time now. In 1977, as a Senator in the Pennsylvania Legislature, I introduced a resolution asking the President and Congress to exert their best efforts to resolving the crisis in Cyprus, to restore the 200,000 suffering Cypriot refugees to their homes, and to restore to the people of Cyprus the right of self-determination. The resolution also urged them to give generous American support to the Cypriot refugees. I would never have dreamed then that the terrible situation in Cyprus would have been magnified today by the attempted legitimization of this Turkish Cypriot annexation.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that I am a Greek American, but as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and a U.S. citizen, I am an American first and always will be. Certainly, I am aware of the importance of Turkey to our NATO alliance. Early in this, my first term in Congress, I was briefed by defense officials as to Turkey's significant role in NATO. However, as an American, I cannot remain quiet as I see actions taken in Northern Cyprus that are highly disruptive to the relations of two NATO allies, and also disruptive to the relations between the United States and those allies. The results are dangerously harmful to the condition of NATO's southern flank.

Also, as an American, I cannot stand by as a NATO country takes part in an exercise totally alien to the values and norms of our democratic society. The recognition of this new nation encourages the Turkish Cypriots to abandon attempts at a negotiated solution to this problem that was caused 10 years ago by an undemocratic land grab. As Americans, we should all be concerned

about these issues and willing to take some positive action to solve them.

The United States must act now to address this situation in Cyprus. Time is of the essence. Therefore, I heartily applaud the action taken by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last month. As many of you know, they voted to grant a portion of our aid to Turkey on the condition that Famagusta/Varosha in Cyprus be returned to the Government of Cyprus under the auspices of the United Nations, to begin immediate resettlement of the Greek Cypriot refugees expelled from the town by Turkish troops in 1974. The Turkish Government has been promising to return the town to its Greek inhabitants for several years without following through, so this committee vote may finally result in some concrete action being taken in this regard. It is my sincere hope that the House will also support similar conditions if the foreign aid bill reaches the floor for consideration.

The placing of conditions on aid to Turkey will hopefully speed up the resolution of this festering international problem, and will then relieve the tensions building up between the NATO allies involved. It is my hope that our efforts tonight will serve to focus a bright spotlight on this problem, and thereby prevent it from continuing into the future, to be accepted with time.●

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Ohio for calling for this special order on the Cyprus issue.

The rush of events in international affairs has swept this crucial issue aside in the past few months.

The situation has not changed. The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus remains. Its leader, Rauf Denktash, maintains his intransigent position. And the nation of Turkey, a long-time and trusted NATO ally still recognizes this new state and supports it with the 18,000 to 35,000 troops occupying the island and with funds and with words of encouragement.

Our fundamental belief is also unchanged: Our national interests and the interests of the Cypriot people, would be best served by a bizonal, federal solution. The majority of the people of Cyprus want a unified and independent state.

But the new Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus seems focused more on consolidating power than on working toward a negotiated resolution of the problem. They have written a new constitution, are creating a new flag and a national anthem. Such actions can only make many Cypriots, and many of us here in this House, wonder whether the goal of the new state is unification or partition.

The unilateral declaration of independendence by Denktash and this faction has been opposed by every nation in the world except Turkey. The United Nations has passed a resolution condemning the action.

The question now facing us, with the U.N.-sponsored negotiations at a delicate stage, is how we can best act to promote the goal of peace. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has taken a first step by maintaining aid to Turkey at last year's levels. Although it is clear Denktash and his government are becoming increasingly independent of Turkey, the Ankara government still has considerable leverage. We have demonstrated our continued support for a valued friend, but also express our dismay at the recent policies with regard to Cyprus. We can hope that our demonstrations of concern will send a clear message to Turkey. They should understand that if they continue to support this divisive force in Cyprus and do not use their influence to moderate the situation, many of us in Congress will favor firmer action.

Prime Minister Ozal, the recently elected civilian leader in Turkey, is dedicated to democratic principles. In the name of democracy and peace, he should take the necessary action to bring stability to the eastern Mediterranean.●

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, those in the Congress who value NATO and are dedicated to strengthening all of its elements are deeply troubled by the weakness which plagues the alliance's southern flank. At the heart of that problem is the situation on Cyprus. I therefore approach this special order with mixed emotions. While I am disappointed and frustrated on the one hand, I am also determined and hopeful on the other.

My frustration, of course, flows from more than a decade of Turkey's unwillingness to undo the negative consequences resulting from its invasion of Cyprus. My hope is that this situation can be corrected if a determined effort is made by all parties concerned.

Of this I am certain: Turkey must demonstrate responsible and consistent movement on this issue. Those in the Congress who recognize Turkey's long relationship with the United States and value its contribution to NATO can expect and be satisfied with nothing less.

Ten long years of stalemate is too long. Turkey's unwillingness to take adequate and effective steps to negotiate a solution to the problem is unacceptable. This failure to move merits criticism and will lead to congressional action with respect to U.S. assistance to Turkey. I join in this effort to tell our Turkish allies that our patience is worn thin and that the time for action is now. It is time for the Government of Turkey and its people to recognize that their long-term best interests depend to a large extent on what happens with respect to Cyprus. That issue can and must be resolved or Turkey's relations with its NATO allies and the United States will suffer. That is not in anybody's interests and only Turkey can prevent this from happening.●

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, Mr. FEIGHAN, for setting aside this time to discuss the unacceptable Turkish occupation of Northern Cyprus—incredibly, now in its 10th year. As the tragic events of the last few months prove all too clearly, it is time for the United States to reevaluate its policy toward this country.

The nation of Cyprus has long been marked by turmoil. Under the sway of various governments for centuries, Cyprus finally gained independence from Britain in 1960. Special conditions laid down at the time of independence insured equal representation for the Turkish Cypriots who comprise 18 percent of the population. Further, the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee prohibited intervention by Turkey, Greece, or Britain to change the political balance in Cyprus.

However, in 1974 Turkey violated the treaty when it dispatched 40,000 troops to Cyprus. The Turkish Cypriots laid claim to over 40 percent of the island and set up their own Parliament under the protection of the 20,000 Turkish troops who remain in Northern Cyprus. In addition, they have brought roughly 60,000 Turkish settlers to the northern half of the island. This division has meant the loss of homes and property for tens of thousands of Greek Cypriots.

The Turkish Cypriots have refused to comply with U.N. resolutions calling for the removal of all troops from Cyprus, are unwilling to answer allegations concerning the several thousand Greek Cypriots who disappeared during the occupation, and have impeded progress toward a negotiated settlement.

The tension in Cyprus increased last November when the Turkish Cypriots announced the creation of an independent Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus—recognized only by Turkey. This announcement, timed so as not to endanger the $700 million in military aid that the United States granted Turkey last year, signals a deterioration in the human rights situation in Northern Cyprus, with members of the Parliament coerced into approving creation of the new state.

Creation of an independent state is an illegal and provocative action which has further polarized the situation, making any negotiated settlement all the more elusive.

While there has been relatively little violence since the announcement of the Turkish Republic, the reinforcement of defensive positions on both

sides of the green line and recent talk of Greek guardsmen being brought to the island are ominous signs.

Because the continuing turmoil in Cyprus poses a direct threat to the stability of the Mediterranean and NATO's southern flank, it is crucial that the United States push for a settlement.

However, the administration's approach to the situation is all carrot and no stick. In a January report to the Congress, President Reagan indicated that he does not have a comprehensive plan to ease the tensions on Cyprus. And, while refusing to recognize the Turkish Republic of Cyprus the administration tried, again this year, to boost military and economic aid to Turkey, seeing this country as an ideal staging ground for a U.S. Rapid Deployment Force.

The administration's focus on Turkey has apparently resulted in a loss of peripheral vision. In its zeal to rearm Turkey, the administration is willing to ignore that country's record of human rights abusues, it's problems in paying already outstanding U.S. loans for military equipment and even it's continued, illegal occupation of Cyprus.

These actions, viewed by many as tacit approval of the Turkish Cypriots, ignore the history of Cyprus and alienate Greece, our longstanding ally in the region.

Further, unless and until there is a solution to the problems on Cyprus, there is no guarantee of security for U.S. military or economic investments anywhere in the region.

Fortunately, the House Foreign Affairs Committee has taken action to maintain a balance in the Mediterranean by whittling down the administration's request for military aid to Turkey by $39 million, bringing it back into line with the traditional 7-to-10 ratio and stipulating that both Greece and Turkey support the ongoing talks on Cyprus and agree to withdraw their troops from the island.

The administration should be initiating these actions as a matter of policy. Improved relations between Greece and Turkey are the No. 1 order of business for insuring the security of the region and advancing U.S. policy goals.

Giving Turkey preferential treatment does not forward U.S. policy goals and sets back any chance for improvement of the situation in Cyprus. We should use our aid to persuade the Turks to take a more realistic approach to the issue of Cyprus. We must use our influence to end the illegal occupation and to support the establishment of a constructive independent government on Cyprus.●

● Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from northeast Ohio for arranging this special order to discuss the current situation in Cyprus.

As the situation grows worse on this island country, the role of the United States and of Congress must be to mediate the surmounting tensions between Turkey and Cyprus. A resolution of this longstanding conflict is, indeed, a vital necessity in order to insure the stability of this troubled region of the world. Only through the leverage the United States has over Turkey—through our large military aid program to this country—can we influence Turkey to reevaluate its present occupation of Cyprus and pressure the Turkish Cypriots to moderate their position.

Tensions in Cyprus, which originated 10 years ago with the Turkish invasion of Cyprus, were recently fueled by the recent exchange of Ambassadors between Turkey and the self-proclaimed Turkish Cypriot Government on Cyprus. This ongoing conflict not only harms our strategic interests and investments in the Mediterranean and the Middle East, but also damages our relationship with this island country that has been a dependable friend to the United States.

I could list many examples of this dependability including; the Government of Cyprus granting the United States full access to its facilities when our planes needed to serve the marines stationed in Lebanon; allowing U.S. U-2 overflights of the Middle East and the Soviet Union to originate on its territory; and it remains the only nation in the region to exchange Ambassadors with Israel.

By escalating this year's military aid to Turkey, the administration is walking away from an opportunity to play its hand in an attempt to facilitate a political solution to the Cyprus problem.

Conditioned Turkish aid may not be the only solution to the problems facing Cyprus, however, it is one way to pressure the Turkish Government to realize the importance of a peaceful solution to this growing problem.●

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I eagerly support this special order on Cyprus. Now is the time to do something about the continuing tragedy of Cyprus. Unless real headway is made soon, I believe that Congress will seriously consider cutting military aid to Turkey. Although I regret that such action may be necessary, something must be done now to remedy the current sad situation on that island.

Let us take a look at the facts. As all of you know, Northern Cyprus recently declared itself an independent Turkish-Cypriot Republic. This illegal state is to be separate from the Greek-Cypriot majority of the strategic Mediterranean island. The Turkish-Cypriot Legislative Assembly, meeting in the northern Turkish part of the country, made this shocking and shameful decision. In recent weeks, the Turkish Government established formal diplomatic relations with the synthetic new country. I am angered and disappointed by the shortsightedness and insensitivity of this illegal action.

As many of my colleagues well remember, Turkey invaded Cyprus in 1974 and occupied part of the island. Thousands of innocent Cypriots were killed in the bloodbath that followed. Many young and innocent Greek-Cypriots are missing. Turkey occupied over 40 percent of the island with over 30,000 combat troops. In recent years, Turkey brought in over 40,000 Anatolian settlers and gave them large areas of Northern Cyprus. Many native Cypriots have been forced from their ancestral villages. Ironically, 78 percent of the population of Cyprus has always been Greek-Cypriot.

Since 1974, the United Nations Special Representative has sought a political solution to the problems of Cyprus. Progress has been essentially nil thanks to the intransigence of the Turkish-Cypriots. Our Government recognizes the Government of the Republic of Cyprus as the only legitimate government of that island. We have called for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Cyprus and have supported a unified Cyprus under one government. We have also undertaken extensive diplomatic efforts with the Turkish Government to persuade them to support our position on this issue.

The recent unilateral declaration of independence and Turkey's decision to exchange Ambassadors with Northern Cyprus only serves to heighten tensions between two key NATO allies. Prolonging difficulties will only undermine America's security interests in the important Mediterranean region. These foolish actions can only lead to further strife, tension, and possible bloodletting.

I believe that the Turkish Government must clearly be told, in no uncertain terms, that what happens on the island of Cyprus does matter to the United States and to NATO. Ankara must soon realize that security assistance to that country can be directly linked to progress on the resolution of the Cyprus issue. Continued delay on the part of Ankara will further harm the NATO alliance and worsen relations betwen Turkey and the United States. The Turkish Government must realize the urgency of giving this issue their full attention.

I strongly urge my colleagues in the House to support this timely and appropriate special order.●

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to focus the attention of my colleagues on the dismal plight of the Cypriot people as they have struggled for the past 10 years to free their country from Turkish occupying

forces. I commend my colleague from Ohio, Mr. FEIGHAN, for his initiative in calling this special order and in drawing the attention of the Congress to this grave situation. I am pleased to join him today in this worthwhile effort.

Mr. Speaker, as the 10-year anniversary of the violation of Cyprus fast approaches, the Cypriot people are no closer to achieving their goal of a unified and peaceful Cyprus than they were the day Turkish troops landed on Cyprus and forced 170,000 to flee from their homes, causing more casualties, desecrating churches and cemeteries, and completely disregarding the outrage expressed by an astounded international community. Though feeble attempts have been made throughout this past decade to reach a solution acceptable to all the Cypriot people, the intransigence of the Turkish and Turkish Cypriots has impeded any progress. The infrequent resumptions of the intercommunal talks between the Turkish and Greek Cypriots have proven futile and frustrating.

Our own country's best interest in the Mediterranean and the Middle East dictate that we work diligently and tirelessly to seek an effective solution to the conflict that continues to plague the Cypriot people. The intransigence that the Turkish Government has exhibited during this seemingly endless conflict should be condemned by our Government and by all nations that respect the value and sanctity of human life.

Instead of pressuring the Turkish Government to comply with international law and resolve the Cyprus conflict, the administration has chosen to rely on the U.N. Secretary General's attempts and has even proposed an increase in levels of military aid to Turkey. To condemn the Turkish Government on the one hand and to reward the Turkish Government with inceased military aid on the other hand is paradoxical and hypocritical. In its foreign aid request, the administration recently proposed an increase in military aid to Turkey and requested $759 million. Of this total, $230 million would be provided as a free grant, $250 million in credits at a concessional rate of 5 percent—well below the prime lending rate in our country—and $275 million in credits at market rates of interest. The military aid request for Greece and Cyprus, however, was left at last year's levels of $500 million for Greece and only $3 million for Cyprus. This aid request not only disrupts the traditional 7-to-10 ratio between Greece and Turkey but also causes grave concern within the Greek Government. This is no way to treat a trustworthy and important ally.

I am gratified that the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had the courage to cut the administration's aid request. In the House, the Foreign Affairs Committee trimmed $40 million from the Turkish aid and brought the grant aid down to $215 million, reinstating the 7-to-10 ratio. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee went one step further and attached conditions to the $215 million grant aid. Under the Senate version, the grant aid will not be released to Turkey until the President can certify to Congress that the formerly Greek-Cypriot city of Famagusta/Varosha has been returned to the Government of Cyprus under the auspices of the United Nations for the immediate resettlement of refugees. Both committees increased aid to Cyprus to last year's level of $15 million. Similar amendments will probably be offered in the House when the foreign aid authorization bill reaches the House floor.

Last November, the Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash, supported by the Government of Turkey, issued a universal declaration of independence declaring the secession of Turkish occupied Northern Cyprus and effecting a devastating partition of Cyprus. To quell any doubts about the seriousness of Mr. Denktash's declaration and intentions of partition, I would like to inform my colleagues that the Turkish Cypriots have already developed their own flag, and just last week, exchanged Ambassadors with the Government of Turkey. Turkey continues to recognize the Turkish occupied section of Cyprus as a separate state and thus further lessens the chances of a settlement.

For the past decade, we have silently looked on and we have ignored our own strategic interests in not doing all that we could to promote an effective and durable solution to the Cyprus conflict. We have silently looked on as Turkey created a new Berlin Wall dividing north and south and adding a physical barrier to the already existing delicate relations of coexisting Greek and Turkish Cypriots. And we are now not only silently looking on but also rewarding with increased military aid a nation that has condoned the partition of Cyprus.

The actions taken by the House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations Committees in cutting aid to Turkey and in imposing conditions on the remaining aid are to be commended. I would urge my colleagues to support these actions and I hope that the aid cuts will be sustained when the aid bill reaches the House and Senate floors.

The situation that currently exists on Cyprus is simply not acceptable. We have the ultimate responsibility for sending a clear signal to the Turkish authorities that we are convinced that the illegal partition of Cyprus is not only contrary to the interests of the Cypriot people but also to those of the United States. Our country's reputation has been built on our active support for justice and political and religious freedoms throughout the world. In keeping with our traditional support for liberty and freedom, it is our responsibility to actively speak out against this injustice and act to solve this conflict.●

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in expressing my deep concern about the present situation in Cyprus. It has been almost 10 years since the armed forces of Turkey invaded this small country, occupying nearly 40 percent of the island, and forcing about 200,000 Greek Cypriots to flee south from their homes in the northern part of the island. Yet the Turks still have not been held accountable for their numerous human rights violations and flagrant breaches of international law.

There is extensive documented evidence of gross atrocities and crimes against humanity committed by the Turks during the invasion, and over 1,500 Greek Cypriots are still missing from this conflict. This Turkish action resulted in censorship of the press, imprisonment of innocent individuals, torture, rape, murder, and an immense loss of property and lives.

Most recently, in an attempt to legitimize their barbaric acts, the Turks illegally declared the northern third of Cyprus an independent republic. This action is a culmination of a decade of Turkish aggression on Cyprus, which has been in direct contradiction with established international law, the United Nations Charter, the Charter of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the European Convention on Human Rights.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stand behind our trusted Greek and Greek Cypriot friends in the NATO alliance, and put pressure on Turkey to reach a resolution to this ongoing conflict. We should immediately utilize all available means to hold Turkey accountable for its illegal actions, to call for the withdrawal of Turkish forces currently occupying Northern Cyprus and for retribution for crimes against the Greek Cypriots.

Almost $3.5 billion has been sent to Turkey since 1978 in U.S. aid, and it is time for our Nation and this Congress to condition continuing American financial assistance to Turkey on tangible and positive Turkish efforts to achieve a peaceful solution on Cyprus.●

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague Mr. FEIGHAN of Ohio for setting up this special order. The issue of the status of Cyprus is important to the United States for two reasons: First, it involves central questions of international law, and second,

it involves a dispute between two NATO allies.

Resolution of this dispute between the states that comprise NATO's southern flank would enhance our security, and remove a troublesome dilemma from our relations with both Greece and Turkey. Yet, 10 years after the Turkish military intervention in and occupation of Northern Cyprus, prospects for such a settlement seem more distant than ever.

The Turkish occupation of Northern Cyprus continues at this very moment. Despite lengthy U.N. efforts to mediate, the dilemma remains.

One major reason that I am pessimistic about a resolution of the dispute is the unilateral declaration of independence made by the Turkish occupied sector of Cyprus. This act, which is in total violation of the Treaties of Association and Guarantee of 1960, has created new tensions and new barriers to a peaceful resolution of this dispute. I will continue to oppose that act.

I will support U.S. efforts to promote concessions from both sides. But as long as Turkish troops remain on Cyprus I will oppose military assistance to Turkey.●

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, the recent exchange of Ambassadors between the Republic of Turkey and the independent Turkish Republic on Northern Cyprus remind us that the Cyprus question will not go away. The situation on Cyprus has serious strategic implications, since both Turkey and Greece are our NATO allies. Surely it is not in America's interest for these two nations to be in conflict. At the same time, the Cyprus situation involves fundamental questions of justice and of self-determination.

Ultimately, we all hope to see a settlement whereby the people of Cyprus can govern themselves, whereby foreign armies are removed, the island reunified, and the rights of all Cypriots are respected. Obviously this is a delicate matter which will involve delicate negotiations. The latest round in this dispute, however, brings into question the good faith of Turkey. Beginning with the declaration of independence, the Turks have signaled us that they prefer theatrics and escalation of tension to serious negotiations. This is not only damaging to Cyprus, but to the NATO alliance, and Turkey has correctly been censured by the world community for its recklessness.

We are all interested in preserving good relations with Turkey, Mr. Speaker, and we should support the effort to revive democratic institutions in that country. But if we are to maintain good relations, we must put pressure on Turkey to refrain from jockeying for position on Cyprus. It is counterproductive; it will only lead to further tension, and that will make democracy harder to achieve, both in Turkey and on Cyprus.●

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) for giving Members this opportunity to speak on this important issue today.

We are now approaching the 10th anniversary of the Cyprus conflict and we have as yet seen no hope of a resolution in the near future. In fact, due to recent actions by the Turkish Cypriots declaring an independent Turkish Cypriot Federated State and exchanging ambassadors with Turkey, we are now perhaps further from a resolution than we were only 5 months ago.

There is no doubt that the United States has vital security interests in Turkey, but Turkey alone does not constitute the strength of the southern flank of NATO. If the problems on Cyprus are left to fester, relations between Greece and Turkey will continue to deteriorate and United States and NATO security interests will be further weakened. The effectiveness of NATO is severely undermined by the tension between Greece and Turkey, and that tension is profoundly exacerbated by the feud between these two nations over Turkey's intervention and continued occupation of 40 percent of Cyprus. The threat of regional war, which almost broke out after the invasion, has not been eliminated.

The United States must make it clear to Turkey that it is not in Turkey's interest to continue its intransigence on this issue. While the argument that it is in the U.S. national interest to assist in upgrading Turkey's defenses is a valid one, this must be considered in concert with the fact that Turkey spends roughly $200 million annually to support the 25,000 Turkish troops on Cyprus. In addition, 40 percent of the Turkish Cypriots' budget is underwritten by the almost bankrupt Turkish economy. Pressure must be placed on the Turks to insure that U.S. assistance is utilized as it was intended—to help strengthen Turkey's participation in NATO—rather than to pay for the continuation of the Turkish occupation of Northern Cyprus.

In addition to the security aspect of the conflict, the tragedy of the 1,600 disappeared—including 8 American citizens—continues. For 10 years, the Turks have refused to provide any information on any of these cases, despite hundreds of petitions presented by family members.

The United States is rightfully concerned about American security interests and a strong Turkey; however, should this concern supercede the importance of our relations with both Greece and Cyprus, we will all be the losers. U.S. assistance to Turkey is vital, but without cooperation from Turkey to end this decade-long dispute, our efforts to protect the southern flank of NATO will be wasted. Absent a just resolution of the conflict on Cyprus, there will be no peace in the eastern Mediterranean and no security for NATO.

Steps by Turkey to remove its troops from the island, to provide an accounting of the disappeared, and to agree to the return and resettlement of Farmagusta, would certainly go a long way toward lessening the tensions in the region and in diffusing the opposition to aid to Turkey in the Congress. The ball is in Turkey's court, as it has been for the past decade. We must make it clear that Turkey is out of "time-outs."●

● Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, the division of Cyprus is an issue of continuing importance to the United States and thus I am pleased that so many of our colleagues have joined today in addressing the tragic history of that island. It is especially timely in light of recent Turkish and Turkish Cypriot actions which can only aggravate tensions in the eastern Mediterranean.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Turkey exchanged envoys last week with the self-proclaimed Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, sending an ambassador to the island to present his credentials. Clearly, this ill-conceived action can only undermine efforts to promote national reconciliation between the two communities on Cyprus.

U.S. policy since the early 1960's has been aimed at preserving an autonomous, united and sovereign Cypriot Republic as mandated by the treaties of 1960 under which Cyprus gained its independence. This policy was severely tested by the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in the early 1970's. At that time, the United States imposed an arms embargo on Turkey.

Since the Turkish invasion, successive administrations, cooperating with the United Nations, have sought to mediate the dispute and to bring about the removal of Turkish forces from the island. They have done so because of our traditional support for a unified Cyprus, and because they have recognized that the continuing division of the island only exacerbates tensions between Greece and Turkey, both important American allies and members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. In order to facilitate efforts at mediation, Congress agreed to lift the arms embargo against Turkey at the request of President Carter. We were told that lifting the embargo would encourage Turkey to be more forthcoming in the continuing effort to negotiate a solution.

Despite our efforts to promote a solution, Turkish and Turkish Cypriot actions since last November offer little hope that they are committed to a united Cyprus. Actions such as we have seen in the last week damage the

prospects for unification in two ways. First, in the short-term, the exchange of envoys implies an increased Turkish commitment to Turkish Cypriot sovereignty, which is clearly incompatible with national reconciliation and a unified Cypriot Republic. Second, in the long term, Turkish and Turkish Cypriot actions since last November have further polarized the Cypriot community and heightened tensions between Greece and Turkey.

While this most recent move may have been intended to confront Greece and the Greek Cypriots with a fait accompli, thereby solidifying the Turkish Cypriot negotiating position, the practical effect has been to undermine efforts to achieve a negotiated solution. Indeed, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, has indicated that he deeply regrets these developments, which have placed current U.N. negotiating efforts in jeopardy.

The Turkish decision to recognized the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is in direct violation of Security Council Resolution 541, and the talks between Mr. Perez de Cuellar and Rauf Denktash, the leader of the Turkish Cypriots, would appear to be stalemated. As a result, we seem no closer to a resolution of this issue today than we were a decade ago.

Clearly, the continuing lack of progress can only cast a pall over the relationship between Turkey and the United States. The sending of a Turkish Ambassador to Nicosia completely ignores the expression of congressional sentiment contained in House Concurrent Resolution 220, which condemned the unilateral declaration of independence by the Turkish Cypriots last November. And it was made in spite of the fact that the United States has substantially increased aid to Turkey since President Reagan assumed office. In fiscal year 1985, for example, the President is requesting $934 million in economic and military aid for Turkey, more than twice the funding level when the Reagan administration took office.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, recent Turkish and Turkish Cypriot actions have damaged the prospects for national reconciliation, jeopardized U.N. efforts to resolve the conflict, and threaten to further damage good relations between Turkey and the United States. I am deeply troubled by these developments, and I sincerely hope that some moderation in the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot position will be forthcoming.

Until we see a more forthcoming position, I would have to oppose the ever higher levels of assistance to Turkey that President Reagan is recommending.●

● Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, we continue to hear about the situation on Cyprus from many people on all sides of the issues involved there, but one thing that remains as true today as it was 10 years ago is that the situation is not getting any better. There have been numerous talks under the auspices of the United Nation and there have been many missions from the United States. The result of all of these efforts at mediation has been a blatant attempt at permanent partition by the Government of Turkey.

Last fall, the day after President Reagan signed a foreign aid package to Turkey, the Turkish Cypriots declared their portion of the island an independent nation. They were able to get away with this secession because of the presence of 20,000 Turkish Army troops on Cyprus. This latest insult to the international effort to restore Cyprus as an independent and unified nation was a coldly calculated act that must not go unrecognized by our Nation. The fact that the newspapers of Greece and Cyprus carried the news of the secession right above the story about our $1 billion aid to Turkey had to have been planned by the Turks for maximum negative effect on our vital relations with Greece.

I am the first to acknowledge that Turkey is an important part of NATO. As such, Turkey needs to be helped and supported in its ability to resist any military or political moves by the Soviet Union. However, the strategic value of a nation does not replace its obligation to live by moral principles and to halt aggression upon and occupation of another nation's territory. Turkey refuses, despite all efforts of the world's diplomats, to withdraw from its occupation of Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, I am disheartened by the actions of the Government of Turkey. I do not believe that the United States should deal with the continuing crisis in Cyprus in separation from its other dealings with Turkey. I shall do all that I can to see that Cyprus is reunified and returned to its former status as an independent nation which rules its own destiny and its own people.●

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the situation on Cyprus. Ten years ago Turkish troops occupied the northern one-third of the island; 200,000 Greek Cypriots were uprooted from their homes, and our two allies in NATO were thrust into a deep emnity. In November 1983, a virtual independent state was declared by the Turkish Cypriots, and last month, after Turkish gunboats fired near Greek vessels, Greece recalled its ambassador from Turkey and put its armed forces on alert. And still, 20,000 Turkish troops occupy Northern Cyprus. The tragic situation seems to be worsening.

At a time when our country's strategic interests are clearly being threatened in the Middle East and Persian Gulf, Turkey with its need to defend its eastern borders with Syria, Iraq, Iran, and the Soviet Union, is distracted by its continuing fued with Greece to the West. Greece, on the other hand, has threatened to withdraw from NATO over our apparent indifference to the situation. Both countries are vital to secure NATO's southeastern flank. It is clear that finding a quick and equitable solution to the situation in Cyprus is crucial to American interests.

I commend my colleague, Mr. Feighan, for his efforts in allowing us this opportunity to reaffirm the commitment of the Congress toward finding a peaceful settlement for Cyprus. We must restate our determination to work for the freedom of all of Cyprus. In the past, Congress has endorsed rewarding cooperation and punishing intransigence in finding a peaceful solution to the matter. The International Security Assistance Act of 1978 which specified that "any future aid requests for Turkey be analyzed in terms of the steps Turkey has taken to facilitate a Cyprus settlement, with emphasis on removal of Turkish troops from Cyprus and the return of refugees to their homes." The linking of U.S. military aid to Turkey's assurance of continuing to seek settlement may be the best way of securing freedom for Cyrpus. Yet, since 1978, and especially in the past 2 years, military aid to Turkey has increased substantially. Indirectly, this aid is allowing Turkey to continue to keep its troops on Cyprus. It is time to carefully review our aid program in this light, and to make Turkish assurance of active cooperation in seeking a just settlement to the Cyprus problem a precondition for continuing further military aid.

I urge my colleagues to take note of the continuing suffering of Cypriots, the danger to NATO security, and the growing demand of the American people for a peaceful and speedy resolution to the stalemate on Cyprus. Freedom on Cyprus can only come with the removal of all foreign troops. When considering further military aid to Turkey, I urge you to also consider the impact that guarantees made for that aid can have on resolving this crisis.●

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, Congress deservedly devotes a good deal of time toward Middle Eastern affairs, yet events concerning Cyprus are often overlooked. Thus I am pleased to join my colleagues in a discussion of the current situation on Cyprus.

It has been a decade since Turkish troops invaded and partitioned Cyprus. Unfortunately, the island remains divided and there has been no decrease in tension; Turkish troops remain in northern Cyprus. Last year Turkish-Cypriot leaders illegally declared the creation of an independent

state in Northern Cyprus, and this month the Turkish Government exchanged ambassadors with the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. While Turkey stands alone in its recognition of this "state," it is urgent that a negotiated solution is reached before this illegal partition becomes permanent.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that our Government make all possible attempts to assist the Government of the Republic of Cyprus in attempting to resolve the island's problems. It is in our strategic interest to see that this conflict, one that also involves Greece and Turkey, is ended and NATO's southern flank strengthened. Also, it is appropriate that we come to the aid of one of our most dependable allies in the Middle East. We need only look back to recent times to see what a dependable ally Cyprus has been. When the United States needed a base from which it could serve our marines in Lebanon, Cyprus was more than willing to grant us full access to its facilities. The Cypriot people have been staunch friends of the United States.

In November we passed House Concurrent Resolution 220, in which this House condemned the UDI. My comments at that time provide an important message:

> While talks on the reunificaton of Cyprus have been proceeding slowly, they have continued. Optimism has been particularly high since the accession of a democratically-elected government in Turkey last month. However, the Turkish-Cypriot community has now taken an unnecessary action which may lead to the permanent division of Cyprus into two hostile states. We must condemn this attempt to secede from the Republic of Cyprus: it destroys the country's territorial integrity and unity and it serves to make permanent the disruptions caused by the 1974 occupation of Cyprus, in which thousands of people were dislocated and others remain unaccounted for.

We must remember this situation as we consider this year's foreign aid bill, which includes large sums for Turkey. We have an interest in supporting Turkey as a vital part of NATO and an ally. However, we must also remember that the Turkish Government is the key to the resolution of the continuing standoff on Cyprus. The President of Cyprus, Mr. Kyprianou, has recently come forth with a comprehensive plan to resolve the conflict. Likewise, U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar has been working for months to bring about a resumption of negotiations on the future of Cyprus. However, this willingness must be matched by the Turkish Cypriots if real progress is to be made. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is the area in which the United States can be of assistance. We must find ways to spur all sides to sit down and negotiate an end to this prolonged and unfortunate crisis.●

● Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in today's special order concerning the situation in Cyprus.

In 1974 Turkish military forces invaded the independent nation of Cyprus. This action, which was condemned by both the United Nations and the United States, initiated what has become a serious threat to peace in the eastern Mediterranean region.

For 10 years now, international bodies have repeatedly condemned this occupation and have called for the immediate disengagement of the military presence in Cyprus, and for 10 years the Government of Turkey has ignored these demands. On November 15, 1983, the Turkish occupation of nearly one-third the entire island was solidified by the illegal declaration of the region as an "independent" state.

Yet, despite its undeniable involvement in this act, Turkey continues to be the third largest recipient of U.S. military aid. I am well aware that Turkey plays a vital role as an ally in a critical area of the world. I am also aware that expressing support of this nation by reauthorizing current levels of military aid implicitly condones Turkey's violations of international law and pursuit of a policy of aggression against another dependable U.S. ally.

When the House Foreign Affairs Committee considered President Reagan's request for continued military aid to Turkey, I reluctantly supported a compromise agreement allowing that aid to move forward because of signs of progress toward negotiations. However, a number of us on the committee intend to seriously reexamine that decision when the foreign aid bill reaches the floor in several weeks, and will base our final determination on military aid for Turkey on specific progress toward a solution to the Cyprus problem. I urge my colleagues to join me in monitoring very closely developments in this regard, and to consider what concrete steps have been taken for peace before any military aid to Turkey is approved.●

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a decade now since Turkish troops landed on Cyprus and the island was effectively divided in two. It has been 21 years since intercommunal fighting broke out and the first steps toward partition began. One might say that this is a problem that is now coming of age.

Last November 15, the leadership of the Turkish-Cypriot community issued what it called a declaration of independence in an attempt to secede from the Republic of Cyprus. Apart from the Government in Ankara, no government has recognized this secession. In fact, it has been condemned almost universally. I am happy to see that the Reagan administration has made known its displeasure, as has the United Nations.

The solution to the wrenching problems of divided Cyprus will not be found in yet deeper division. The islanders share one small island; that is a fact that all the secessionist declarations in the world cannot alter.

I would hope that the Congress would go on record as supporting the territorial integrity of Cyprus and opposing its bifurcation.

Vocal declarations of support for the central Government—the internationally recognized Government—of Cyprus are important for another reason as well. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I would like to highlight this other reason for Members who may not be aware of it. During the deployment of our marines in Lebanon, the Government of Cyprus went out of its way to be helpful. It made available to our Armed Forces the airport at Larnaca, without which we could not have so easily moved mail, medicines and supplies to our task force off Beirut. Throughout the world, many countries—including nations allied to us by treaty—refused to help. Now, many of us were unhappy with the administration's Lebanon policy. But I think it is very important to remember that despite the controversy of that policy domestically and abroad, the Government of Cyprus was willing to brave criticism and help us to reduce the cost and complexity of that deployment. Governments willing to be of such assistance should not lightly be pushed aside or ignored when they ask for our assistance.

Right now, the assistance that the Government of Cyprus requests is very modest. It simply wants our support for the principle of a united Cyprus. We should give that support mainly because it is the right thing to do, because a policy of partition is no solution for the travails that bedevil that island. And we should give that support enthusiastically, loudly, and unstintingly because Cyprus stood by us when it was not always the popular thing to do. If we are to expect other small countries to stand by us in the future, they must know they can expect our unswerving support when they are right.

Mr. Speaker, I will not pretend to outline a constitutional resolution for the problems of Cyprus. That is not for me or for the American Government to do. A settlement in Cyprus must be worked out by the communities that live on Cyprus, not by us or any other outside powers. But the hopes for settlement are not enhanced by secessionist declarations. The hopes for settlement can be improved as the nations of the world, and the United States, make abundantly clear that we

are not about to accept that secession.●

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, 10 years have passed since the army of the Republic of Turkey invaded the sovereign Republic of Cyprus on the pretext that they were protecting the rights of their Turkish minority compatriots. The dimensions of this so-called protection of Turkish minority rights have been continually expanded since that tragic day. Just recently Turkey exchanged Ambassadors with the political entity they forcibly created on the territory of the Republic of Cyprus.

Can we in good conscience stand by while Turkey uses the military assistance we provided for offensive purposes when they are only supposed to use our assistance for defensive purpose? Can we stand by while Turkey expels the inhabitants of Cyprus, wipes out every trace of their history and culture, and de facto incorporates this land into itself with the importation of thousands of colonists? I think that we cannot.

As the major supplier of arms and technical support for the Turkish military we share responsibility for their actions. We must take positive steps to end this blatant aggression or end our assistance to Turkey. That is why I strongly support House Resolution 4505, a bill that would terminate our assistance program to Turkey unless action is taken to revoke the illegal declaration of independence of the rump Turkish state of Cyprus. As I wrote in testimony before the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East:

> The only legal and responsible course to take in this situation is to insist that the military assistance we provide be used for defensive purposes only, and not in support of blatant aggression. This principle must be the cornerstone of our policy.

The continuing partition of Cyprus is a personal tragedy for many of my constituents whose own families have suffered exile from their homes and the destruction of their historic and religious sites on Cyprus. It seems unmistakably clear to me that the Turkish Government by its recent establishment of diplomatic relations with its puppet republic has no intention of respecting the integrity of Cyprus and is unlikely do do so unless we take stern action to remind them that it is not our policy to reward military invasions and occupations with out military and economic assistance.●

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue that is of vital importance to U.S. interests and to international peace as a whole: the situation in Cyprus.

Since 1974, Turkish troops have illegally occupied a portion of the sovereign nation of Cyprus. Regardless of U.S. and U.N. efforts, Turkey has shown little indication of willingness to withdraw from the island. Considering the circumstances, the United States must send a strong and clear message to the Government of Turkey that meaningful negotiations must begin immediately.

In an effort to provide adequate pressure, I believe the United States must inform Turkey that future aid will specifically depend on Turkey's willingness to begin negotiating a peaceful resolution to the Cyprus problems. Aid should be conditioned on the resumption of U.N. negotiations and progress in settling the conflict based on democratic principles of majority rule with full minority rights. In addition, it should be stressed that all Turkish military forces in excess of those permitted by the 1959 Treaty of Alliance should be withdrawn from Cyprus and necessary steps taken to reverse the declaration of an independent state in Northern Cyprus.

While these steps are justifiable solely on the basis of human and civil rights for the people of Cyprus, it is also important to remember that Cyprus is of significant strategic importance to the Western nations. It is part of the southeastern flank of NATO, and there are two British bases and a U.S. radar base on the island. These bases provide important assistance to NATO and Western interests in the area, including the operation of surveillance flights and over the horizon monitoring of Soviet nuclear launches.

Considering the gravity of the circumstances, the United States must strongly express its dissatisfaction over the current situation. It is my hope that by specific and emphatic action, we can convince the Turkish Government to reconsider its precipitous and unwise actions.●

● Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, the stability and security of our southern flank in Europe is being undermined by the tension between two of our important allies—Greece and Turkey. One of the most serious problems contributing to this tension is the conflict regarding Cyprus. A mutually, satisfactory reconciliation of differences regarding Cyprus could resolve this problem.

Unfortunately, last November Rauf Denktash exacerbated the problem by declaring a separate and independent Turkish-Cypriot state. This declaration was uniformly condemned by the world community because it sought to foster secession from the recognized Republic of Cyprus and to destroy its territorial integrity and unity. President Reagan condemned the declaration and called for its nonrecognition and reversal. Both Houses of Congress, also, condemned the declaration and called for its nonrecognition and reversal. In Resolution 541, the Security Council of the United Nations deplored the declaration as a "legally invalid" act and called for its nonrecognition and reversal. The European Community, the Council of Europe and the European Parliament condemned it as well.

One country stood alone in support of this declaration—Turkey. In addition, Turkey continues to subsidize the Turkish-Cypriot community and maintains thousands of troops over 37 percent of the island, which protects this declaration. Without this support the Turkish Cypriots would be forced to work for a political reunification of their country with the Greek Cypriots.

The United States can play a role in resolving this problem which affects our own security. Through our foreign assistance to Turkey, we can send a clear message to Turkey that they must begin to work for a resolution of this question as opposed to supporting a division between these two communities.

Therefore, when the House considers the foreign assistance bill, I will work for such a clear message.●

NEW ERA FOR ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CORCORAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the New Economic Recovery Act of 1984 today to usher in a new era of economic growth. We can credit our country's surprisingly rapid economic recovery to reduced inflation and the impact of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981, both results of the leadership of President Reagan. President Reagan took a lesson from the books of President Kennedy, reducing taxes and stimulating saving, consumption, and investment—all essentials of a healthy economy.

The new era bill is geared toward business investment and growth. It would amend the Internal Revenue Code to reduce all levels of corporate income tax rates, collapsing the five existing rate categories into three. Section 11(b) of the Internal Revenue Code currently taxes corporate income at rates of: 46 percent for income in excess of $100,000; 40 percent for income between $75,001 and $100,000; 30 percent between $50,001 and $75,000; 18 percent between $25,001 and $50,000; and 15 percent for income not in excess of $25,000. My bill would tax corporate income at rates of: 36 percent for income in excess of $100,000; 24 percent for income between $50,001 and $100,000; and 12 percent for income not in excess of $50,000.

In addition to simplifying taxes, an advantage in and of itself, new era would promote the private sector

growth necessary to the creation of jobs and reduction of unemployment. When we reduce the tax on corporate income, we free up capital for investment, modernization, research and development, hiring—in short, for economic prosperity.

A most popular misconception exists that corporations do not share equally the tax burdens of America. Abysmal corporate profits explain all too well reduced corporate tax revenues of recent years. The decline in corporate tax receipts as a proportion of total Federal tax receipts reflects the long-term reduction of corporate profits as a share of our national income and the incredible growth of payroll tax burdens on employers and workers. In less than 25 years, payroll tax receipts have increased from 18 percent of total receipts to over 33 percent.

That businesses have not been able to absorb the disastrous effects of three recessions in just 8 years is evident from a study of key indicators of corporate financial strength. According to the New York Stock Exchange Office of Economic Research, corporate profits were down to 6.6 percent in the first three quarters of 1982, from an average of almost 10 percent in the seventies and almost 13 percent in the 1964 to 1969 period, reflecting a steady and sharp decline. Short-term debt is up, requiring constant repayment or debt rollover, and the interest coverage ratio—the ratio of interest liabilities to corporate profits—reach all time lows in 1980, 1981, and again in the first three quarters of 1982. This means that interest payments relative to corporate profits have greatly increased, placing a strain on businesses' ability to finance debt obligations. In short, corporations are more in debt with less ability to handle that debt. Debt-equity ratios have also deteriorated, making it difficult to find additional financing. The sorry state of corporate finances is most painfully reflected in the levels of business failure in 1981 and 1982, the highest rates in half a century.

There are many sources for this financial strain—the recessions, burgeoning Federal budget growth and accompanying crowding out of private investment, tax biases toward debt financing, inflation and deflation, high and volatile interest rates—you name it. The solutions are more difficult to locate, but a key element must be to ease the pressure toward debt by returning money to the businesses. This will improve cash-flow, alleviate the need for borrowing, reduce the pressure of continuing high interest rates, and increase ability to finance existing debt.

In the short term, a reduction in corporate tax rates will doubtless lead to some revenue loss to the Treasury, but the long-term increase in economic growth will provide a more stable and profitable source of revenue growth than does a policy that continues to encourage business failure, with attendant job and revenue losses.

Some of my colleagues point to the deficit and cry out for tax increases, a foolhardy step just as our economy is beginning to revive. Such increases would, in the short run, raise revenues, but in the long run we would choke our fledgling recovery and set into motion another cycle of economic devastation.

I hope my colleagues will consider the evidence of the past and stay with the course President Reagan set for us in 1981, a course of private sector recovery combined with spending control—a course that we know works. My bill follows this path, and I urge my colleagues to support my bill and a new era of growth.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of our colleagues, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point the text of the bill I am introducing today.

H.R. 5506

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the rates of income tax on corporations

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "New Economic Recovery Act of 1984".

SEC. 2. RATES OF INCOME TAX IMPOSED ON CORPORATIONS REDUCED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 11 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to amount of income tax imposed on corporations) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be the sum of—

"(1) 12 percent of so much of the taxable income as does not exceed, $50,000;

"(2) 24 percent of so much of the taxable income as exceeds, $50,000 but does not exceed $100,000; plus

"(3) 36 percent of so much of the taxable income as exceeds $100,000."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1983.●

PRO-AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the work of an organization that deserves recognition for its many contributions to the preservation of the principles upon which our Nation was founded.

The organization to which I refer is Pro-America, a nonpartisan organization of women volunteers founded in 1933 by Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt. Organized to support the principles of the Constitution and its traditional ideals and values, Pro-America accomplishes this by:

First, combating all destructive influences which would imperil the sacred heritage of liberty bequeathed the Nation by its Founding Fathers.

Second, establishing educational programs.

Third, supporting legislation which is consistent with the intent of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Fourth, participating in the election process through the identification and support of truly qualified candidates.

Fifth, giving input to the executive branch and the U.S. Congress on issues of concern to the membership of Pro-America.

Sixth, addressing State legislators and local officials on issues of concern to the members of Pro-America.

The organization has developed Pro-America resolutions which constitute its policies. Hours of study and deliberation go into the writing of these resolutions, and every effort is made to formulate ones which will stand the test of time.

Following are a few of the many principles Pro-America seeks to preserve. These resolutions were adopted at the Pro-America national board meeting in 1983.

Pro-America believes that as an immediate strategic objective, the U.S. Government should use its space technology to accomplish the following:

Reverse the adverse trends in the strategic weapons balance;

Replace the failed strategy of mutual assured destruction with a strategy of assured survival and peace through strength;

Provide both protection and incentive for U.S. industry to tap the enormous industrial potentials of space; and

Adopt the high frontier concept which fulfills these objectives.

The National Association of Pro America:

Opposes a nuclear freeze and continues to advocate a buildup of all areas of defense to convince the Soviets that they could not win a war against the United States.

Recognizes the involvement of the Soviet Union in terrorist activities throughout the world as well as the role of the Soviets as instigator/motivator behind so-called peace groups, and deplores any action by U.S. citizens which lends credibility to such activities as detrimental to the national security of the United States.

Seeks to educate the general public by publicizing the subversive actions of the Soviet Union, Soviet agents and other misguided individuals in order to preserve the security of the United States and its citizens.

Demands that our Government, as a first step toward world peace, end "most favored nation" status, cancel

all loan guarantees, cut off further credit, rigidly enforce the espionage laws to prevent theft or smuggling, and bring an immediate end to this suicidal and treasonous transfer of technology and technical expertise to the world's largest arms producer and threat to peace, the Soviet Union and all other Communist nations.

Supports all efforts to oppose and expose the Soviet active measures, especially in the nuclear freeze movement.

Supports the liberty amendment.

Opposes the equal rights amendment.

Urges the administration to honor the Taiwan Relations Act.

Supports complete suspension of funding for the Asian Development Bank if Taiwan is ousted.

Opposes abortion.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend Pro-America for its dedication and perseverance in upholding the ideals our Founding Fathers advanced. I would personally like to thank all those involved with Pro-America for their unending support and ability to keep the faith in the face of great adversity. These individuals, who have given so freely of their time, should be saluted for their hard work and enthusiasm. I wish them success in continuing this vital service, guided by the traditional values promulgated by our Founding Fathers.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BATEMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent yesterday for rollcall No. 91, which was final passage of S. 373, the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984. I am a supporter of this bill, which in its present form is the product of both of the committees on which I serve, the Committee on Science and Technology and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I would like the record to reflect that if I had been present I would have voted "Aye."●

FREEDOM AND DEFENSE OF THIS COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, many times we hear a lot of unnecessary rhetoric on this floor, and I do not like to participate in that. However, there are two areas in which I feel a great deal of concern and those areas are the subjects of my special order tonight. One is freedom and the other is the defense of this country and the immediate threat to our security and freedom by problems that originate very close to our borders.

Mr. Speaker, I was recently watching "ABC World News Tonight" and heard a very interesting account of the Vietnamese boat people, who continue to try to escape Communist tyranny by the sea. The newsman on this show, Peter Jennings, remarked about how horrible the Thai pirates are: Of the 138 boats which reached Thailand, 77 had been attacked by Thai pirates. Since 1981 more than 500 refugees, mostly young women, have been abducted by the pirates, most all were raped and then either thrown overboard to drown or sold into prostitution. The U.S. Committee on Refugees says something must be done to help the Government of Thailand's efforts to stop piracy or it will never end. I agree.

Equally horrendous, however, are the atrocities perpetrated on the Vietnamese by the Communists who have taken over the country.

I believe these barbarous acts are clearly described by Nuygen Vu, who is a very young man who escaped to freedom from Vietnam. Nuygen Vu was one of those boat people. Three years ago his family was one of the lucky ones that made it to the United States and ended up in College Park, GA. Nuygen Vu is now in the fifth grade. I would like to read to my colleagues the essay he wrote and read before the Georgia Association of Educators, and I quote:

Sometimes I wake up in the middle of the night and wonder whether I'm in Vietnam or in America. I can't believe that I'm in an American school with wonderful teachers and friends—have I forgotten everything? I store it in my heart day after day. That's the suffering I experienced during my early childhood. When I was four, just like other children, I had a family, we had a happy life, but one day something happened to us. It was like a mean storm took away our happiness.

The Communists conquered South Vietnam after the Americans left, and my parents worried how life would be. I could see wrinkles come over their faces. In 1975 the Communists took my father to a concentration camp, we did not have enough food to eat so we saved what food we had for my mother so she could eat and work. We only had one meal a day. Sometimes I was so hungry I would sneak into my mother's kitchen and have a spoon of soup. I looked at the weary faces of my relatives. Everyone was tired and hungry. There was no food at all except leaves from the trees. I often went to school hungry, but I studied hard to make my mother happy, because she told me we are poor, but if you want to have a brighter future you must study very hard. I thought that a boy like me coming to USA was like a Christian going to Heaven. I believe that we would never make it, but after two failures we finally escaped to America.

I love America as I did my own country. I don't have to worry about someone taking my father to prison unjustly or stopping me from leaving. I have the right to stand as tall as everybody else. I wish I could tell every American how truly precious their freedom is and not to take it for granted.

Mr. Speaker, this young 9-year-old boy is proud to be in America. He can stand tall. He can go to school and learn. He can eat and not be hungry. He is free.

Sometimes, as Americans, we do not realize just how lucky we are. We do not realize how horrible it is to live under Communist rule. We do not realize how it feels to have hunger pains, to have one of our parents taken away to a concentration camp, or to live in fear of another attack on our towns and our families.

□ 1950

THINGS THAT GO KABOOM

Another issue that was brought to my attention just today by one of my friends in the House was an article that was written by R. Emmet Tyrell, Jr., in the Washington Post on April 23, 1984, and the title of that article was "Things That Go Kaboom." I would like to read just a little bit of that article to you because I think it bears upon the freedom I just talked about that this young Vietnamese boy has finally attained by coming to the United States of America.

How very much like our 535 U.S. Congressmen and Senators are those sadly unappreciated mines now floating in Puerto Corinto, Puerto Sandino, and El Bluff off the progressive Nicaraguan coast, and how curious it is that so many of these 535 Machiavels now rail against them. These are mines whose only talent is to let off shocking fortissimos of noise. They do not sink ships. They hardly damage them. All they do is fulminate, and yet they have been the object of indignant yells from Congressmen and Senators, many of whom are themselves mere fulminators.

Our loud and theatrical Congressmen cannot effect a balanced budget. They cannot cut the deficit. They cannot stop the spread of unfriendly Marxist regimes in Central America. All they can do is go kaboom when they brush up against a genuine question of American national interest, much as our mines merely go kaboom when they brush up against a ship laden with arms to strengthen Nicaragua's anti-American regime or El Salvador's anti-American rebels.

These mines, or course, destroy themselves during their great glorious outbursts, and it is not unthinkable that our noisy Machiavels are destroying themselves too. The American electorate is not going to be pleased when faced with the increased danger of Central American bases abounding in Soviet missiles, guerrilla fighters and terrorists.

In Central America there is a growing threat to American Security, very few interested observers remain in doubt as to this. According to the bipartisan Kissinger Commission Report, "The Commission encountered no leader in Central America, including democratic and unarmed Costa Rica; who did not express deep foreboding about the impact of a militarized, totalitarian Nicaragua on the peace and security of the entire region." To be ignorant of this danger

one has to be a left-wing ideologue or a self-righteous inhabitant of Capitol Hill.

Of course, all those who voted last week against our involvement in mining Nicaraguan ports solemnly claim that they will not allow another Cuba in Central America. Senator Christopher Dodd (D-Conn.) said it himself last April 27 when, in delivering the Democrats' response, he proclaimed, "We will oppose the establishment of Marxist states in Central America."

Well, on what ground can he and his colleagues make good on his promises? If, as they say, international law proscribes us from assisting the Nicaraguan freedom fighters in mining Nicaraguan ports, what sacred passage in international law will allow them to "oppose the establishment of Marxist States in Central America"? Furthermore, how are they going to "oppose" the establishment of these states by exploding in oratory on Capitol Hill?

On ABC's "This Week With David Brinkley," Senator Patrick Leahy (D-Vt) went so far as to say that were Nicaragua to allow the emplacement of Soviet missile sites, "We would have the opportunity, in fact the right, to go in and remove that."

Well, if international law bars us from stopping hostile shipping into Nicaragua, how will Senator Leahy justify the immensely more costly and dangerous task of removing missile sites—Soviet missile sites from that area?

Comes that grim day when the Soviets do in Nicaragua what they have done in Cuba, the Machiavels of Capitol Hill will lose themselves again in oratory and pettifoggery. That is all. The fact is they do not want to do anything about the growing danger in our hemisphere. They lack the pluck. They believe in what we might call the enduring present, a present that finds them very comfortable and unbothered about tomorrow.

Thus, there is farce. In Central America others fight our battles. On Capitol Hill the orators thunder against the CIA, as though it were our enemy. Last week as money ran out for those Nicaraguan freedom fighters who might bring to their country the peace our troops brought to Grenada, the Capitol Hill Machiavels indulged their appetite for noise and theater by pursuing the vexed procedural question of who in the CIA had told whom in Congress about what and in how many sentences.

Senator Daniel Moynihan, Democrat of New York, says the CIA vouchsafed him but one sentence, that is, and so he will resign as vice chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. How many sentences would have prevented this calamity, and how many words per sentence, the Senator did not divulge. Meanwhile, the wars in Central America spread.

Freedom is directly tied to the stopping of Communist aggression, not only in our hemisphere but throughout the rest of the world. This young Vietnamese refugee who is not in the United States and who enjoys freedom summed it up very well in the last sentence of his speech when he gave it in Georgia. I would like to once again repeat that:

I wish I could tell every American how truly precious their freedom is and to not take it for granted.

We must address these issues in our hemisphere. Otherwise, our freedom is jeopardized.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The Chair would remind the gentleman from Indiana that he should not mention, under the rules of the House, Members of the other body by name or quote Members in the other body.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that I could not read a newspaper article that named those. Is that a fact?

I know I cannot mention them in my speech, but when quoting a newspaper article, is it permissible?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rule still applies.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, I stand corrected. I thank the Chair.

SYNTHETIC FUELS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Illinois, TOM CORCORAN, has devoted considerable attention to the synthetic fuels program during his 6 years on the Energy and Commerce Committee. When congressional interest in promoting domestic production of synthetic fuels heightened in 1979, TOM represented Republican members of the old Energy and Power Subcommittee in Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee deliberations on various proposals. Today, as the senior Republican member of the Energy and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Fossil and Synthetic Fuels, TOM continues to evaluate the synfuels program now administered by the independent Federal Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

On Tuesday, April 24, the synthetic fuels group of the American Petroleum Institute had the opportunity to discuss synfuels policy with TOM, and I insert his address in the RECORD at this point:

SYNFUELS—A MIDDLE COURSE ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN TOM CORCORAN

Synthetic Fuels. Before we ask, "Where is it going?", let's ask, "Where has it been?"

In 1979 I voted for a $3 billion research and development bill produced by the House Banking Committee as an amendment to the Defense Production Act.

It was argued, and I agreed, that the national security would be advanced by publicly-sponsored research into how to produce liquid transportation fuels from our domestic resources of coal.

Shortly after that modest (only in Washington is $3 billion "modest") bill passed the House, several events occurred:

1. The Iranian Revolution and subsequent import disruptions,

2. The Election Year, and

3. Jimmy Carter caught "malaise".

The result was the Congress overreacted to the Iranian Revolution and was looking to "do something". The modest $3 billion R&D bill became a huge $80 plus billion "Commercialization" bill. Where was the usual caution that can slow down a "new idea" until it can be examined? The Election Year had the Carter White House focusing on methods to avoid electoral losses in oil and gas producing states without creating losses in consuming states—and spending a great deal of public money usually is the answer. And, to overcome "malaise", something very big was necessary.

The Senate added billions and billions to the bill as one committee after another competed to outdo the other. Remember, this was a bill which would surely be signed into law and so it tended to attract all of the pet projects which never could command enough support on their own. The bill grew to a final tally of roughly $93 billion, with $88 billion for synfuels.

In as brief a story as I can retell it, that's the atmosphere in which Congress created the Energy Security Act. I voted against the final conference report not just because of the high price tag but also because the central mission of the original bill had been lost in the frenzy.

It is no surprise to many in this room that I am no supporter of the Energy Security Act, but you may well be surprised to know that I am a supporter of government-funded research for synthetic fuels. I introduced a bill a year ago that would realign the mission of the SFC to research and development and reduce its budget to $3 billion.

As I noted, one reason the Energy Security Act became law and the Synthetic Fuels Corporation was created was to accelerate development of a synthetic fuels industry in America so that we could back out foreign oil. In 1978, you may recall, we were dependent upon imports for 42 percent of our oil supply, and in the aftermath of the revolution in Iran we became painfully aware of what that extent of dependence meant. Synfuels were seen by many as a substantial element in reducing our import dependence.

Since 1979 and 1980, the portion of our oil supply which is imported has dramatically declined, to 34 percent in 1981 and, at the present time, to 29 percent, according to the Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration. Still, with increased energy demand due to the continuing strong economic recovery quite likely resulting in higher imports, especially with the equivalent of a million barrels of oil a day in natural gas supplies being "shut in" (according to Energy Department testimony not long ago), there is concern that another devastating "oil crisis" could occur. That is the most common justification offered by those who say we need the Synthetic Fuels Corporation as it was constituted by Congress in 1980. I disagree. Massive subsidies to synfuels projects are not the way to energy security.

Imported oil is the marginal supply, and its cost is thus higher than domestic supplies—about $29 a barrel today. Synthetic fuels will never be substituted for imports on a permanent basis unless they are less expensive. Contemporary synfuels technologies yield products costing more than twice as much as imported oil's current price. Even if oil import prices go up, they will undoubtedly be far lower than the $70-$80 a barrel price of synthetic oil from coal or the $67 a barrel shale oil price. Synfuels simply cannot be competitively priced when produced with current technology.

What we must do, I believe, is to restructure the federal synfuels program, investing in research on and development of technologies which may yield cost-competitive synthetic fuels. Spending $15 billion on subsidies under the present Synthetic Fuels Cor-

poration mandate does not provide the market test needed to ensure that synfuels will play a long-term role in our energy future.

I am no supporter of the current synthetic fuel program but am no opponent of synthetic fuels or even of government support for them. My view is simply this:

1. That Congress was not at its best when it wrote the Energy Security Act and it ought to amend it;

2. That the energy market has become substantially more competitive as a result of oil decontrol, a policy I supported wholeheartedly;

3. That every investor in any new energy project, but especially high-risk ventures, needs to keep one eye on the market and another on its costs;

4. That technologies that seemed ready for commercialization in the expectation of ever-rising energy prices may not be ready at all for the tougher reality of the energy market of the 1980's and 1990's; and

That the public will tolerate high government spending for only so long without demanding an accounting. Every program better be ready to pass the test at the time given.

Does that sound like the opinion of "one of the most vociferous critics of the Syn-Fuels Corporation" as the Oil Daily called me in February? Or does it sound like any prudent member of one of your Boards of Directors meetings to discuss a potential investment in synthetic fuels?

I want to pause a moment and ask you to imagine yourself in my shoes, a Congressman with taxpayers worried about the prospects of even higher taxes if the government cannot control its spending. But also consider yourself as a Director of the SFC who believes—as I do—that some role for Federal spending is appropriate but who is limited to "commercialization" when the very best scientists tell you that further research is necessary.

There is indeed a middle course. It is my basic theme today to tell you that the Energy Security Act needs to be amended not just to save Federal funds but in fact to save the synfuels program.

There is support for synfuels research among those taxpayers I represent because they believe—as I do—that at some point this country may well need to tap the huge resources of domestic energy trapped today. But moving too fast with too much ambition and too little homework will endanger the support for synfuels research.

Let me try to explain the current unrest with synfuels on Capitol Hill. First I believe that the design of the current program—its huge fund, the concentration on commercialization—is the heart of the problem.

The allegations of malfeasance, of misdirection and of mismanagement by the SFC all add to the theater of Congress' current disfavor with its own child. I have to admit it's more than a bit fickle, if not phony, for Congress to gush $93 billion on synfuels in 1980 and rush to renege four years later.

All the focus on "the personalities and the peccadilloes" disturbs me more than you may realize. It removes the focus of the debate from the policy, which I would like to see seriously explored, to one of personnel.

What I would like to impress upon you is that if the current program is never amended by Congress, or to the extent possible by real leadership at the SFC, then the program will ultimately fail. And this failure will mean a loss not just of public monies on technologies not ready for the rigors of highly competitive world market, but also loss of the public's confidence. Support for any program can, over time, grow so thin that it goes beyond rescue, beyond salvage, beyond realignment. The Clinch River Breeder reactor is a perfect example. When that happens, those of us who argued to replace the program with one capable of passing the test of the market and of the public trust will also have failed.

I supported the Clinch River Breeder Reactor for many years, and still do. I am a supporter because I believe that America needs to invest in maintaining its leadership in nuclear power and Clinch River is the kind of research and development project that will help us to do that. Yet this Congress, despite support from the President and his Secretary of Energy, killed funding for Clinch River. Some say it was because its most visible supporter, senator Howard Baker, became a lame duck when he announced his retirement. Well, Senator Baker would have retired one day. No, I believe the reason is that the opponents of Clinch River had a long-term strategy to cut its funding while the supporters of the Breeder Reactor stayed on the defensive, playing brinksmanship. "Toughing it out" isn't necessarily the wiser course than compromise in politics, especially when you forfeit the middle ground.

Support for Synfuels in Congress can go the same way. But it need not.

Here is my suggestion. Realign the synfuels program to sponsor the research necessary to refine various technologies so that when the market genuinely is ready, the technology will be. A new plan for synfuels that acknowledges the competitive market which exists for all energy types will be much healthier for the synfuels industry in the long run.

The Synthetic Fuels Corporation could start this reexamination. By June 30, the SFC is required to submit to Congress the "comprehensive strategy" for how it will meet the goals established by the Energy Security Act. Why not add a more timely challenge—why not plan to meet the challenges of the market and of the public trust by proposing to Congress that more research and development is needed and that "commercialization" in this country ought to mean the private sector.

Today there are 186 co-sponsors of a bill, introduced by Congressman Howard Wolpe, to suspend all SFC funding until both Houses of Congress approve the comprehensive strategy by joint resolution. Many of these co-sponsors, myself included, would support a realigned synthetic fuels program while others opposed the Clinch River Breeder Reactor. The point is that a near majority of the House of Representatives is showing its disapproval of the current program. Why shouldn't supporters of synfuels come forward with their own alternative?

This may well return support for the synfuels program to Congress. As of now, support is waning. Chairman John Dingell has called for the resignation of two SFC Board members, (Messrs. Noble and Thompson), while the White House has announced its intention to nominate one replacement, Eric Reichl, who Energy Daily called a "Synfuels virtuoso."

Since the SFC must have four board members to constitute a quorum, isn't that just one step forward, two steps back?

I want to leave you with this one observation. The Energy Security Act, a $93 billion overreaction of government intervention into the energy industry, was created during the tempest of the Carter-Mondale reelection effort of 1980. But candidates Walter Mondale and Gary Hart, both supporters of government intervention in the energy markets generally, have come out for abolishing the SFC.

I believe that the policy of the synfuels program should be changed. If it is not, it may not survive for long.

It may seem that the SFC is ready to commit nearly all its $15 billion and that supporters of synfuels would be foolhardy to "cut a deal" on the advent of such a large check in the mail. Remember Clinch River—those funds were cut years after private money was expended after one ironclad promise of government after another. Don't be so sure the check won't bounce.

As we say on Capitol Hill: When you don't have the votes, cut a deal. When you cut a deal early, you get a better deal.

Think about it.●

SMALL BUSINESSES SAY NO TO CREDIT CARD SURCHARGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANNUNZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the battle over whether credit card surcharges should be banned is often put in the context of big against little, with those in favor of surcharges claiming that surcharges are the only way small merchants can fairly recover the allegedly burdensome costs of credit cards imposed by the large credit card issuers. Nothing could be further from the truth, and my mail on this issue is proof of this.

Those who favor credit card surcharges claim that cash customers subsidize credit card customers because merchants must pay a merchant discount, or fee, to the credit card issuer for honoring a credit card. A Federal Reserve study claims this fee typically ranges between 1 and 5 percent of the amount of the charge. According to surcharge proponents, this amount is passed along to all customers in the form of higher prices. Surcharge proponents make this claim even though the Federal Reserve found that the cost of credit represents only 1 percent of the retail price of an item. For many merchants, the cost is even less, as low as one-half of 1 percent.

Merchants are supposedly in favor of surcharges because it would permit them to allocate the so-called hidden costs of credit cards to the affluent credit card customers from the less affluent customers. In the eyes of the surcharge proponents, surcharges would enable merchants to stop having the poor subsidizing the rich.

What do merchants think of surcharges? After all, why would merchants want to anger their cash customers by making them pay for a service they do not receive? In a broader context, do merchants anger their pe-

destrian customers by offering free parking to customers who use the parking lot free of charge? Or are both of these costs borne by merchants to attract and serve customers?

The letters that I have received from merchants indicate that the small merchants of America oppose credit card surcharges. These merchants are the backbone of the retailing industry. They know what is beneficial for their businesses and their customers and they oppose credit card surcharges.

Consider a letter I have received from the Professional Cleaners' Association. This trade association represents carpet, furniture, and drapery cleaners in all 50 States. It opposes credit card surcharges:

> Surcharge legislation would increase consumer costs * * * since small companies * * * would be forced to carry burdensome accounts receivable, stand bad check losses and suffer collection costs associated with credit operations. These cumulative costs would, in our opinion, far exceed the 5 percent to 6 percent range.

For this group of small merchants, the impact of surcharges would be immeasurably damaging and would inevitably lead to overall loss of business and higher consumer prices.

The Chicagoland Bowling Proprietors Association also opposes credit card surcharges. The association, which represents over 130 bowling establishments with more than 250,000 bowlers in the Chicago area, believes that Congress should "permanently ban any surcharge of any type on credit card purchases."

Individual businesses have written in opposition to surcharges as well. Linwood M. Aron, a real estate appraisers and consultant from Richmond, VA, wrote that "a surcharge on charges made on credit cards is both arbitrary and inflationary." Larry E. Dixon, president of MAP International of Wheaton, IL, points out that for travelers "it would be extremely difficult to depend on carrying cash and traveler's checks."

Small businesses are not fooled by the rhetoric emanating from the proponents of credit card surcharges. They know that surcharges are a bad idea for consumers, and a bad idea for businesses. It is time that surcharge proponents start listening to those businesses who they seek to help by allowing surcharges, and start understanding what those businesses are saying: Vote no on surcharges!●

MARY GAIL BLACK: A GREAT CITIZEN OF SAN LUIS OBISPO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, the San Luis Obispo Democratic Central Committee will pay tribute to Mary Gail Black, a great citizen of San Luis Obispo who has made enormous contributions to the community since she moved there several decades ago. I would like to take this opportunity to join in that tribute and to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House the career of this remarkable woman.

After a career in journalism and publishing, with a summa cum laude degree from the University of California at Berkeley and a masters degree from Smith College earned along the way, Ms. Black moved to San Luis Obispo in the early 1950's, in time to work there on Adlai Stevenson's Presidential campaign. She has led three county campaigns since that time, including two congressional campaigns and a State senate campaign. Since 1962, she has been a member of the San Luis Obispo County Democratic Central Committee and has served as both chair and vice chair of the committee. For 3 years in the mid-1970's, Ms. Black coedited the Central Democrat, a local newsletter. She is a founding member of the San Luis Obispo Democratic Club.

In addition to her activities in the political sphere, Ms. Black has been very active in community affairs. She is a founding member of the local World Affairs Council and has held several leadership positions in the American Association of University Women. For 20 years, she worked as a volunteer for the Cancer Society, and for 3 years, she was a member of the Diocesan Council for the Episcopal Diocese of California. Finally, after 4 years on the Area Agency Council for the Aging, Ms. Black has recently been elected as a member of its board of directors.

Mr. Speaker, Mary Gail Black is a woman who has committed her life to the betterment of her community, the Nation, and the world. Her spirit of dedication is an inspiration to all of us, and I know all of my colleagues join me in paying tribute to her today. It takes citizens like Mary Gail Black to make democracy work, and Ms. Black can be proud of the great contribution she has made through the years.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NELSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to official business yesterday, Tuesday, April 24, I missed one vote.

On rollcall No. 91, final passage for S. 373, the Arctic Research and Policy Act, I would have voted "aye" had I been present.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I was absent yesterday for the vote on S. 373, Arctic Research/Critical Materials Policy, rollcall No. 91.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."●

THE JAMIE WHITTEN DELTA STATES RESEARCH CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation that would designate the Delta States Research Center in Stoneville, MS, as the Jamie Whitten Delta States Research Center.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to honor the dean of the House and the dean of the Mississippi delegation in this way. He has been closely related to the agricultural communities for many years. His contributions to the farm have been innumerable.

I think it is especially fitting that the Delta States Research Center be renamed to honor Chairman WHITTEN. He was instrumental in the establishment of the center in Stoneville. His continual influence and support for agricultural research both at this center and nationwide has contributed much to the current role the United States plays in worldwide agriculture.

Our dean is renowned and widely acclaimed as one of the foremost authorities in the U.S. Congress on agricultural research. His national leadership has certainly had an influence on the ongoing programs that are being initiated at the Midsouth regional headquarters at Stoneville. I cannot think of a better name for this research center and I am pleased to take this opportunity to seek the change from the Delta States Research Center to the Jamie Whitten Delta States Research Center.●

COKE PRODUCTION FALLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, an essential element in steelmaking is coke, a material made from metallurgical coal. The importance of this material cannot be underestimated, for without it, a good deal of the steel used by this Nation could not be produced.

A situation has developed in which domestic coke production has precipitously fallen. In 1982, U.S. coke pro-

duction was only 28 million tons, down from 60.5 million tons 10 years earlier. Obviously, the demand for metallurgical coal and coke is derived primarily from the demand for pig iron and raw steel. Hence, the declining trend in coke production and metallurgical coal use is due primarily to the slump in steelmaking.

However, the ability of domestic coke producers to respond to a sudden and unexpected increase in demand for coke has been eroded. A great many coke ovens have been shut down and those which are operating are growing old and less efficient. According to a recent report by Paine Webber Mitchell Hutchins, Inc., entitled "World Coke Dynamics," an age profile shows troubled times ahead with much capacity close to the threshold of useful life and effective productivity rates. The study adds that USA coke capacity seems within 5 years of serious oven-age problems and productivity losses unless major investments are soon made.

Perhaps the most startling finding of the study is that by 1985 U.S. coke capacity could fall short of demand by 5 to 9 million short tons.

Indeed, in 1978 an 8 million short ton domestic coke shortfall did occur. Domestic coke stocks dropped by 46 percent and the United States imported 5.7 million short tons of coke in order to meet steelmaking demands. However, if the United States was facing a national emergency, it is doubtful that imported tonnage could have been obtained quickly enough to meet defense-related steel requirements.

I would also point out that if those 8 million short tons of coke had been produced by domestic coke ovens, U.S. metallurgical coal production would have been 11.7 million short tons greater than it was, providing for 3,256 coal miner jobs.

The dire prospect of the U.S. steel industry operating at an artifically low rate because of growing constraints on domestic coke production exists. Such a situation would have grave consequences on the Nation in the event of a national emergency.

For this reason, today I am introducing legislation which would add coke to the national defense stockpile. I believe such a requirement would fulfill the two criteria placed on materials which are considered strategic and/or critical for stockpile purposes by the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Revision Act of 1979. First, the material would be needed to supply the military, industrial and essential civilian needs of the United States during a national emergency. Second, the material is not found or produced in the United States in sufficient quantities to meet such need.

Under current law, the Federal Emergency Management Agency is the executive agency primarily responsible for setting acquisition goals for materials to be stockpiled. The basic criteria used for this purpose is the determination of how much material would be needed during a wartime emergency lasting 3 years. As such, the bill I am introducing directs the President to acquire a 3-year supply of coke. This coke would be purchased by FEMA from domestic coke ovens which use domestically produced metallurgical coal.

According to a CRS analysis of this situation, between 47.5 million and 63.5 million short tons of coke would be needed under the stockpiling scenario outlined by my bill based on data relevant to the 3-year period of 1985 to 1987.

Mr. Speaker, purchasing coke through long-term contracts for the national defense stockpile would have the effect of encouraging steelmakers to invest in new and more modern coke ovens.

The requirement to stock coke would also work to stimulate the demand for metallurgical coal. Currently, it takes 1.5 tons of metallurgical coal to produce 1 ton of coke. Coke is produced by heating metallurgical coal to very high temperatures in the absence of air. The general requirements for coking coal to be designated as a metallurgical coal are a volatile matter of up to 35 percent, a low-sulfur content and a low, but uniform, ash content. The coke is then combined with iron ore and limestone in a blast furnace to produce pig iron which is transferred to a steelmaking furnace.

As such, this legislation would stimulate the production of between 71.25 and 95.25 million short tons of low-volatile, low-sulfur metallurgical coal. Much of this type of coal is produced in southern West Virginia, Virginia, and eastern Kentucky.

While I realize that the 1979 act established guidelines for the President to follow in determining which materials should be included in the stockpile, I am making this legislative initiative to add coke because of this administration's record of ignoring the value coal holds for national security goals. When we have an administration that does not recognize the importance of coal to national energy goals—or for that matter does not even deem it important to have an energy policy—I hardly think it will consider the critical importance of coal for national security purposes.

Currently, FEMA is stocking a wide variety of minerals and materials including those in the aluminum metal group, asbestos, bauxite, chromium, copper, lead, rubber, and tin. Surely, coke has an equal value as these elements during a time of national emergency.●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my special order speech this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WEISS (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for April 24 and 25, on account of illness.

Mr. ACKERMAN (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), on April 25, on account of official business.

Mr. SKELTON (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for the week of April 24, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CORCORAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BATEMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, on April 30.

Mr. WEBER, for 60 minutes, on April 30.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, on April 30.

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, on May 1.

Mr. WEBER, for 60 minutes, on May 1.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, on May 1.

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, on May 2.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, on May 2.

Mr. WEBER, for 60 minutes, on May 2.

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, on May 3.

Mr. WEBER, for 60 minutes, on May 3.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, on May 3.

Mr. MICHEL, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RICHARDSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. NELSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. RAHALL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. PANETTA, for 60 minutes, on May 1.
Mr. REID, for 60 minutes, on May 1.
Mr. LANTOS, for 60 minutes, on May 1.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DELLUMS and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $2,183.

Mr. GREGG, to include a letter in the RECORD that he spoke of during debate on H.R. 4974 in the Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DANNEMEYER in three instances.
Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE in two instances.
Mr. BADHAM.
Mr. CORCORAN.
Mrs. JOHNSON.
Mr. HYDE in two instances.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio in three instances.
Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. FRENZEL.
Mr. KEMP.
Mr. GREEN.
Mr. SILJANDER in two instances.
Mr. O'BRIEN.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
Mr. MCKINNEY.
Mr. CLINGER.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. MOLINARI.
Mr. GEKAS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RICHARDSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. UDALL.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. RAHALL.
Mr. MATSUI in three instances.
Mr. DYSON.
Mr. GAYDOS in three instances.
Mr. FORD of Michigan.
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.
Mr. MOLLOHAN.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. MCHUGH.
Mr. GARCIA in three instances.
Mr. SMITH of Florida.
Mr. KOSTMAYER.
Mr. CHAPPELL in two instances.
Mr. BOUCHER.
Mr. FRANK.
Mr. GEJDENSON in two instances.
Mr. LELAND.
Mr. BERMAN in two instances.
Mr. LONG of Maryland.
Mr. ROE.
Mr. LANTOS in two instances.
Mr. ERDREICH.
Mr. OLIN.
Mr. SISISKY.
Mr. MCCLOSKEY.
Mr. FLORIO.
Ms. MIKULSKI.
Mr. FAUNTROY.
Mr. STUDDS.
Mr. HARKIN.
Mr. SHELBY.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. GORE.
Mr. LONG of Louisiana.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 26, 1984, at 11 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports of various individuals and delegations traveling under authorizations from the Speaker concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them during the first quarter of calendar year 1984 in connection with foreign travel pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ASIA AND ITALY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 7 AND JAN. 22, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Debra Cabral	1/7	1/9	Hong Kong	2,843.80	366.00						366.00
	1/10	1/13	Thailand	10,167.50	444.000		57.67		77.71		579.38
	1/14	1/16	Pakistan	4,399.92	324.00				13.21		337.21
	1/17	1/18	Turkey	33,113	108.00						108.00
	1/18	1/22	Rome	876,168	516.00						516.00
Military air transport							7,887.57				7,887.57
James Rowan	1/7	1/9	Hong Kong	2,843.80	366.00						366.00
	1/10	1/13	Thailand	10,167.50	444.00		57.67		77.71		579.38
	1/14	1/16	Pakistan	4,399.92	324.00				13.21		337.21
	1/17	1/18	Turkey	33,113	108.00						108.00
	1/18	1/22	Rome	876,168	516.00						516.00
Military air transport							7,887.57				7,887.57
Committee total					3,516.00		15,890.48		181.84		19,588.32

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DEBRA M. CABRAL, FEB. 21, 1984.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ASIA AND ITALY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 7 AND JAN. 22, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Debra Cabral	1/7	1/10	Hong Kong	2,843.80	366.00		31.86		47.92		445.78
	1/10	1/14	Thailand	10,167.50	444.00		57.67		58.48		560.15

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ASIA AND ITALY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 7 AND JAN. 22, 1984—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	1/14	1/16	Pakistan	4,399.92	324.00				32.45		356.45
	1/17	1/18	Turkey	33,113	108.00		7.50		34.44		149.94
	1/18	1/21	Italy	876,168	516.00		54.61		70.14		640.75
Military air transport							7,887.56				7,887.56
James Rowan	1/7	1/10	Hong Kong	2,843.80	366.00		31.86		47.92		445.78
	1/10	1/14	Thailand	10,167.50	44.00		57.67		58.48		560.15
	1/14	1/16	Pakistan	4,399.92	324.00				32.45		356.45
	1/17	1/18	Turkey	33,113	108.00		7.50		34.44		149.94
	1/18	1/21	Italy	876,168	516.00		54.61		70.14		640.75
Military air transport							7,887.56				7,887.56
Committee total					3,516.00		16,078.40		486.86		20,081.26

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DEBRA CABRAL, Mar. 26, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO INDIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 13 AND FEB. 22, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Lisa Gomer	2/13	2/21	India		774.00		[3] 2,421.00		[4] 10.74		3,205.74
			India				[5] 178.05				178.05
	2/21	2/22	Nepal		150.00		[3] 284.00				434.00
Michael Teitelbaum	2/15	2/21	India		516.00		[3] 2,427.00		10.74		2,953.74
			India				[5] 178.05				178.05
	2/21	2/22	Nepal		150.00		[3] 284.00				434.00
Committee total					1,590.00		5,772.10		21.48		7,383.58

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Air.
[4] Miscellaneous.
[5] Can.

LISA GOMER, Mar. 22, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 15 AND FEB. 21, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Levitas, E. H.	2/15	2/17	France		182.00						182.00
	2/17	2/21	Sweden		488.00						488.00
Commercial transportation							3,576.00				3,576.00
Abbruzzese, P. A.	2/15	2/17	France		182.00						182.00
	2/17	2/21	Sweden		488.00						488.00
Commercial transportation							3,709.00				3,709.00
Committee total					1,340.00		7,285.00				8,625.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS, Mar. 15, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOSEPH R. RUTLEDGE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 10 AND FEB. 13, 1984

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Joseph Robert Rutledge	2/10	2/13	Grenada								399.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOE RUTLEDGE, Mar. 14, 1984.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL DELEGATION TO SOUTH AMERICA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 3 AND JAN. 17, 1984

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Campbell, Frances	1/3	1/5	Costa Rica		150.00				142.23		292.23
	1/5	1/9	Peru		300.00				100.85		400.85
	1/9	1/11	Argentina		225.00				70.24		295.24
	1/11	1/15	Brazil		342.00				339.63		681.63
	1/15	1/16	Barbados		156.00				102.76		258.76
	1/16	1/16	Grenada						60.45		60.45
	1/16	1/17	Jamaica		109.00				80.91		189.91
Military transportation							6,823.82				6,823.82
Commercial transportation							137.19				137.19
Gille, Kathy	1/3	1/5	Costa Rica		150.00				142.23		292.23
	1/5	1/9	Peru		300.00				100.85		400.85
	1/9	1/11	Argentina		225.00				70.24		295.24
	1/11	1/15	Brazil		342.00				339.63		681.63
	1/15	1/16	Barbados		156.00				102.76		258.76
	1/16	1/16	Grenada						60.45		60.45
	1/16	1/17	Jamaica		109.00				80.91		189.91
Military transportation							6,823.82				6,823.82
Commercial transportation							137.19				137.19
Killen, Carson	1/3	1/5	Costa Rica		150.00				142.23		292.23
	1/5	1/9	Peru		300.00				100.85		400.85
	1/9	1/11	Argentina		225.00				70.24		295.24
	1/11	1/15	Brazil		342.00				339.63		681.63
	1/15	1/16	Barbados		156.00				102.76		258.76
	1/16	1/16	Grenada						60.45		60.45
	1/16	1/17	Jamaica		109.00				80.91		189.91
Military transportation							6,823.82				6,823.82
Commercial transportation							137.19				137.19
Mellody, Charles	1/3	1/5	Costa Rica		150.00				142.23		292.23
	1/5	1/9	Peru		300.00				100.85		400.85
	1/9	1/11	Argentina		225.00				70.24		295.24
	1/11	1/15	Brazil		342.00				339.63		681.63
	1/15	1/16	Barbados		156.00				102.76		258.76
	1/16	1/16	Grenada						60.45		60.45
	1/16	1/17	Jamaica		109.00				80.91		189.91
Military transportation							6,823.82				6,823.82
Commercial transportation							137.19				137.19
Committee total					5,128.00		27,844.04		3,588.28		36,560.32

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CARSON K. KILLEN, Mar. 29, 1984.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3208. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual animal welfare enforcement report for fiscal year 1983, pursuant to Public Law 89-544, section 25 (84 Stat. 1565); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3209. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Military Personnel and Force Management), transmitting a report on defense contractors and consultants who during the past 3 years held positions of GS-13 or above within the Department, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2397(e) (96 Stat. 1293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3210. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting information on the real and personal property of the Department as of September 30, 1983, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2701(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3211. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report on the community development, rehabilitation loan, and the urban homesteading programs, pursuant to Public Law 93-383, section 113(a) (91 Stat. 1124); Public Law 88-560, section 312(k) (92 Stat. 2081; 93 Stat. 1101) and Public Law 93-383, section 810(e); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

3212. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Follow-up Audit of the University of the District of Columbia's Athletic Department", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 455(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3213. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Reported Purchase of LaMancha, Inc.", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 455(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3214. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the 1983 annual report of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, pursuant to Public Law 89-36, section 5(b)(3); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3215. A letter from the Executive Vice President, National Industries for the Blind, transmitting its annual report for 1983; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3216. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend and amend programs under the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3217. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a list of GAO reports that were issued in March, pursuant to 31 U.S.C 719(h); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3218. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting a report on the Commission's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during 1983, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3219. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Mediation Board, transmitting a report on the Board's compliance with the laws relating to open meetings of agencies of the Government (Government in the Sunshine Act) during 1983, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3220. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1110 of title 11, United States Code, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3221. A letter from the Special Counsel, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting his review of the Veterans' Administration's investigation of allegations of a violation of regulations, abuse of authority, and a substantial and specific danger to public health and safety at the VA Medical Center, Murfreesboro, Tenn., pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1206(b)(5)(A) (92 Stat. 1125); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

3222. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Banking Finance and Urban Affairs.

3223. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1985 and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 1244. A bill to amend the provisions of title 31, United States Code, relating to the President's budget to require it to separately identify and summarize the capital investment expenditures of the United States, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to require the Secretary of Commerce to conduct an inventory and assessment of the Nation's public facilities, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-153, Pt II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 490. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 2570, a bill to continue the transition provisions of the Bankruptcy Act until May 26, 1984, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 98-698). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 491, providing for the consideration of H.R. 4275, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain hydroelectric powerplants at various existing water projects, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-699). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ASPIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 5027. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify procedures for payment of military retired pay to spouses and former spouses of members of the uniformed services in compliance with court orders without amendment (Rept. No. 98-700). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 5051. A bill to give permanent effect to the provisions of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 relating to the reimbursement of United States commercial fishermen for certain losses incurred incident to the seizure of their vessels by foreign nations; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-701). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 4585. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Office of Environmental Quality and the Council on Environmental Quality for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-702). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 4921. A bill to provide for the selection of additional lands for inclusion within the Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-703). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 5050. A bill to extend until October 1, 1986, the authority and authorization of appropriations for certain programs under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-704). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 5271. A bill to extend the Wetlands Loan Act (Rept. No. 98-705). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 537. Joint resolution designating the Brigantine and Barnegat units of the National Wildlife Refuge System as the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge (Rept. No. 98-706). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 3987. A bill to improve the preservation and management of Federal records, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-707). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 4821. A bill to establish uniform audit requirements for State and local governments receiving Federal financial assistance; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-708). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BOLAND: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. House Resolution 467. Resolution directing the President of the United States to provide certain information to the House of Representatives concerning the Central Intelligence Agency and death squads in El Salvador (Rept. No. 98-709). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. SHUSTER):

H.R. 5504. A bill to apportion funds for construction of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways for fiscal years 1985 and 1986, to revise authorizations for mass transportation, to expand and improve the relocation assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. SNYDER) (by request):

H.R. 5505. A bill to amend title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CORCORAN:

H.R. 5506. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the rates of income tax on corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLORIO:

H.R. 5507. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to give the Federal Trade Commission authority with respect to certain regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board relating to unfair acts or practices, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GORE:

H.R. 5508. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require manufacturers, importers, and distributors of medical devices to maintain certain records respecting the handling of complaints, analysis of device failures, and the return of devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HERTEL of Michigan:

H.R. 5509. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide civil penalties for false claims and statements made to the United States, to certain recipients of property, services, or money from the United States, or to parties to contracts with the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H.R. 5510. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a mechanism for taxpayers to designate overpayments of income tax, and to contribute other amounts, for purposes of reducing the public debt of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOSTMAYER:

H.R. 5511. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide incentive grants in order to encourage States to adopt and enforce laws requiring the use of safety belts by schoolchildren in new school buses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MOLINARI:

H.R. 5512. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reinstate and reinforce the biological integrity of our Nation's waters; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, and Mr. FRANKLIN):

H.R. 5513. A bill to designate the Delta States Research Center in Stoneville, Miss., as the "Jamie Whitten Delta States Research Center"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 5514. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 100-percent tax credit for tuition paid for the education of any individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE (for himself and Mr. DICKINSON):

H.R. 5515. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to the unknown American who lost his life while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam era and who has been selected to be buried in the Memorial Amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R 5516. A bill to require that a 3-year supply of coke be acquired for the national defense stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:

H.R. 5517. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for certain additional experts and consultants for the General Accounting Office, to provide for certain additional positions within the General Accounting Office Senior Executive Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SUNDQUIST:

H.R. 5518. A bill to require high-buoyancy life vests aboard commercial aircraft; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 5519. A bill to reauthorize and amend the Indian Financing Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BROYHILL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DIXON, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BATES, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ROSE, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. ROE, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. MOODY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. KRAMER, and Mr. PETRI):

H.J. Res. 554. Joint resolution to designate the week of November 11, 1984, through November 17, 1984, as "Women in Agriculture Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.J. Res. 555. Joint resolution to designate July 20, 1984, as "Space Exploration Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMON (for himself and Mr. GILMAN):

H.J. Res. 556. Joint resolution to proclaim October 16, 1984, as "World Food Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

372. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to H.R. 5185; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

373. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to POW-MIA Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

374. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to Federal health policy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

375. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, relative to foreign steel imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

376. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to programs that would reestablish wolf populations in Idaho; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Agriculture, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 5520. A bill for the relief of David Labbaf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANK:

H.R. 5521. A bill for the relief of Barbara Killion Applegate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 5522. A bill for the relief of Jody Guthrie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5523. A bill for the relief of Flora C. Ralston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLPE:

H.R. 5524. A bill to provide for the free entry of a ring of eight bells for the use of Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 953: Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina.

H.R. 1242: Mr. ALBOSTA and Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 1315: Mr. BRITT, Mr. GRAY, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1743: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. MOODY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. PRICE, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 1925: Mr. COURTER.

H.R. 1955: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1991: Mr. REID.

H.R. 2474: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 2837: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.R. 2944: Mr. GORE.

H.R. 2960: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 3105: Mr. EDGAR.

H.R. 3277: Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 3282: Mr. ROYBAL and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 3811: Mr. DASCHLE and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 3832: Mr. NOWAK and Mr. MAZZOLI.

H.R. 3917: Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 3966: Mr. PAUL, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. FROST, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. VANDERGRIFF, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. WILSON, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. ARCHER, and Mr. MARRIOTT.

H.R. 3987: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. BATES, and Mr. DASCHLE.

H.R. 4080: Mr. VANDER JAGT and Mr. HARKIN.

H.R. 4098: Mr. LOWERY of California and Mr. MACKAY.

H.R. 4124: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. ECKART, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ROSE, and Ms. OAKAR.

H.R. 4272: Mr. DANIEL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 4273: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 4274: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DICKINSON, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 4287: Mr. TAUKE.

H.R. 4300: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. GORE, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 4345: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 4395: Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. MINISH, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. EDGAR.

H.R. 4440: Mr. MCKINNEY and Ms. OAKAR.

H.R. 4447: Mr. WIRTH, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. CARPER, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. GRAY, Mr. CARR, and Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H.R. 4468: Mrs. BURTON of California.

H.R. 4571: Mr. EDGAR.

H.R. 4642: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. MCEWEN.

H.R. 4685: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 4686: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 4760: Mr. GUARINI, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. ASPIN.

H.R. 4772: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 4800: Mr. DONNELLY and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 4813: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 4877: Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio.

H.R. 4966: Mr. BRITT, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. TRAXLER.

H.R. 5011: Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. ANDERSON.

H.R. 5015: Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 5032: Mr. BATES, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. LELAND, Mr. ROE, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 5042: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 5068: Mr. DONNELLY.

H.R. 5090: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DAUB, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. ROE, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. OWENS, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BATES, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GORE, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. EDGAR.

H.R. 5108: Mr. FROST, Mr. CORRADA, and Mr. SIMON.

H.R. 5141: Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. GRAY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. HANCE, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. KENNELLY, Ms. FERRARO, and Mr. ROYBAL.

H.R. 5173: Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 5195: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.R. 5196: Mr. BRITT and Mr. GORE.

H.R. 5238: Mr. MINETA, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 5265: Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FRANK, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. ALBOSTA.

H.R. 5321: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 5361: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 5367: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 5383: Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 5389: Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. RUSSO.

H.R. 5390: Mr. SIMON.

H.R. 5391: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HAWKINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. WYLIE, and Ms. MIKULSKI.

H.R. 5422: Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H.R. 5428: Mr. GINGRICH.

H.J. Res. 120: Mr. LUNDINE.

H.J. Res. 254: Mr. COUGHLIN.

H.J. Res. 272: Mrs. BYRON, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GORE, and Mr. SYNAR.

H.J. Res. 433: Mr. WINN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. SABO, Mr. EARLY, and Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.J. Res. 446: Mr. LUKEN and Mr. RITTER.

H.J. Res. 450: Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. SWIFT, and Mr. ERDREICH.

H.J. Res. 451: Mr. MACKAY, Mr. RUDD, and Mr. ROEMER.

H.J. Res. 457: Mr. WIRTH, Mr. ROE, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WALGREN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MINETA, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DAUB, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. OLIN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LELAND, Mr. FUQUA, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. WINN, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BRITT, Mr. CARPER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. REID, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FISH, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MINISH, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SABO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. WEISS, Mr. KASICH, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. NEAL, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. DYSON, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. YATRON, Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. VANDERGRIFF, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. DIXON, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. FLORIO, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. BARNES, Mr. ROSE, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. CARR, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. TORRES, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. MICA, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.J. Res. 463: Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. RITTER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DAUB, Mr. FRANK, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. YATRON, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. CARR, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. RUDD, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.J. Res. 472: Mr. SKELTON and Mr. EMERSON.

H.J. Res. 482: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. DAUB, Mr. HYDE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. TRAXLER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. ANTHONY, Ms. FERRARO, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.J. Res. 488: Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. FROST, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. RITTER, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. WINN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HUTTO, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. BRITT, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. PRICE, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. YATRON, Mr. NICHOLS, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. GREGG, Mr. REID, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. WILSON, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. PEPPER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. RODINO, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. DE LA GARZA.

H.J. Res. 509: Mr. BARNES, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HANCE, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LENT, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. MCCURDY.

H.J. Res. 512: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. FROST, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GUARINI, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. MINISH, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GREGG, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. EARLY, and Mr. YOUNG of Missouri.

H.J. Res. 528: Mr. KASICH, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BRITT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MOORE, Mrs. BOGGS, and Mr. BREAUX.

H.J. Res. 532: Mr. DEWINE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WINN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. VENTO, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. CROCKETT, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BRITT, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. COATS, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. GORE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HORTON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. FISH, Mr. SISISKI, Mr. PETRI, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. TORRES, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. COELHO, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ROE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. JACOBS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. FROST, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DAUB, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. BARNES, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. OWENS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. LELAND, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FLORIO, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.J. Res. 535: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BRITT, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SIMON, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. BONIOR of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 537: Mr. SHAW.

H.J. Res. 543: Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. DASCHLE.

H.J. Res. 553: Mr. SHAW.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. DYSON.

H. Con. Res. 260: Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. LOWRY of Washington.

H. Con. Res. 265: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. WOLPE.

H. Res. 337: Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LENT, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ROE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FROST, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. UDALL.

H. Res. 468: Mr. TAUKE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1029: Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 5345: Mr. DORGAN.

H.J. Res. 509: Mr. GLICKMAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

346. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council of Melbourne, Fla., relative to the Comprehensive Crime Control Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

347. Also, petition of the American Public Works Association, Chicago, Ill., relative to the interstate cost estimates; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

348. Also, petition of the Suffolk County Legislature, Riverhead, N.Y., relative to Brookhaven National Laboratory Research Hospital; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RALPH FOSTER—PIONEER RADIO BROADCASTER

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, today, Mr. Ralph Foster is celebrating his 91st birthday. For everyone in southwestern Missouri, Ralph is known as "Mr. Conservation," and a pioneer in radio broadcasting.

Ralph Foster's success in radio broadcasting is attributed to his ability to provide wholesome family programs and innovative programing techniques. He started his first station in St. Joseph, MO, in 1926. Ralph's radio station was the first to originate Weather Bureau direct forecasting and to syndicate radio shows nationally. "The Ozarks Jubilee" was the first regular country music show on television and one of the biggest tourist attractions in Missouri in the mid-1950's. Through this program and other programs he produced for KWTO in Springfield, Ralph Foster has brought many an outstanding entertainment personality to the Ozarks.

It was Ralph's love for the outdoors that brought him to the Ozarks in 1933, where he has lived with his wife, Harriet, for over 53 years. In addition to his outstanding achievements in the field of radio and television, Ralph has been the catalyst in establishing good conservation practices for the State of Missouri. Mr. Foster helped establish the Conservation Commission in 1936 and has been collecting Native American artifacts for years. In the mid-1960's, Mr. Foster donated his collection to the School of the Ozarks Museum, and in 1967, the college changed the name of the museum to the Ralph Foster Museum.

Ralph Foster has dedicated his life to his fellowman. He currently is vice chairman of the Ralph Foster Museum Board, member of the Board of Trustees of the School of the Ozarks, and a member of the board of the Lester E. Cox Medical Center.

I know my colleagues join me in wishing Mr. Foster a very special 91st birthday. Ralph Foster has given Missourians and so many others so much joy through his caring and happiness through his radio programing.●

AN EMERALD THREAD SPANS THE GENERATIONS IN SCRANTON

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most famous events celebrating March 17 is the annual dinner in Scranton, PA, of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick. Every year they have outstanding speakers, usually a clergyman and a political figure.

In 1964, Robert Kennedy delivered one of the most memorable addresses ever presented to that distinguished gathering, and I am pleased to provide a newspaper account from the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 18, 1984, written by its editor, Edwin Guthman, reminiscing about that unforgettable occasion. Mr. Guthman's article also adverted to this year's most moving address by Father William J. Byron, S.J., the president of the Catholic University of America.

Father Byron's address should reach into the heart of every person who reads it, and so I take great honor and pleasure in providing both Mr. Guthman's column and Father Byron's address to my colleagues:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Mar. 18, 1984]

AN EMERALD THREAD SPANS THE GENERATIONS IN SCRANTON

(By Edwin Guthman)

SCRANTON.—"So you were here with Bobby Kennedy in 1964, were you now," the young man said grabbing my hand. "I was too. I'll never forget it."

I looked him over. Maybe 28 he was or 30 at best.

"Aw, you couldn't have been," I said. "You're not old enough."

"I was only 9," he said. "My father sneaked me in."

Maybe his father did. There's hardly an Irishman in Scranton who'll admit he wasn't in the old Hotel Casey on that raw March night when Kennedy gave one of the most heart-wringing speeches of his life. Not a one did I meet at the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick dinner last night.

And why should I have. It was a very special event.

It was here on St. Patrick's Day, 1964 that Kennedy appeared before a large public gathering in the United States for the first time following President Kennedy's death.

He went somewhat reluctantly and only after insistent urging by Rep. Dan Flood of Wilkes-Barre for through the crushing weeks after the assassination in Dallas he had been desolate; holding his grief inwardly, functioning tautly and wondering bleakly what he would do with his life.

As spring approached he began to perk up, but just below the surface one often saw signs of a new somberness and fatalism, caused not only by the trauma of his brother's death, but also by the realization that any decision he would make about his future depended on events beyond his control.

Scranton marked a turning point.

When his plane landed at Scranton-Wilkes-Barre Airport on a gray afternoon, more than 2,000 people, most of them young, broke through police lines and crowded around him—jumping, shouting, laughing as they tried to touch him—so that he could not move from the bottom of the ramp until police cleared a path.

He was taken into Scranton to officiate at ground-breaking ceremonies for the new John F. Kennedy Elementary School and then driven to nearby Yatesville to speak briefly at a St. Patrick's Day dinner. Heavy, wet snow had begun to fall and along the route about 10,000 men, women and children huddled under umbrellas to catch a glimpse of him.

They were still lining the highway when he drove back to Scranton.

At the Hotel Casey the crowd was so large and so exuberant that the hotel's heavy doors were torn from their hinges as people pressed forward to shake his hand.

His appearance before the Friendly Sons was one of the most difficult he ever made. He had drafted a sentimental Irish speech and for the ending he had written:

"I like to think—as did President Kennedy—that the emerald thread runs into the cloth we weave today . . . and I like to think that his policies will survive and continue as the cause of Irish freedom survived the death of 'The Liberator,' Owen Roe O'Neill."

And he proposed to close with a poem written after O'Neill's death, when Ireland was overwhelmed with grief:

Your troubles are all over, you're at rest with God on high, But we're slaves and we're orphans, Owen!

—why did you die?

We're sheep without a shepherd when the snow shuts out the sky—Oh! Why did you leave us, Owen? Why did you die?

When I worked some changes he wanted into the speech, I eliminated the poem. When he read the redrafted text, he asked.

"Why did you do that?"

"Because you'll never get through it," I said.

"I've been practicing in front of a mirror," he said, "can't get through it yet—but I will."

And in Scranton he did—just barely, but among the 600 stalwart sons of Erin in the audience, many a man wept openly.

Kennedy would never forget Scranton. On the plane back to Washington, astonished by the reception he had received—the poignant outpouring of love for President Kennedy and so much evidence that he stood well with the people in his own right—that he made an irrevocable decision about his future. Somehow, someway, he would remain in public service.

At Scranton's 79th annual dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick last night, the speaker was a Philadelphian, the Rev. William J. Byron, now president of Catholic University in Washington, and there was an emerald thread that stretched back across the years.

Kennedy had urged the men of Scranton to be true to their Irish heritage.

"Let us hold out our hands to those who struggle for freedom today—at home and abroad—as Ireland struggled for a thousand years. Let us not leave them to be 'sheep without a shepherd, when the snow shuts out the sky.' Let us show them that we have not forgotten the constance and the faith and the hope of the Irish."

Last night, Father Byron, dispensing with any Irish sentiment, went directly to the heart of his concern: hunger in Africa, Latin America and Asia. He began by reminding "every Irish one of you" that their forebearers came to America destitute, fleeing from the Irish famine of the 1840s.

"For any Irishman with a sense of history," he said, "the words—'migrate or face starvation'—have to carry with them the shock of recognition. The problem in Bolivia, and Kampuchea, and Mozambique, and in so many parts of the world, not to mention parts of these United States, is hunger and what to do about it.

"And it ill becomes an Irish-American to be uninterested . . . Let's, therefore, be courageous enough to entertain this question tonight: What are we doing about the problem of hunger *now*?

". . . Let's follow the urging of that faith our forebearers carried with them to these shores—that impulse which prompts us to show our love of God through love of neighbor. Your neighbor, in the global village you now inhabit, is hungry. What Irishman can allow himself to look the other way?"

Surely now, was that Bob Kennedy I heard applauding above the rest of us?

RIM OF THE WORLD, EDGE OF STARVATION: A SAINT PATRICK'S DAY REFLECTION

(By the Reverend William J. Byron, S.J.)

John McShain, the famous Irish-American contractor from Philadelphia, always wanted to build a great national monument and a beautiful cathedral. As a young man he opened a Washington office just to be there in the nation's capital when an opportunity presented itself to bid on a great public project. His patience, persistence, resourcefulness and competence eventually paid off. Within a few decades, he built the gracious Jefferson Memorial, the sprawling Pentagon, the extensive White House renovations, the new State Department, and the grand Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. But he takes greatest pride in his cathedral—the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, our national Catholic monument to Mary, on the campus of The Catholic University of America. It is the world's seventh largest cathedral and its largest Marian shrine.

The National shrine was built by John McShain in the 1950's at the invitation of the then Archbishop of Washington, Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle. In the 1970's, the last remaining space for a dedicated chapel in that great structure was transformed, through the generosity of Mr. McShain, into an "Irish Oratory." On the marble wall of that prayer chapel, which attracts thousands of visitors every year, these words are inscribed: "For all we Irish living on the world's rim are disciples of Saints Peter and Paul."

So there is Ireland—on the rim of the world! And everywhere now around the world are the Irish—men and women of faith, disciples all of Saints Peter and Paul, and this through the missionary labors of Saint Patrick.

If, as the Irish novelist James Joyce once remarked, "the poet is the mediator between the world of reality and the world of dreams," permit me to use that poetic positioning of Ireland "on the world's rim" to draw your attention to a link between the rim of the world and the edge of starvation, between the world of contemporary reality and the world of Irish dreams.

You know, every Irish one of you, that your forebearers, for the most part, came to this country poor and famished, victims of the Great Hunger of the 1840's. They arrived on these shores stripped of everything save the breath of life and the faith which Patrick brought to their homeland and which they brought with them to America. They knew oppression, hunger, suffering, discrimination, and the denial of their human rights. They knew abject poverty. But they also knew family love and high-hearted hope grounded in their Christian faith.

The Irish came to these shores as the "boat people" of the 1840's. Theirs was a flight from famine. Yet, if we are honest with ourselves today, we have to admit that concern for the hungry of the world is not high on the list of Irish-American priorities. This is strange—"passing strange," as Irish storytellers might say—when you really think about our Irish hunger then and our Irish-American power and influence and affluence now.

What other immigrant group left so many famished behind and brought so many fevered with them, only to die over here as an ultimate consequence of the potato failure over there?

And yet we seem to have forgotten that sunken eyes, pallid lips, protruding bones and bloated bellies—characteristics so much in evidence today in the African nations of Somalia, Chad, Mozambique, Rwanda, Ghana, Sao Tome, Principe and Cape Verde—were part of the scenery on an Emerald Isle blackened by blight in 1846. Millions of inhabitants of our world in our time—particularly in Africa, Asia and Latin America—exhibit today the same symptoms and experience the same despair that the Irish suffered in the second half of the decade of the 1840's. Chad this year, Cambodia a few years back, Bangladesh a decade before, Ireland 138 years ago. The question is hunger and what to do about it.

I asked your permission a moment ago to bridge for your reflection tonight "the world of reality and the world of dreams." Presuming that I have that permission, I now direct your attention to this description of the world of reality. Time magazine, November 12, 1979, page 42. A description of Cambodians (now called Kampucheans) crossing the border into Thailand.

". . . on reed-thin legs . . . a grisley cavalcade of specters, wrapped in black rags. Many are in the last stages of malnutrition, or are ravaged by . . . dysentery, tuberculosis and malaria. Perhaps the most pathetic images of all are those of tearful, exhausted mothers cradling hollow-eyed children with death's-head faces, their bellies swollen, their limbs as thin and fragile as dried twigs."

That description is the direct descendent of a letter published in the Times (of London) on December 24, 1846. Mr. Nicholas Cummins, Magistrate of Cork, horrified by what he saw on December 15, 1846 in Skibbereen in the County of Cork, wrote to the Duke of Wellington, who was an Irishman, and also sent a copy to the Times which published the letter on December 24, 1846.

"MY LORD DUKE: Without apology or preface, I presume so far to trespass on your Grace as to state to you, and by the use of your illustrious name, to present to the British public the following statement of what I have myself seen within the last three days. Having for many years been intimately connected with the western portion of the County of Cork, and possessing some small property there, I thought it right personally to investigate the truth of several lamentable accounts which had reached me, of the appalling state of misery to which that part of the country was reduced. I accordingly went on the 15th instant to Skibbereen, and to give the instance of one townland which I visited, as an example of the state of the entire coast district, I shall state simply what I there saw. . . . Being aware that I should have to witness scenes of frightful hunger, I provided myself with as much bread as five men could carry, and on reaching the spot I was surprised to find the wretched hamlet apparently deserted. I entered some of the hovels to ascertain the cause, and the scenes which presented themselves were such as no tongue or pen can convey the slightest idea of. In the first, six famished and ghastly skeletons, to all appearances dead, were huddled in a corner on some filthy straw, their sole covering what seemed a ragged horsecloth, their wretched legs hanging about, naked above the knees. I approached with horror, and found by a low moaning they were alive—they were in fever, four children, a woman and what had once been a man. It is impossible to go through the detail. Suffice it to say, that in a few minutes I was surrounded by at least 200 such phantoms, such frightful spectres as no words can describe, either from famine or from fever. Their demoniac yells are still ringing in my ears, and their horrible images are fixed upon my brains. My heart sickens at the recital, but I must go on."

He did. I shall not. If you want to read the full account you can pick it up on page 162 in Cecil Woodham-Smith's "the Great Hunger."

Ireland then; Africa today. Senator John Danforth (Republican of Missouri) visited Africa several months ago. In an essay published in the Washington Post under the title, "Africa: Does Anybody Really Care?" the Senator wrote:

"Politicians argue about the extent of hunger in the United States, but for Africa there can be no debate. No food has reached the drought-stricken, guerilla plagued settlement of Changanini in Mozambique since November. The people are eating leaves from the trees, roots and cashew nuts, and the results of such a diet are predicatable. One need not be a physician to diagnose starvation: emaciated bodies, distended bellies, discolored hair and haunting eyes are symptoms anyone can recognize. As of last week, such infrequent aid as has arrived from international donors was sporadic and unsupervised. Unlike the Thailand-Cambodia border of 1979, volunteers from organizations such as CARE, Catholic Relief Services or World Vision had not yet arrived." (the Washington Post, January 25, 1984, A-23)

Permit me just one more reference to hunger today—in this case, Latin America.

In a January 17, 1984 article describing human suffering due to drought right now in Bolivia, the Washington Post concluded:

"These are the scenes of a devastating drought in poor landlocked Bolivia where as much as half the population of close to six million normally depends on subsistence agriculture for a living. Crop losses valued at over $300 million in the last year have undermined the fragile foundation of the country's economy, caused food shortages in the cities and confronted thousands of rural families with a terrible choice—migrate or face starvation."

For any Irishman with a sense of history those words—"migrate or face starvation"—have to carry with them the shock of recognition. The problem in Bolivia, and Kampuchea, and Mozambique, and in so many parts of the world, not to mention parts of these United States, is hunger and what to do about it. And it ill becomes an Irish-American to be uninterested.

Somewhere on a shelf or file cabinet in the White House is the 1980 report produced by Jimmy Carter's Presidential Commission on World Hunger. Chief among the report's recommendations is the idea that the United States should "make the elimination of hunger the primary focus of its relationship with the developing countries, beginning with the decade of the 1980's." That decade is now well on its way; we have not yet implemented the Carter Commission recommendation. Now we have not only another President, but another Presidential Commission on hunger! Ronald Reagan's Task Force on Food Assistance looked only at domestic U.S. hunger. The panel reported that it found "no evidence that widespread undernutrition is a major health problem in the United States." It further reported that it had "not been able to substantiate allegations of rampant hunger" in America.

How wide is "widespread?" At what level does a health problem become "major?" Must hunger-related suffering become "rampant" in order to attract decisive Federal action?

With a Reagan in the White House, an O'Neill in the House Speaker's chair, and names like Kennedy, Moynihan and Leahy responding to Senate roll calls while McDade, McHugh, Foley, O'Brien and Markey sit with scores of other Irishmen in the House of Representatives, the hungry of the world who know anything at all about the famine of the 1840's might be forgiven for asking when Irish-American political leadership is going to emerge to champion the cause of the hungry poor.

There were hundreds of thousands, perhaps as many as two million Irish men, women and children who died from starvation and disease related to the great potato famine. British lawmakers at that time lined up on the side of protectionism and laissez-faire. Government initiatives did establish public works to provide wages, paltry as they were, for potatoless farmers. But provision of food for starving Irishmen was left to private enterprise. As everyone now knows, that simply did not work.

It is fair to ask how history is likely to evaluate today's occupant of the Oval Office and all those Irishmen in the U.S. Congress in terms of their response to hunger at home and abroad. Sure, the Friendly Sons raise more glasses than questions on St. Patrick's Day. That is only natural. But out of the Irish-American experience comes a question that simply must be asked as the decade of the 1980's moves along: Will America make the elimination of hunger the primary focus of its relationship with the developing countries? Must America wait until hunger at home is clearly and by all measures "rampant" before it organizes the political will to eliminate it?

By the year 2100, it is conceivable that political leadership in the United States government could be in the hands of Cambodian-Americans, or Somali-Americans or Bolivian-Americans. Those possibilities are not less likely than was the expectation in the 1840's that the Irish could rise to the top of our executive and legislative branches of government. Such groups—the Vietnamese-Americans or Mozambique-Americans, to offer a couple of additional examples—could well have their own black-tie events on special days to celebrate their own heritage. The rice or whatever on their plates, like the potato on the plate of every Friendly Son tonight, could stimulate some musings about past hardship and present responsibilities. Some might be prompted to wonder what a political leadership, which happened to be Irish in America in the 1980's, did for the hungry of the world at that time. The answer to that question is being shaped today in the Reagan White House and the Congress of the O'Neills and all those other Irish-Americans who enjoy our admiration and respect, as well as our votes.

World hunger is not a problem for the politicians alone (few problems are!). Each one of us has to think about it. Each one of us must do what can be done.

When I return to Washington and next visit John McShain's Irish Oratory, I'll be thinking of 138 years of extraordinarily impressive Irish-American achievement in business, politics, education, ecclesiastical leadership, the arts, the military and all the other walks of American life. I'll thank God that the Irish-Americans have kept the faith. I'll pray that God will inspire us to find a link between the rim of the world (our Irish dreams) and the edge of starvation (the harsh reality confronting so many human beings today). I'll also pray that Irish-American genius, generosity, creativity and commitment will come together in a leadership effort to eliminate the scourge of hunger from our world.

It is frightening to consider what some very recent scholarship is suggesting, namely, that the entrepreneurial inadequacy of the Irish landlord class had more than a little to do with allowing Irish poverty in the 1840s to spread from tolerable and even manageable scarcity to death-dealing famine. The 1846 Irish equivalent of today's prosperous and powerful Irish-American "Friendly Son" was the landlord. If you grant that, then try this stretch of the imagination: Perhaps we (our class, our kind) could have prevented hunger then! Let's, therefore, be courageous enough to entertain this question tonight: What are we doing about the problem of hunger now?

"Nothing" is, by anybody's measure, certainly not enough! Let's go forth from here tonight and start to write a better answer with deeds that show our gratitude for the progress we have made. Let's follow the urging of that faith our forebearers carried with them to these shores—that impulse which prompts us to show our love of God through love of neighbors. Your neighbor, in the global village you now inhabit, is hungry. What Irishman can allow himself to look the other way?●

CALVARY BAPTIST CHURCH TO MARK 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months the congregation of the Calvary Baptist Church in West Mifflin, PA, has held a series of events commemorating the 100th anniversary of their church's founding. The highlight of this observance will be staged May 26 at an anniversary dinner in the church hall.

The occasion, however, will be touched with a tinge of sadness for at that time the congregation will bid farewell to the pastor who has served them so faithfully for the past 19 years—the Reverend Joseph D. Sullivan.

It was under Reverend Sullivan's leadership that the present church was constructed. In addition to his counseling and administrative duties, Reverend Sullivan has taught adult church school classes and led numerous Bible study groups. His wife, Alberta, also has been extremely active in the work of the church, serving as director of Christian education, choir leader, pianist, and teacher.

Reverend and Mrs. Sullivan will leave Calvary Church on June 3 and retire to Kentucky but they will long be remembered by the works they leave behind.

Calvary Church began as a Baptist Mission in October 1883, meeting in McClure Hall in Homestead, PA. It was officially designated the "First Baptist Church" in 1884 and became affiliated with the Pittsburgh Baptist Association the following year.

Its first full-time pastor was the Reverend F.R. Scully and under his leadership the congregation acquired its first building, which was dedicated in 1887. As a point of interest, the church was presented a pipe organ—the first in the town—by Andrew J. Carnegie, the great philanthropist.

Over the years the church prospered under a succession of dedicated pastors and as membership grew the congregation was relocated. In 1965, shortly after the arrival of Reverend Sullivan, a decision was made to construct a new church on the present site in West Mifflin. Ground was broken for the new edifice in 1972 and on April 18, 1975, the "First Baptist Church" was renamed the "Calvary Baptist Church."

Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to list by name all those individuals and pastors who devoted time, energy, and talent to the growth of Calvary Church over the past century. But, I deem it appropriate that my colleagues in the Congress of the United

States join me in extending our congratulations to the congregation of Calvary Baptist Church on the 100th anniversary of their church and wish it continued success in the years to come.●

A FOR THE EFFORT OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a copy of a letter published in the April 3 edition of the New York Times by Vincent Sombrotto, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, on the quality of mail delivery in New York City.

Mr. Sombrotto makes a good case for the hard work being done by the employees of the Postal Service in New York City. He deals with the reality of the situation in the city of New York. He is clear on the difficulties yet to be surmounted, and just as clear on the determination of the employees of the Postal Service in overcoming those difficulties. I think he is right on target, and I submit his statement for my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 3, 1984]

WERE NEW YORK TO "SECEDE" FROM THE POSTAL SERVICE

TO THE EDITOR: Representative Bill Green's complaint about the quality of mail service in New York City (Op-Ed March 10) culminates in a classic example of throwing out the baby with the bath water.

Suspending the Private Express Statutes in the Manhattan-Bronx postal district to open the door for private services would not only lead to far worse mail delivery in New York City, it would also lead to the eventual destruction of the U.S. Postal Service and thus end the universal mail service Americans everywhere have historically enjoyed.

New York City is not an island to itself. There is no practical way of allowing New York or any other large, congested urban area to secede from the Postal Service's universal delivery network without the entire system crumbling.

In fact, the suspension of the Private Express Statutes (the body of law that provides for a universal mail system) for New York City would create a chaotic situation as the various private couriers working within the city's confines would attempt to link up their competing networks with that of the Postal Service. Mail coming into the city would be delayed significantly, as would mail leaving it.

In sum, privatizing mail service, even in a single city, will not improve it—just as breaking up A.T.&T. certainly has not improved telephone service. What privatizing could do, however, is to destroy what is universally regarded as the most efficient, most cost-effective mail service in the free world.

In fiscal year 1983, the Postal Service processed over 119 billion pieces of mail—more than all other countries' postal services combined. Gross productivity increased for the ninth consecutive year as the amount of mail processed per full-time worker rose to an all-time high of 173,320, far more than any other postal service. And the nationwide delivery performance for local mail was 96 percent. Finally, first-class postage in this country is the second lowest in the free world. Only in Switzerland can you mail a letter for less.

By opposing a frivolous and highly parochial proposal, however, I am not arguing that the quality of mail service in New York City cannot be improved. As Mr. Green pointed out, delivery in a densely populated, highly transient and congested area like New York City presents major challenges. The Postal Service and all postal employees are committed to overcoming these challenges.

VINCENT P. SOMBROTTO,
President, National Association of Letter Carriers.●

FUTURE INDUSTRIAL POLICY

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Senator THOMAS EAGLETON, recently delivered a speech at a symposium on industrial policy sponsored by the Women's National Democratic Club. In this speech, Senator EAGLETON presented some ideas about U.S. competition in the world market, the need for a sounder fiscal and monetary policy, the development and upgrading of human resources and scientific and technological innovation. I believe that his remarks are thought-provoking and deserving of our attention.

UNMORTGAGING THE FUTURE: AN ALTERNATIVE TO REAGANOMICS AND REAGANISM

(By Senator Thomas F. Eagleton)

Next to the overriding issue of war and peace in a nuclear age, the fundamental question facing the country is whether the policies of Ronald Reagan have laid the foundation for long-term economic growth and prosperity. What does the future hold for our children who are just preparing to graduate from high school or college? What does it hold for those who are 35 or 40 in a job which appeared secure several years ago, but seems less certain now?

My own view can be simply stated. We are all grateful for the present economic recovery, but it is a recovery built on sand. No one ever doubted that $200 billion deficits could fuel consumer spending and help drive the economy out of the recession, but no one believes we can sustain for very long a recovery in the face of mega-deficits projected for the rest of the decade. The disarray among the President's economic advisers, the widening U.S. trade deficit, and the plunge in the stock market reflect that grim reality.

Even more fundamentally, we have not put into place the long-range policies needed for success in the 1980's and beyond. Nostalgic for the good old days when our industrial dominance was unquestioned, the Reagan Administration is a passive bystander as the winds of change sweep across our land. In a very real sense, the industrial policy debate is not about central planning or the wisdom of "a bank"; it is about what is needed for success in a changing world and the future competitiveness of our industries.

1. THE WORLD WE FACE

We are enmeshed in a world economy characterized by intense international competition. Fully 70 percent of our products compete against those from abroad; virtually every one of our major industries has suffered a significant loss of market to foreign competition.

The good old days are gone and won't be returning. Japan will be a formidable competitor in all the high technology and information sectors central to future prosperity. The Europeans are making a determined effort to target the same sectors. Nor is that the only competition; the newly-industrializing countries such as Mexico, Brazil, South Korea, and Taiwan, continue to shift rapidly from supplying raw materials and inexpensive labor to becoming prime suppliers of increasingly sophisticated products. South Korea and Taiwan have already begun to produce steel and ships more efficiently than Japan. They are moving aggressively into consumer electronics and, in the case of the South Koreans, even into automobiles and the semiconductor business. A recent article in Fortune Magazine captured the frenetic pace of competition by observing that "the world economy is like a crowded staircase, with each nation scrambling upward as though there was a fire in the basement."

The dazzling pace of technological change intensifies the pressure of international competition. When the internal combustion engine transformed almost every facet of American life, its introduction was spread over generations. Today, new technologies, even new industries, develop, mature and are in worldwide use in a friction of the time. Unprecedent changes in product, production and communications technology ensure that our children will see more change in the next twenty years than our grandparents did in a half century.

I think that we are beginning to adjust to these new realities. The blast of competition has energized our business sector; the complacency of the past is gone. Our automobile industry, for example, has made extraordinary changes in a very few years: the quality of the product and the relationships on the factory floor have improved radically. Our vibrant high-technology sector reminds us how dynamic private enterprise can be. Our great universities, national laboratories, and corporate research centers continue to set the pace in leading-edge technologies. The recession and international competition have produced a new realism about the link between wages and productivity—and a moderation that may last.

2. MORTGAGING THE FUTURE: THE SHORTSIGHTEDNESS OF REAGANOMICS AND REAGANISM

We have the resources to deal with this challenging period. What we lack is political leadership which understands the critical role which government must play. Some of our most prominent business leaders—Lee Iacocca at Chrysler; William Norris at Control Data, James Beré at Borg Warner; Ed Jefferson at DuPont—have pointed out that we can meet the challenges of international competition and technological change only if government enters into an effective partnership with other key sectors of the country, for the benefit of all.

Government policy can make the difference between success and failure in a keenly

competitive world. In the 1950s-'60s, the Japanese government took the lead in building a consensus that developing world-class basic industries was critical, and Japan became the world's leader in steel, shipbuilding and autos. When the outlines of the future, based on high technology and information industries started to emerge, Japan emphasized education and training, encouraged research and development, licensed or purchased advanced technologies from us where possible, and formulated legislation and other strategies to ease the transition out of basic industries into higher technology. Today, they still lead the world in steel, shipbuilding and autos, but also lead in robotics, VCRs and consumer electronics, and they are keenly competitive with us in semiconductors, computers and biotechnology.

In contrast, Harvard Professor Otto Eckstein, former member of the Council of Economic Advisers, has recently traced the decline in United States manfacturing squarely to the economic policies of both Republican and Democratic Administrations. High interest rates made the cost of capital to business twice what it is in Japan, blocking investment. Tax laws made it reasonable for families to consume, rather than save, and for businesses to embark on unproductive mergers, rather than build factories. The dollar, which was overvalued deliberately after World War II to help Japan and Europe, stayed overvalued long after the original justification ceased to be valid, doing incalculable harm to our trade sectors. Overall, we formulated policy with absolutely no concern about the impact it would have on industial competitiveness.

Obviously, the Reagan Administration did not create this situation. But it has had the chance to explain the realities of a changing world and rally the country behind new policies. Instead, the Administration has given us massive deficits and a stunning trade imbalance, and the ideological, reflexive answer that the free market can take care of everything and that government has no meaningful role to play in helping to chart our future.

In contrast, DuPont Chairman Ed Jefferson has made this observation:

"Any successful industrial strategy in the U.S. must be thoroughly consistent with the idea of private enterprise. . . But at the same time I would reject the notion that pure free market economics will suffice to ensure our international competitiveness.

Our competitors recognize their nation's vital interest in quality education. The Reagan Administration slashes at federal funding for education, apparently thinking tuition tax credits and school prayer alone will propel us into the 21st century. Science and technology are critical to our ability to compete, but the Reagan Administration has reduced support for non-military applied R&D, and totally refused to carry out the Stevenson-Wydler Act, a farsighted measure enacted to spur innovation in this country. The need to train displaced workers for new jobs and to cushion the adjustment period are obvious. Yet the Administration has refused to fund the Jobs Partnership Training Act fully, and abolished the Trade Adjustment Assistance program without suggesting anything to replace it.

The future direction of our economy and the role of government warrants a full and honest debate.

In fact, and in truth, every Administration, Democratic or Republican, intervenes in the free market through tax, regulatory, trade and other decisions all the time. The Reagan Administration, for example, has denied trade relief to the machine tool industry, but granted it to Harley-Davidson motorcycles. They have radically transformed the pattern of capital investment in the U.S.A. through the 1981 tax cut. They have dramatically increased defense research while slashing funds for energy research.

The real question is whether the Federal government's intervention in the market will be effective, and for what ends. Will we continue to practice what Robert Reich and Ira Magaziner have called "industrial policy by default . . . an irrational and uncoordinated policy," dictated by political expediency, "in which the goal of international competitiveness has not figured?" Will we continue with irresponsible, budget-busting tax cuts for the wealthy while scrimping on our vital investments like education for our children?

3. THE DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE

The Democrats offer a two-part alternative.

Policies designed to enhance our competitiveness will not help unless we reduce the deficits to manageable proportions. It isn't easy to advocate raising taxes, reducing defense expenditures or touching sensitive items like entitlements, but all the Democratic Presidential candidates have been offering detailed proposals for doing so. Leadership demands that kind of courage; it is not leadership to submit a budget which sweeps the problem under the rug until after the election, or to express a willingness to reduce the deficit while ruling out every option which has a chance of helping the situation.

Beyond deficit reduction, Democrats are recommending new policies and organizational arrangements to enhance our competitiveness and make our economy more adaptable:

We emphasize education and training for reasons that the authors of Global Stakes: The Future of High Technology in America, describe well.

"Whereas American wealth and power have traditionally been based on natural resources and on capital investment in physical plant and machinery, the balance is now tipping toward investments in people and knowledge as key resources . . ."

We favor extending Title I to secondary schools; targeting vocational education; upgrading instruction in science, math, computer and foreign language instruction; and providing aid to gifted students. And we remain angered by the sheer hypocrisy of President Reagan's posturing in the area of education.

As A. Graham Down, Executive Director of the Council for Basic Education recently observed:

"One enemy of excellence is cheapness. The Reagan Administration allies itself with the popular cause of school improvement, but is unwilling to assume responsibilities that the federal government alone can shoulder . . ."

Innovation—in process and product technology—is at the heart of our ability to compete. We favor creation of technology extension centers, modeled after the successful Agricultural Extension Service, to function as a clearinghouse and to assure the effective transfer and utilization of new technology. We also favor clarifying the antitrust laws to permit joint research and development, and creating a national technology foundation which would do for technology what NSF has done for basic science.

We want industries to modernize to restore competitiveness where it is flagging, and we would provide temporary trade relief to enable them to do so. However, the quid pro quo for relief would be a realistic, hardheaded modernization plan hammered out by all affected parties. The public is entitled to receive something for the relief given; no longer would U.S. Steel get trade and regulatory relief and then proceed to buy Marathon Oil!

In our effort to enhance competitiveness in our capital-intensive industries and high-technology, we cannot neglect our labor-intensive industries. A dozen years ago, one out of eight industrial workers was in the textiles, apparel and clothing industry. No longer. Low-wage foreign imports in this industry increased 17 percent last year alone. In my view, market-sharing arrangements, such as those envisioned in the Multi Fiber Agreement, sensitive to the needs of both developed and developing nations—are crucial to these labor-intersive industries.

The pressure of competition and the pace of change ensures that thousands of jobs will be created while many others will be destroyed. Prosperity will not be evenly distributed among regions and communities. It is the role of government to ensure that the burdens of change are shared; that individuals who lose their jobs are recognized as the victims of circumstances beyond their control—not failures—and aided in the search for new work through retraining and adjustment assistance.

Finally, Democrats are proposing creation of a 20-person advisory Council on Economic Competitiveness and Cooperation to serve as the forum in which the nation's industrial strategy would be debated and formulated. The Council would also establish, after a request from the private sector, advisory working groups to analyze and consider responses to problems that affect individual industries and geographical areas.

Our current approach to economic, industrial and trade policy is ad hoc, fragmented, fundamentally adversarial, and therefore, destined to be reactive, rather than anticipatory. A recent House report observed that Japan's approach is characterized by a "web of policies," while ours is a "heap." We cannot afford the luxury of this kind of policymaking when other countries, stressing government-business cooperation, are pursuing tightly-integrated industrial and trade policies.

We need to bring parties together to identify problems and opportunities earlier, and respond to them more quickly. If such a Council had been in place, our steel industry might have avoided the agony which has marked the last decade. Business, labor, government and academia could have combined their knowledge of the present situation and their reading of the future. Strategic investments could have been made in a timely fashion; wages could have been moderated when it counted; the industry now restructuring itself could have done so in the middle '70s. Thousands of jobs might have been saved; unavoidable dislocation would have been eased. The Japanese are the number one steel producers in the world, but Japan has been planning, since the mid-1970s, how to ease the transition during which steel production would be reduced.

Some critics of the Council argue that consensus-building comes easy in a homogeneous society like Japan, and we should not pretend that we can imitiate them. But any

democratic society needs to have consensus before taking significant action. The more diverse and contentious the society, the more you need institutions to build consensus. The Japanese may have ingrained the habit of building consensus, but the have also relied on institutions like their Industrial Structure Council to produce a process where consensus could be built.

The Reagan Administration condemns these proposals to solve problems through cooperation and consensus-building as somehow un-American. Flying the flag of free enterprise, they offer trickle-down economics and Social Darwinism—survival of the fittest. They misread, or ignore, American history.

Our greatest accomplishments have resulted when government cooperated with private enterprise: to build our extraordinary strength in agriculture; to make us the "Arsenal of Democracy" in World War II; to produce the space program which responded to Sputnik.

In his State of the Union, President Reagan told us that "America is back." We are not back, and in fact, we can't go back. We have entered upon what one commentator called "a great white-water river of change." We will navigate it successfully if we enlist all segments of the society in a cooperative effort. The alternative is drift and decline. As Benjamin Franklin warned the citizens of the faltering new republic two centuries ago, "we can all hang together, or we will all hang separately." He might also have added: by hanging together, there is no limit to the great things that can be done.●

MAYOR TOM BRADLEY ATTENDS THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY'S INTEGRATED EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COURSE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALLIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, most Members will recall that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) was established in 1978 to create an improved and more efficient organization for implementing Federal activities for emergency planning, mitigation, relief, and recovery. FEMA manages and provides coordination for the national flood insurance, crime insurance, civil defense program, strategic and critical materials stockpiling program, defense production act authorities; and the disaster relief programs, in addition to the earthquake and fire prevention and control programs.

For years I have urged FEMA to develop a multihazard research, planning and mitigation approach to deal with emergencies. It has been my belief that research findings and knowledge gained in developing comprehensive mitigation and response plans for an emergency such as an earthquake may be applicable to other hazards.

For example, an earthquake may be accompanied by other manmade and natural disasters in the course of events, and a multihazard mitigation and response plan would be necessary to deal with these related problems. The earthquake which occurred near San Jose, CA, on Tuesday, April 24, provided a vivid demonstration of multiple emergencies accompanying a moderate earthquake.

I am happy to report that FEMA has developed an integrated emergency management program to deal with multiple problems that would occur as a result of a disaster. The benefits of this program have already been realized by Mayor Tom Bradley and city officials in Los Angeles.

During the first week of March, Mayor Bradley transported 50 of his top city officials to the Emergency Management Institute in Emmitsburg, MD, for an intensive weeklong exposure to FEMA's new integrated emergency management course. In the course, Los Angeles officials were faced with multiple disasters in rapid succession, to test how they would react.

I submit two articles recently in the print media and a letter from Mayor Tom Bradley to FEMA director, Gen. Louis O. Giuffrida, regarding the merits of the program be included in the RECORD directly after my remarks.

The articles follow:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 9, 1984]

DISASTER STRIKES LOS ANGELES: THIS IS A TEST

(By Evan Maxwell and Bill Farr)

EMMITSBURG, MD.—Mayor Tom Bradley and 50 top officials of the City of Los Angeles had quite a day Thursday. In rapid succession, they faced these problems.

Ten-thousand angry demonstrators tried to parade from the Westwood Federal Building to the UCLA campus without a permit.

A terrorist group demanded the release of two of their comrades and blew up a downtown high-rise building to underscore their seriousness.

A storm dumped four inches of rain on the city, further saturating hillsides that had been deluged by six inches of rain in the last two weeks. High winds struck several parts of the city simultaneously.

Bradley and other city officials had to deal with these emergencies, not in sunny Southern California, but while ensconced in the snowy hills of western Maryland, 10 miles from the historic battlefields of Gettysburg and 3,000 miles from the scene of the "disasters."

In reality, the multiple disasters were fictional; they were dreamed up as a training session to test how the city's top leaders would react.

"This should be a good dress rehearsal for a potential problem at the Olympics, but the training is more broad-based and designed to put them to the test on how they would handle any major emergency," said one of the organizers of the session, Louis Giuffrida, director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

The session, staged during three days at the agency's Emergency Management Institute, was extraordinary, according to its managers, in both the stature of the participants and the magnitude of the problems they faced.

Besides Bradley, eight directors and a large number of top executives of city departments took part, including City Council President Pat Russell, Fire Chief Donald Manning and Administrative Officer Keith Comrie.

Bradley said the decision to hold the workshop at the institute in rural Emmitsburg was made to isolate the participants from the distraction of "a hundred phone calls a day in the normal operation of their offices" and to force them to focus on the emergency situations they were facing.

"This allows us to see the total operation and underscores the concept of team planning for emergencies," Russell said.

The showpiece of the training session was an extended role-playing situation in which the mayor and the other officials were given a scenario of multiple crises, all of which have happened in Los Angeles at one time or another.

"All these things have occurred," said Cmdr. George Morrison, who heads the Los Angeles Police Department's headquarters uniformed services command and who was a key designer of the intricate scenario. "Not everything achieved the magnitude we use here, but these are realistic situations."

As the scenario progressed, new twists were added, much in the way that real emergency situations unfold. For instance, the terrorist incident escalated dramatically over a period of hours, Morrison said.

The incident began when the FBI authorities arrested two suspected members of a right-wing terrorist group. Shortly thereafter, Bradley's "office" received a tape-recorded threat to blow up downtown buildings unless the terrorists were released.

Subsequently the role-players were informed that a bomb had been found in one of the city's largest office buildings. Police bomb experts X-rayed the bomb and determined that it could not be disarmed. The role players had to devise an emergency evacuation and traffic control plan, then to deal with the ultimate disaster when the bomb exploded and all but leveled the high-rise structure.

At the same time, the decision-makers and their emergency operations personnel were trying to cope with a disastrous rainstorm and student unrest on the Westside, where a lawful protest against cuts in educational aid turned into an illegal march by 10,000 demonstrators. As the scenario progressed, the city officials invoked mutual aid agreements and had to cope with everything from police cars running out of gas to borrowing bulldozers from private contractors to control storm damage.

"These people had to face the real possibility of the city running out of resources when hit by multiple emergencies," Morrison said.

Even the city's legal department was drawn into the maelstrom, with Deputy City Atty. Cheryl Ward Smith dealing with the legal ramifications of "sidewalk contracts" for emergency food and shelter and with the nuances of invoking a "state of local emergency."

Bradley said the workshop was "not designed for Olympic purposes." But, he said, "lessons learned cover any kind of emergency, under any circumstances, including the Olympics."

Agency officials said the Los Angeles training session is part of an expanding pro-

gram to acquaint politicians and government managers with the most sophisticated forms of emergency control and to educate them to considerations they might not normally include in their contingency plans.

Bradley said one of the most important lessons he learned from the classroom part of the workshop is that the law enforcement officers, firefighters and other city employees confronting a disaster are subjected to enormous stress.

"We just take for granted that they are superhuman and will perform, but they are subjected to the same stress reaction as everyone else. We need to try to prepare them better," the mayor said.

Over the next few days, workshop organizers will evaluate the performances of the Los Angeles officials and departments during the mock disaster.

"We are pretty certain the city survived, but it suffered some scars," Morrison said.

LOS ANGELES CITY OFFICIALS VISIT EMERGENCY TRAINING CENTER

EMMITSBURG, MD., March 8, 1984.—The string of disasters that Mayor Tom Bradley and 60 Los Angeles city officials endured at the National Emergency Training Center were only fantasy, but their frazzling effects on officials' nerves were real.

In just one day, Bradley, Fire Chief Don Manning, City Council President Pat Russell, and other top officials withstood a major storm, a street cave-in and an evacuation 3,000 miles from home.

Bradley's mark? An A for the day from a Federal Emergency Management Agency head.

The exercise at the facility 75 miles from Washington, D.C., culminated an intense three-day Emergency Management Institute course tailored especially for Los Angeles, the nation's third largest city.

"I was very proud of the way our people performed," Bradley told UPI. "The exercise attempted to break us, to overwhelm us with incidents."

He said some city officials "still need to sharpen skills and resolve conflicts over defining turf."

Los Angeles, which has experienced a major earthquake, mudslides, serious flooding and a series of devastating brush fires, has "a running start" in disaster exercises, Bradley said.

"We've gone through other practice runs and real life situations," he said. "We have had considerable experience and we have a lot of resources in Los Angeles."

A "great benefit" of the federally-funded exercise that cost $45,000 to produce was the camaraderie that developed among city department managers who rarely if ever before participated in such an exchange with their colleagues, the mayor said.

As expected, he said, "the demands exceeded our resources and we had to call on outside agencies to send in personnel."

Los Angeles County fire departments have organized a mutual aid network with surrounding areas to help each other during major brush fires and other emergencies.

Andy Casper, a former San Francisco fire chief who heads FEMAs Comprehensive Emergency Management Program and directed the exercise, praised Bradley's handling of the exercise.

"He's very cool. He's decisive," Casper said. "I haven't seen anything really shake him, and we gave him some tough problems."

"I worked for three mayors in San Francisco—Joseph Alioto, George Moscone and Dianne Feinstein—and they were all excellent. But Tom Bradley is the first mayor I ever saw take a strong lead with his sleeves rolled up."

Casper said many California cities have a much higher disaster potential than cities in other parts of the country because, "They're living with the threat of a major earthquake."

Los Angeles "has its act together" in handling disasters, but needs "some fine tuning," he said.

"The weaknesses were not obvious in the police, fire and public works departments, but (in) other city departments (that) don't have the daily activities (to gain such experience,)" he said.

To prepare for the exercise, a FEMA team went to Los Angeles, analyzed its previous and threatened disasters and created a scenario for the exercise.

In the first two days, officials were given lectures and shown gruesome slides of real-life disasters from the FEMA collection that includes the Kansas City hotel skyway collapse and the Pacific Southwest Airlines crash in San Diego.

Bradley, a former Los Angeles police officer, was not shaken. "We emphasize stress and brink of disaster," Casper said. "We cover everything that's possible from natural and man-made emergencies.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Los Angeles, CA, March 29, 1984.

Gen. LOUIS GIUFFRIDA,
Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, DC.

DEAR GENERAL GIUFFRIDA: This letter is a small expression of the appreciation that I, as Director of the Emergency Operations Organization of the City of Los Angeles, as Mayor of this City and as a private citizen, wish to convey to you and the FEMA/NETC staff. I am thanking you from this threefold perspective because the "Integrated Emergency Management Training" your organization provided in Emmitsburg, Maryland, March 5 through 9, 1984 has provided benefit and momentum to the City in all three areas. Our Emergency Operations Organization has gained new insights into its operational structure and the resources which would be available during a disaster. City General Managers and Division Heads have received a vision of the unity and teamwork necessary to successfully mitigate or manage a disaster; and the citizens of Los Angeles have been assured the best possible mobilization of emergency resources.

Your concept of "Integrated Emergency Management" is a vision which will be of benefit to cities, large and small, across the nation. It conveys so well the principle of teamwork at the management level being brought to bear against all types of disasters. The "Integrated Emergency Management Team" of the City of Los Angeles is richer for the training you have provided.

Yours truly,

TOM BRADLEY,
Mayor.●

WOMEN FROM WEBA TO FIGHT ABORTIONS

HON. MARK D. SILJANDER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, of the 1.5 million abortions performed each year in the United States, it is estimated that over 150,000 second and third trimester babies are legally terminated. According to the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, approximately 500 babies actually survive the "procedure" and go on to be adopted. Thousands more survive momentarily, but receive no treatment whatsoever. Clearly, the unborn child is a pathetic victim whose right to live is predicated solely on whether or not he or she is wanted.

But it is becoming increasingly clear that they are not the only victims.

As Nancyjo Mann, founder of Women Exploited by Abortion (WEBA) points out in the August 4, 1983, edition of the Washington Times, the women who abort are also victims.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Mann should know. She had a saline abortion when her baby was 5½ months gestation. She gave birth to a dead baby girl poisoned by the salt. She has been through hell trying to deal with what she permitted a doctor to do to her baby. She feels she has been ripped off by the abortionist who trivialized the nature of the deed and conned by a legal system that stretches freedom of choice to include the painful destruction of children. She named her baby girl Shauna Marie.

In the article she says:

> Once they put the saline in there's no way to reverse it. And for the next hour and a half I felt my daughter thrash around violently while she was being choked, poisoned, burned, and suffocated to death. I didn't know any of that was going to happen. And I remember talking to her and I do remember telling her I didn't want to do this, I wished she could live.

Less than 1 year ago, Ms. Mann founded WEBA. Its 10,000 members all had abortions and are eager—despite the personal pain involved in going public—to get the message out that abortion exploits women.

Recently I had the honor of meeting the president of WEBA, Lorijo Nerad, who lives in my district. Articulate and sincere I was impressed with her determination to make all Americans aware of the double tragedy of abortion. As many of us have been strong advocates of the rights of the unborn children—Lorijo helps us to focus on the need to concern ourselves with the tragedy facing those women who have been misled by others in the media, in the community, and sometimes in public office.

I compliment her work and urge all my colleagues to read the interview in the Washington Times to further understand the enormous importance that WEBA has to our Nation.

[From the Washington Times, Aug. 3, 1983]

WOMEN FORM WEBA TO FIGHT ABORTIONS

Nancyjo Mann on the horror of having an abortion, and of the mission of Women Exploited By Abortion.

Every year for the past 10 years 1.5 million women have had an abortion. For many, according to Nancyjo Mann, founder and president of Women Exploited By Abortion (WEBA), having an abortion only began their problem. Mann was interviewed by Washington Times staff writer and columnist Tom Diaz.

Q: Tell us about your experience with abortion and its consequences,

A: My experience goes back to 1974, the month of October, 30th day—the day that I killed my baby girl. It was a second trimester abortion. I was 5½ months pregnant.

I went to the doctor because family members had pressured me, had encouraged me. There was no "Nancy maybe you should reconsider," because it was not my idea in the first place, it was theirs.

My husband had walked out the door and deserted us. The responsibility of three children was just too much for him. I went to my mother and my brother and asked. "What am I going to do?" And my mother said "It's obvious, Nancy, no man's going to want you with three children, let alone the two you already have. You're probably not going to amount to a hill of beans and you're probably going to be on welfare the rest of your life."

And following those three positive, uplifting statements, she said "You're going to have to have an abortion." Then she called one of the leading ob/gyns in the Midwest, and he said, "Absolutely, no problem. Bring her on in."

Q: Did he know at the time how far you were along?

A: Absolutely. He does all kinds of second trimesters no problem.

I went in and I asked, "What are you going to do to me?" All he did was look at my stomach and say, "I'm going to take a little fluid out, put a little fluid in, you'll have severe cramps and expel the fetus."

I said, "Is that all?" He said, "That's all."

It didn't sound too bad But what that doctor described to me was not the truth.

I went to the hospital and 60 ccs of amniotic fluid were drawn out, and a saline solution injected. Immediately the needle went through the abdomen I hated Nancyjo, I hated myself. With every ounce of my being I wanted to scream out "Please, stop, don't do this to me." But I couldn't get it out.

Once they put in the saline there's no way to reverse it. And for the next hour and a half I felt my daughter thrash around violently while she was being choked, poisoned, burned and suffocated to death. I didn't know any of that was going to happen. And I remember talking to her and I remember telling her I didn't want to do this, I wished she could live. And yet she was dying and I remember her very last kick on her left side. She had no strength left.

I've tried to imagine us dying that kind of death, a pillow put over us, suffocating. In four minutes we'd pass out. We'd have that gift of passing out and then dying. But it took her an hour and a half just to die.

Then I was given an intravenous injection to help stimulate labor and I went into hard labor for 12 hours. And at 5:30 a.m. on the 31st of October I delivered my daughter whose name is now Charmaine Marie. She was 14 inches long. She weighed over a pound and a half. She had a head of hair and her eyes were opening.

I got to hold her because the nurses didn't make it to the room in time. I delivered my girl myself. They grabbed her out of my hands and threw her, threw her, into a bedpan. After they finished and took her away in the bedpan, they brought a lady in to finish her last hour of labor lying next to me. She had a healthy baby boy.

That was tough.

I liked Nancyjo, I liked me, prior to the abortion. But shame and remorse and guilt set in—I mean, when you get a hold of your own daughter and you see what you did. She was not a "fetus." She was not a "product of conception." She was not a "tissue adhering to the uterine wall." She was my daughter and I got to hold her, at only 5½ months, 22 weeks. So those are cheap, inhuman words to use around me.

I chose to be sterilized because I couldn't cope with the idea that I could possibly kill again. It was too devastating. It was not something you go around telling people, that you just killed your baby, no problem. I was ashamed, totally ashamed.

Q: But some people would say that although this experience obviously had a great impact on you, it is not characteristic of most other women who have abortions. Is your case unusual?

A: No, my case is not unusual at all. People want to say "Oh, but Nancy, you're the extreme." That's not true. In fact there are so many more of us than there are the other. The emotional hurt is so deep. You do not discuss your abortion, the suction machines and the needles and everything else, over a cup of tea and a cookie. Women just don't do this. The pain is just too deep and too great.

I'm sure there are women out there who are never fazed, never, by their abortion. But I would say that 98, 99 percent of them are fazed, whether it's for a small period of time or for the rest of their life, whether they suffer only a small degree or die from their abortions.

Q: How did WEBA—Women Exploited By Abortion—get started?

A: About one year ago I was talking to another recording artist who was pro-life. I asked what pro-life meant and he said he was anti-abortion. I said "Hank, I had an abortion in 1974. I was 5½ months pregnant. It hurt so bad for so long."

He just about drove the car off the road. And he said, "Nancy, you've got to tell the story." So, a year ago I went public, founded WEBA.

Q: How many members do you have?

A: I'm a 10-month-old corporation and in 10 months I've gone from being two people, my vice president and myself, in two states, Virginia and Iowa, to now having 34 states with approximately 10,000 women in my group.

Q: What are some of the effects of abortion on women?

A. I have women who cannot vacuum their carpets. They have to have the neighbor or their husbands do it while they're at the grocery store, because of the suction sound. You see, the suction machine (used in many abortions) makes that sucking sound—it's 29 times more powerful than the vacuum we use in our home. The majority of the women aren't put to sleep. It's done without being put to sleep. It's heartbreaking to me that they can't run a vacuum cleaner—that's a deep wound.

One psychological effect we see almost all the time is guilt. Others are suicidal impulses, a sense of loss, of unfulfillment. Mourning, regret and remorse. Withdrawal, loss of confidence in decision-making capabilities. They feel that maybe they've made a wrong decision, maybe they can't make another decision right in their life. Lowering of self esteem. Preoccupation with death. Hostilities, self-destructive behavior, anger and rage. You can lose your temper quickly. A despair, helplessness, desire to remember the death date which is really weird but you do that. You remember these dates very strongly. A preoccupation with the would-be due date or due month. My daughter was due in early March, so in early March it's there.

An intent interest in babies but a thwarted maternal instinct. Women really are interested in babies, but I have many members who can't hold children. A hatred for anyone connected with abortion. Lack of desire to enter into a relationship with a partner, loss of interest in sex, an inability to forgive self, feeling of dehumanization, nightmares, seizures and tremors, frustrations, feelings of being exploited. And child abuse. We see a lot of child abuse.

I want you to understand that I do not come from any right to life organization. We are connected with no one. We remain neutral. But we are the ones they are all arguing about and discussing and debating. We are the voice of experience.

I told Congressman (Henry A.) Waxman, D-Cal., at a recent hearing, "Have you ever had your cervix dilated and the womb ripped open? Have you ever had tubes stuck inside of you and everything sucked out? Have you ever had needles stuck through your abdomen? Have you ever felt your baby thrash around and die? Have you ever had hard labor, delivered and held your baby? Because if you haven't, sir, you can't intelligently talk to me about this. We are the voice of experience. We've all had this done to us."

And that's a fact. So we hold our own ground, our own turf, our own territory.

Q: What is it that your organization does as a voice of experience?

A: We are a support group for those women who hurt—physically, emotionally, mentally and spiritually—from their abortions. We are there when the phone rings at 3 in the morning and someone is suicidal because maybe it was four years ago on that day and they still can't cope with it. We cry with them and talk with them. We are a support group. We also are a political group. I am classified as that, and I guess the strongest thing of what I intend to do—I intend to shut the abortion industry down. I intend to shut the abortion-on-demand industry down.

We also have rape victims and incest victims among our members—the other 3 percent (not abortion-on-demand). And every one of them is getting ready to go public, to speak very publicly—their full names, ages, everything. They're not ashamed. They know what happened to their lives. They became victims of an industry that is making lots of money, that was supposed to be a quick answer.

And now they're under psychiatric care, psychological care. Because of the abortion, not the rape and incest. They overcame the rape and the incest. Sure they needed help, but they overcame that. But they have had

a very difficult time overcoming killing that innocent baby.

They heard of WEBA and they contacted us. And two of them were so brutally beaten they couldn't make it to the hospital in time. Pure rapes, I'm not talking about just a strong sexual aggressiveness. I'm talking about women who were brutally beaten, true rape victims.

Q: You talked about political activity. What's been your experience here in the Congress?

A: I testified two weeks ago before Rep. Waxman, Barbara Mikulski and a few other congressmen. It was a stacked hearing—14 to 1 doesn't sound very balanced to me. But I went in very open and honest with them, they sat very intently and very amazed at the story I had to tell about my organization, myself and my constituency, WEBA.

Barbara Mikulski said "I've never heard this side." I said, "No, Pandora's box got opened up 10 years ago and now you're just starting to see it." I predict that in five years we will see an epidemic of mental and nervous breakdowns among the women of this country. People are not going to know why and I'm going to be able to tell you why: because they've had an abortion, that's why.

It's a quick solution. Abortion is not an ending of problems, it's the down payment for a whole new set of problems. That's what it is. It doesn't get rid of them.

Q: Have congressmen been exposed to your view, the voice of experience?

A: No. I hear time and time again, "I've never heard this side before." "Are there many more like you?" they ask. And my answer is this. Take the 15 million of us who have, by legal abortion-on-demand, killed our babies. I will give 2 million or 3 million to Planned Parenthood, NOW or whoever they want. I will give another 2 million or 3 million who have two or three abortions without open remorse.

And justification to oneself is important here, by the way. I don't know how many women I told to go have abortions. Justification. It's like, if you can have a few more, go do what you did and kind of justify it, it makes it better. It makes it not quite so bad.

That still leaves 9 million of us who've been hurt in one way, shape or form or the other—psychologically, physically, emotionally or spiritually.

Q: So you believe that there are—by conservative estimate—perhaps 10 million women who suffered as you did?

A: I believe being very conservative there's 8 million who have been hurt.

Q. Where can they write or call? Or what can they do if they need somebody, such as your organization?

A. They can call or they can write. The address is WEBA, 1553 24th St., Des Moines, Iowa 50311. Or they can reach me at 515-255-0552, my business phone. If they hurt, if they're at a certain state, I may have a state representative where a girl can be with them and talk with them. I get so many women who have written me to say, "Thank God, there is somebody that I can now finally pour the whole thing out to."

And I'm thankful that I am a Christian because I couldn't carry that load. If you could read my mail . . . It started off where I'd get two and three letters a day and now they're wrapping it in bundles to bring to me. And I get mail from all over the world.

Q. Within 10 months this has happened?

A. In 10 months. There is such a need. No one thought 10 years ago of the aftermath. We're the aftermath.●

U.S. EMBASSY MOVE IN ISRAEL

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East and the Subcommittee on International Operations of the House Foreign Affairs Committee held joint hearings on legislation that would require that the U.S. Embassy in Israel be moved to Jerusalem. I would like to congratulate the two subcommittee chairmen—the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) on the success of these hearings. Excellent testimony was heard both in favor of and in opposition to this legislation. I would like to insert for the benefit of my colleagues the testimony of a former colleague of ours—Pete McCloskey—who traveled 3,000 miles to testify before these two subcommittees. I feel that Pete's testimony is interesting reading to consider with regard to this legislation.

STATEMENT OF PETE MCCLOSKEY TO THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman, I have come 3,000 miles today to respectfully urge my former colleagues on this Committee to vote against House Resolution 4877.

In my judgment, passage of this Resolution could cost more American lives and cause greater problems for American foreign policy than did a similar break with U.S. Constitutional history 20 years ago.

In 1964, in enacting the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, Congress overrode a basic constitutional protection by authorizing a President to make war without a formal declaration of war by the Congress.

It took 9 years and nearly 50,000 American deaths before Congress recognized and remedied that tragic error.

Today, H.R. 4877 would mandate the President to conduct foreign policy in the Mideast, not as the Constitution clearly provides, by and through the President's exclusive power to appoint and receive ambassadors, but against the President's will by requiring him to locate our ambassador in a particular city in violation of a long history of solemn U.S. treaty and diplomatic commitments.

These commitments are not just of diplomatic expediency. They go to the heart and soul of American principles and morality.

These commitments start with the historic provision of the United Nations Charter * * * prohibiting the expansion of territory by armed force . . . the treaty obligations of the Geneva Conventions prohibiting the settlement of foreign nationals in occupied territories . . . the principle of Nuremberg where we punished German officers for the destruction of villages in occupied territories . . . the language of the original U.N. General Assembly Resolution 181 which created Israel and set aside Jerusalem as an international city . . . U.N. Security Council Resolution 242 which mandated ultimate Israeli withdrawal from territories occupied in the 1967 War, including East Jerusalem . . . the commitment at Camp David which gave Israel security on its southern border in return for Israel's commitment to the principles of Resolution 242.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that for Congress to adopt H.R. 4877 is to place the United States in square violation of each in this long series of commitments.

This Committee, however, has already heard from far abler scholars than I the long-range constitutional and legal problems which this Resolution presents.

If I may, I would like to focus my own testimony on what I believe to be the greatest practical and short-range difficulty with this Resolution. This is the devastating and possibly-fatal impact the Resolution can have on one of the world's great religious faiths, Islam, and the protective barrier which the Islamic faith has previously interposed between us and our greatest international adversary, the Soviet Union.

We can be under no illusions that our vital interests in the Arabian Gulf . . . interests which both Presidents Carter and Reagan have pledged to protect with ultimate American military force . . . depend directly upon the policies of Islamic nations from Turkey to Pakistan, including the entire Arab world from North Africa to Oman.

In each of these countries, Jerusalem is held in deep reverence, perhaps in greater reverence than the respective governments of the peoples involved.

Jerusalem is not merely a city. It is the third most important center of worship of one of the world's most devout religions.

A United States insensitivity to this reality could well be the final blow to Islamic faith and Arab pride, a faith and pride which have been understandably skeptical of western values since our British predecessors in 1917 gave contradictory promises of a Jewish homeland and Arab sovereignty in the same area of historic Palestine.

Our closest and most moderate friends in the region, the Jordanians, the Saudis and the Egyptians, have warned us of the political impacts of a withdrawal of U.S. commitment to Jerusalem as a neutral center of open access to the three great religions.

There is also a personal danger, however, to American lives as well as to our diplomatic efforts in the region.

On this point I would ask the Committee's indulgence in speaking to a few examples from recent history which demonstrate the depth of Islamic faith and the danger to Americans abroad if this Resolution is enacted.

Each of these examples involves a personal experience rather than an editorial evaluation. Each was an experience gained when I was honored to share with you the privilege of service in this great House.

Several years ago, I visited two Islamic countries, Saudi Arabia and Pakistan, in the company of a distinguished group of Members of this body chaired by the Honorable David Obey. Shortly before our visit, a group of Islamic fundamentalists had seized the holy shrine at Mecca. A brief radio report in Pakistan erroneously attributed this action to the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency.

The result was instantaneous and terrible. Thousands of Pakistanis boiled out of a neighboring university and assaulted, overran and burned the U.S. Embassy in Islamabad. By a miracle of calm judgment on the part of the Deputy Chief of Mission and the courage of a few Marines, the Embassy staff was able to retreat to the refuge of the Embassy's vault and ultimate safety.

This occurred despite the earlier Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and our strong pledge to strengthen U.S. military assistance to Pakistan. Human emotions and religious fervor overwhelmed the niceties of diplomatic and military alliance.

I stress this point because the proposed establishment of the U.S. Embassy in the city of the third most important Islamic shrine could well have similar repercussions in Islamic countries throughout the world, from Turkey to Indonesia.

The second personal experience occurred in early June 1982, shortly after Israel invaded Lebanon and commenced the aerial and artillery bombardment of West Beirut, a city of 600,000 people remarkably similar to San Francisco.

The Islamic world immediately perceived that U.S. bombs and shells were being used against Arabs, regardless of national origin, in violation of the U.S. Arms Control Act, and in specific violation of Israel's specific agreement, made in 1974 and publicly reiterated in 1978, not to use the fearsome cluster bomb (CBU) in civilian areas.

The fact that the United States did not act to invoke U.S. law against Israel, as we had promptly done against Turkey in 1975, was not lost on the Islamic world, and particularly with our NATO ally, Turkey.

Nor was it lost on the single nation on the Arabian peninsula which had acquiesced in our request for basing rights in the Mideast following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. This nation was Oman, situated on the strategic Straits of Hormuz. The Government of Oman, alone among the nations in the region, braved the anger of its neighbors by granting basing rights to the United States, giving us at least some hope of meeting the commitments of Presidents Carter and Reagan with respect to military action to prevent intrusion into the Arabian Gulf countries.

In early June, the Omani ambassador to the United States visited my office in the Cannon Building to ask if I would consider the impact on U.S.-Arab relations caused by what was universally perceived as U.S. consent to Israel's invasion of Lebanon, if not U.S. approval of such action.

The ambassador put it on personal terms. I will never forget his words. He said, "Mr. McCloskey, this is not a matter of nation-to-nation relations. In every Arab heart, in the hearts of ordinary people, there is a growing hatred of America and Americans because they perceive that Americans are supporting the killing and maiming of Arabs with American weapons."

The ambassador was not a prepossessing man. He spoke humbly, with tears in his eyes. He did not plead the peril of Oman or its rulers because of Oman's grant of privileges to the United States. He asked merely that I study the situation and determine whether it was in the United States' best interests to back Israeli territorial expansion and new claims to Arab territory.

The ambassador's depth of concern moved me to ask Speaker O'Neill if he would consider sending a second congressional fact-finding delegation to Lebanon. I had served on an earlier such delegation chaired by Toby Moffett of Connecticut in January, 1980.

The Speaker agreed, and in July, 1982, a group of six of us visited Syria, Lebanon, Israel, Egypt, Jordan and Saudi Arabia, seeking an understanding of the impact of Israel's siege of West Beirut, then at its height. The delegation was chaired by Nick Rahall and included Elliot Levitas, Don Bonier, Merv Dymally and Mary Rose Oakar.

While in Beirut we were privileged to meet, as we had in 1980, with most of the Lebanese leaders, including the Gemayel brothers, Walid Jumblatt and Saleb Salaam, then acting as liaison between Ambassador Philip Habib and P.L.O. Chairman Yasser Arafat in the negotiations for withdrawal of P.L.O. forces from Beirut.

We met with Chairman Arafat and asked him to take the long-desired step of recognizing Israel's right to exist. He responded that this was implicit in the P.L.O.'s agreement to accept "all U.N. Resolutions on the question of Palestine," including Resolutions 181 and 242 authorizing the initial founding of Israel in 1947 and confirming its right to exist free of force or threat of force in 1967.

We left our meeting with the Chairman believing that we had achieved a breakthrough.

It was after meeting with Arafat, however, that Mrs. Oakar and I experienced an event which indelibly affected our perception of the problems this Resolution presents for Americans living and working in the Mideast.

After leaving Chairman Arafat's bunker, Mrs. Oakar and I walked through the nearly-deserted streets of downtown West Beirut during a momentary lull in the Israeli air and artillery bombardment.

We came upon a Lebanese woman digging in the rubble of a collapsed apartment building with her son, a boy of perhaps 12 years of age.

Mrs. Oakar asked in Arabic what the woman was looking for and she replied, "the body of my daughter." Her son then pointed at me and said in English, "You Americans have killed my little sister."

For this young Lebanese, it was American bombs, not Israeli bombs, which had killed his sister.

We had seen in Damascus, and were later to see in Amman, plaques on U.S. Embassy reception room walls commemorating the coolness of American Marines when violence erupted against those embassies following real or fancied American slights to the Islamic faith or Arab pride.

A few days later, Egypt's President Mubarik told us that if American support of Israel was not qualified, "it will take armored divisions to defend your embassies in this part of the world." One U.S. ambassador told us, "A lot of us will be returning to Andrews Air Force Base in wooden boxes if U.S. policy doesn't change."

These sentiments of seasoned governmental leaders, however, merely illustrated the growing depth of fury which we had heard from the 12 year old boy in West Beirut and seen in the blackened ruins of our embassy in Islamabad.

If Resolution H.R. 4877 is enacted, young Moslems could be reacting with violence against Americans throughout the Islamic world for generations. Young Armenians even today are killing Turkish diplomats in vengeance for Turkish genocide against Armenians nearly 70 years ago. Our own Civil War invoked feelings of vengeance in the South which required generations to assuage.

It is the unnecessary attack on Islamic and Arab religious feelings, then, which brings me to Washington today to urge your vote against H.R. 4877. This Resolution will not only justifiably heighten Islamic anger; it has no corresponding benefit in easing Jewish fears.

This Committee has tried to deal with Jewish fears and Arab anger in the search for a reasoned and negotiated Mideast peace since 1967. This Committee understands more than most that there are no greater inhibitions to rational negotiations than these two emotions of fear and anger.

In this light, a Resolution which can trigger even greater anger in a volatile region, among moderate nations whom we desire to remain our friends, is not only stupid, but borders on insanity.

It violates one additional treasured principle in our own society.

We Americans have long treasured our basic constitutional recognition of religious freedom and a respect for all faiths, of whatever derivation.

The Islamic faith is an honorable one. Its embodiment in Arab culture includes virtues of grace and hospitality and politeness which we could well emulate. The teachings of the Koran contain inspiration comparable to those of the Old and New Testaments from which they take guidance.

There is no benefit to us in a Resolution which insults the deep religious convictions of hundreds of millions of people otherwise disposed to be friendly to the United States and supportive of friendship with our people.

As I said earlier, H.R. 4877 could cost more American lives than did the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution.●

LOPSIDED PROSPERITY

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, recently we have heard more and more about how the Reagan policies have adversely affected the poor and middle class of this country while benefiting the upper class. This evidence substantiates what many of my colleagues and I have been saying for some time.

An article in the Washington Post reiterates my concerns in this regard. Although all the evidence is not in yet, the existing facts, and certainly the trend is clear; the formulas for sharing prosperity in this country are in danger of being skewed to favor the rich at the expense of the poor.

LOPSIDED PROSPERITY

The distribution of income is one of the crucial economic balances in a society. It's one of that society's ways of defining fairness. In the United States, the balance now seems to be shifting in favor of the people who occupy the upper rungs of the income ladder.

It's too early for firm conclusions. The evidence unfolds slowly—which is unfortunate, as a matter of democratic politics. The nature and degree of this possibly profound change deserves attention in Mr. Reagan's campaign for reelection, since it is the result of the Reagan tax and budget legislation. Fully reliable data won't be available until the 1988 election, if then. Readers need to be aware that any judgments currently have to be tentative. But the subject is a good deal too important to be deferred until the

statisticians are fully satisfied with the numbers.

Recently there have been many studies showing that the direct effects of tax and spending cuts over the past three years have strongly favored people with higher incomes. That much is unambiguous.

But the Reagan administration has argued from the beginning that those tax and spending cuts would strengthen the private economy, improve the opportunities for wealthy and poor alike and, ultimately, leave everyone better off. That assertion can't be rigorously tested yet. The most important legislation of this administration, the 1981 tax cut, reduced the income tax rates in stages of which the last has taken effect only this year.

And yet a few things are becoming clear. The Internal Revenue Service has now published the aggregate figures from the income tax returns for 1982. To nobody's surprise, they show that the total income of the top one-third of all taxpayers was significantly larger than in 1981. The other two-thirds, taken all together, showed a total income that was lower and, when adjusted for inflation, quite a lot lower than the year before.

Since a recession always skews distribution of income, and the trough of the last recession was in late 1982, that's probably part of the explanation. Since the stock market was rising very fast also in late 1982, that probably explains some of the increase in income reported at the top of the scale. But it's hard to believe that these transient influences will turn out to be the whole reason for these very substantial changes in distribution. The numbers, so far, constitute a warning light. They indicate that the formulas for sharing prosperity in this country may be changing for the first time in nearly four decades, and not in a direction that does much credit to the country's sense of social responsibility.●

VFW POST NO. 894 MARKS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation today there is a rekindling of pride in the men and women who serve in the country's Armed Forces. Much of this resurgence in patriotism is due to efforts of veterans' organizations which constantly strive to instill and uphold the honor and respect due those who don a uniform in America's defense.

One such organization in the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania will be observing its 50th anniversary next month and I have been privileged to be invited to participate in the ceremonies planned by Post No. 894 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Natrona Heights for May 12.

Post No. 894 was organized on January 26, 1934, and the individual who signed its charter as the post's commander-in-chief was a former colleague of ours in the House of Representatives—James E. Van Zandt. "Jimmy" was elected to the House in 1938 and served until 1963 with time out for World War II. In fact, Jimmy served with the Navy in three wars, starting as an apprentice seaman in 1917 and retiring as a rear admiral (USNR) in 1959. So, it is not surprising to learn he is a champion of veterans' rights, serving twice as the Pennsylvania commander of the VFW and three times as its national commander.

Jim, however, is just one of a number of notable figures who have led Post No. 894 over the last 50 years and these past commanders will be singled out for special recognition next month. Among the living past commanders are: Chester Novosielski, Charles Swartzlander, Melvin Young, Herbert Johnson, John Kish, Lawrence Silliman, Bernard Adamski, Warren Fox, Charles McDermott, James Finley, Jack Richards, Martin Hoffman, John Pizzuti and Paul Sekeras, now serving a second term as commander.

Post No. 894's Ladies Auxiliary also will be marking its 50th anniversary, having been organized on March 9, 1934. Over the years its membership has grown from 47 to 99 and 4 of its charter members are still living: Stella Critchlow, Emma Elliott, Emma Fulton, and Roberta Rifley. The women have spent thousands of hours in work at veterans hospitals and raised thousands of dollars through community projects to benefit America's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to introduce the present officers of Post No. 894 and its Ladies Auxiliary to the Congress and I know my colleagues join me in wishing these two fine groups many years of continued success in their endeavors.

Post No. 894 officers: Paul Sekeras, commander; Melvin Beers, vice commander; George Kuzak, junior vice commander; Art Schrencengost, quartermaster; Henry Demarest, advocate; Emil Gneiting, chaplain; Dr. Hymel Fishkin, surgeon; Chester Novosielski, adjutant, and Merle Sterling, Jack Koedel, and John Malobicky, trustees.

Auxiliary officers: Dorothy Bergstrom, president; Helen Beers, senior vice president; Marietta Dietz, junior vice president; Janet Mack, treasurer; Stella Edmonds, chaplain; Matt Fischer, conductress; Irma Presley, guard, and Esther McCormick and Florence Sweeney, trustees.●

HON. JACK FIELDS ON OIL MERGERS

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, recent mergers in the oil industry have sparked a national debate including calls for a moratorium on such mergers and acquisitions. Hearings have been held in several House committees and the other body voted to instruct its committees to report by July 1 on the situation.

I have personally expressed a number of reservations about the merger phenomenon. As one who is as yet undecided on the issue, I was particularly impressed by a recent op-ed piece by our colleague from Texas (Mr. FIELDS). We serve together on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and on its Subcommittee on Fossil and Synthetic Fuels, where he is an articulate advocate of free market energy policies.

We are in particular agreement on one aspect of the merger debate and that is the impact on exploration and development. It is indeed ironic, and hypocritical, that some in the Congress profess to be up in arms over the impact of mergers on exploration when it is the Congress which has closed off onshore and offshore public lands, imposed an onerous windfall profits tax and failed to decontrol natural gas.

The column in the Houston Chronicle of April 6, 1984, succinctly addresses and refutes the major contentions of the proponents of moratorium legislation. As such, it is a major contribution to the congressional consideration of this issue and I commend it to my colleagues for their review:

MERGER MORATORIUM NOT THE ANSWER

(By Congressman Jack Fields, Eighth Congressional District, Texas)

The Congress is at it again, trying to insert itself in the oil industry under the guise of defending "the public interest." Such federal intervention has rarely served the public interest in the past, but proponents of a moratorium on mergers within the oil industry seem not to remember the lessons of history.

Neither do they understand that recent mergers within the oil industry are merely a natural economic phenomenon reflecting the current slump in the oil industry. The rapid expansion of the 1970's has given way to a contraction in the 1980's that is natural and should have been expected. This contraction is the result of decreased demand, greater conservation and more competition within the oil industry in recent years.

The mergers which have made news recently are designed not to "corner the market" in the oil industry. Rather, those mergers have been proposed and executed in order to promote greater economic efficiency within the industry, and, in some cases, to preserve the jobs of thousands of workers who might have been thrown out of work if unfriendly mergers had occurred.

Louisiana Sen. Bennett Johnson and several other congressmen and senators recently proposed a six-month ban on mergers within the oil industry. The Senate, wisely, temporarily sidestepped even voting on such a merger moratorium, choosing instead to direct its Finance, Judiciary and Energy Committee to study the economic effects of oil company mergers. The three committees' report is due by July 1. Despite this stopgap

measure, the threat of this unfounded federal intrusion in the oil industry is very much alive, with merger proponents making three points which simply do not hold up to scrutiny.

First, they argue that such mergers reduce competition in an already non-competitive industry. Second, they argue that such mergers rob the credit markets of billions of dollars that could be better used by other companies to expand and modernize. And third, they argue that the major oil companies should use their money to explore for and develop our nation's oil reserves, instead of to purchase other oil companies.

Clearly, moratorium backers have come to the conclusion that bigness, in and of itself, is bad. Further, they have concluded that the Federal Trade Commission is incapable of enforcing current laws designed to promote competition within the oil industry, and other industries as well. Their conclusions are highly dubious. America's oil industry is more competitive, and less concentrated, than either the domestic steel industry or the domestic auto industry. But that fact gets lost on a great many people when company A buys company B for several billion dollars. And it's easy to understand why.

Texaco's $10.1 billion takeover of Getty; Standard Oil of California's $13.2 billion takeover of Gulf; and Mobil's $5.7 billion takeover of Superior all obscure the fact that concentration is not a hallmark of the domestic oil industry. Indeed, the nation's 20 largest oil companies control less than 70 percent of the motor gasoline market nationwide. The largest of them, Exxon, has a "staggering" eight percent share.

In other industries, there is a much greater market concentration. The most notable of these are America's steel and automobile industries. The seven largest domestic steel companies produce 65 percent of all the steel produced domestically. And of all the automobiles produced and sold here in the United States, General Motors—the nation's largest automaker—holds a whopping 60 percent market share.

Nonetheless, the Congress fears the adverse effects of concentration only in the oil industry, and proposes to ban future mergers in that industry to "protect the public."

A second argument made by those who propose restrictive new regulations on the recently deregulated oil industry is that such mergers as have occurred in recent weeks, if allowed to continue, would rob the credit markets of billions of dollars that could otherwise be more productively loaned out elsewhere. Recently, The Wall Street Journal observed editorially that "virtually all the money received by the benefiting shareholders in these mergers will flow back into the larger capital pool. What is Gulf CEO James Lee going to do with his estimated $11 million benefit—buy a boat?"

The fear that oil company mergers, or mergers in any industry, might draw large portions of available credit out of the system is unfounded, just as the days when most Americans kept their savings in their mattresses has long since passed.

It took Standard Oil of California less than a week to line up banks worldwide willing and able to lend it the $14 billion necessary to take control of Gulf. Only days earlier, and with equal speed, Atlantic Richfield was able to line up the $12 billion necessary for it to purchase Gulf. Earlier, and without problems, Texaco raised the more than $10 billion which it used to buy Getty. While each of these transactions, and potential transactions, involved large sums of money, they were barely significant in the United States' $3.5 trillion national economy.

When Gulf, Getty and Superior shareholders, whose portfolios have gotten much fatter as a result of these transactions, have the chance to reinvest their funds in the economy, they will do so. Whether they reinvest those funds in other energy concerns, in the stocks and bonds of other companies in other industries, or in savings bonds or bank accounts, our nation's economy will be the stronger, not the weaker, for their having been able to do so.

Finally, merger ban proponents urge oil companies to use their money to explore and develop the nation's energy reserves—not purchase other oil companies. In doing so, they show their lack of understanding of the oil industry and of the effects of earlier federal energy policies.

The reason oil companies are merging at this time is because the oil industry is in a slump, one in which the costs and risks involved in exploration and drilling simply cannot be justified. A far less expensive, and much less risky, strategy in times like these is to simply purchase existing oil companies, and their reserves with them. This is exactly what is happening now.

Many of those who urge oil companies to go out and drill for new reserves are the same congressmen and senators who have closed off most of America to energy exploration and development. They are the same congressmen and senators who passed the so-called "windfall profits tax" which, according to the Internal Revenue Service, has taken $55.75 billion out of the oil industry since that tax's inception, reducing the funds oil companies have had available to them with which to explore. And they are the same congressmen and senators who have opposed virtually all efforts to get the government out, once and for all, of the oil industry.

If federal officials seriously wanted the major oil companies to go out and explore for new oil reserves, those officials wouldn't be proposing merger moratoria. Rather, they would be proposing legislation to open up millions of onshore and offshore acres that have been systematically closed to oil and gas exploration and development. The Outer Continental Shelf, for example, provides the most promising areas for major oil and gas discoveries anywhere in the United States. Yet only about two percent of the OCS has ever been offered for lease, due to lawsuits, congressionally approved leasing moratoria and other devices. Opening more of the Outer Continental Shelf to exploration and development would mean billions of dollars in added income for the federal government (from royalties, bonuses, rental fees and the so-called "windfall profits tax"), thousands of new jobs in the energy industry and related fields, and greater energy security for the United States in the years ahead.

The five year leasing schedule announced in 1981 already has been revised substantially, with millions of acres withdrawn from those offered for lease. Of the more than 131 million acres originally identified as possible lease sites, more than 52 million acres (40 percent of the total) have been withdrawn from consideration in just the last three years! Those 52 million acres are estimated to contain 1.35 billion barrels of oil.

Instead of proposing merger moratoria, the Congress should consider legislation to effectively create incentives for additional exploration and development. Repealing the so-called "windfall profits tax" would be one such mechanism, and deregulating natural gas completely would be another. But the Congress seems inclined to do neither.

While a moratorium on mergers within the oil industry has been, and will continue to be the subject of intense debate on Capitol Hill, the far greater issue concerning most Americans is the state of our domestic energy industry in the years ahead, and whether or not that industry can guarantee the energy security of this generation and of generations to come. Our nation's energy security demands that we act to make the energy industry more efficient and cost-effective, and it demands that we enlarge, not reduce, the area leased for exploration and development.

The current wave of mergers within the oil industry is an economic phenomenon brought about by natural market forces. The Congress should get out of the way and allow the market to make necessary readjustments in response to market conditions. But as usual, the Congress will probably not agree to do so.●

PLAYING WITH AFRICA

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the time is long overdue for us as legislators for the American people, to closely examine the facts surrounding the ongoing movement for divestment of funds in South Africa.

Misinformed Americans assert that by breaking financial ties with South Africa, the United States will exert the pressure needed to end the system of apartheid rule. They are incorrect in their assumption since it has been the American businesses that have elevated the way of life for many of the blacks in South Africa. If we pull U.S. investment out of South Africa, the momentum for positive change is most certain to halt.

Divestment will take away the vast array of opportunities opened up to blacks and other nonwhites by U.S. corporations. Continued investment in South Africa will help to insure black progress by guaranteeing the overall growth of the South African economy. This will help to expand job opportunities for skilled and semi-skilled black labor. Thus, divestiture will hurt, not help, South African labor markets which are of vital concern to those we intend to help.

It is important to note that social change does not take place overnight. It is evolution, not revolution that the people of South Africa desire. The first steps have been taken. Changes are taking place; among other things, a new constitution has been proposed which would include coloreds and Indians for the first time in the legislature.

It will take years of slow and steady change before the blacks in South Africa enjoy complete equality with their fellow countrymen. To demand a haste and sudden change is unrealistic; to say that the Government of South Africa is doing nothing to promote this change is incorrect.

The following Wall Street Journal editorial (March 23, 1984) points out that not only is investment good for the economy of South Africa but it has been and will probably continue to be South Africa's most powerful force for change. I urge my colleagues and fellow Americans to read this enlightening commentary regarding United States investment in South Africa.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 23, 1984]

PLAYING WITH AFRICA

All of a sudden the newspapers are full of the big changes now sweeping through southern Africa. The South African government is negotiating peace agreements with its black-ruled neighbors. The whole face of African politics may alter significantly. And how is the U.S. Congress responding? It is busy passing another old-style disinvestment bill.

The House has passed several disinvestment amendments to the Export Administration Act. One would forbid Americans to make any new investments in South Africa, including loans. Another directs a mandatory employment code for U.S. corporations in South Africa. A third bars U.S. banks from lending money to the South African government. A fourth bans the import of South African gold coins. Meetings with the Senate over the bill start today.

The debate in this country over disinvestment is by now predictable. Opponents of disinvestment assert that they have a duty to maximize profits. They insist their presence in South Africa makes blacks there better off. The "disinvestors" answer that American money makes life a bit better for South African blacks today but shores up the government against having to make any real changes tomorrow. The pro-investment people always seem self-interested; the anti-investment people look like the ones willing to make the tough moral choices.

But if you visit South Africa today, you quickly discover a few massively apparent, widely agreed-on facts. First, almost no one at whatever place in the political spectrum is counting on revolution or on forcing the government into all-at-once change. The new security arrangements now being worked out with Mozambique will make it harder for anti-Pretoria guerrillas to find a haven there. The Cubans have made noises about quitting Angola, but the South Africans will believe that when they see it; meanwhile, they are not going to jeopardize their security by turning over next-door Namibia to Soviet-backed Marxists. In theory, a massive uprising against established power can take place anyway. In practice, don't hold your breath.

This means that any strategy of political pressure promising to bring the South African government to its knees is based on a lie. Hostile symbolic gestures from the outside against the government are far more likely to encourage a politics of resentment within the nation than to force change.

Second, the South African government is not unmovable on matters of race. Some of its practices—its current removal and relocation policy, its system of preventive detention—are simply awful in a government that claims to uphold Western standards. But the government is sometimes trying to cope with truly knotty problems, not just expressing its racism. Every African nation, black or white, is trying desperately to control the influx of country people into the city. Every African nation must deal with massive factionalism.

Moreover, the government has in fact been moving on some matters of race. In the past couple of weeks, the country's English-language newspapers—no friends of the Afrikaner government—have been bulging with "liberalization" controversies: a debate over the new national constitution that includes coloreds and Indians for the first time, a debate over the government decision to open central business districts to non-whites, a debate over mixed marriages.

No one knows where all this yelling and pounding is going to end. But it is simply not justified for critics to accuse those who participate in South Africa's economic life of becoming part of an unchanging evil.

Third, all but a tiny minority of anti-apartheid activists living and working in South Africa absolutely do not want disinvestment. They say that industrialization has been the country's driving force for liberalization and the improvement of black welfare. They cannot imagine why anyone would want to slow down the engine. Listeners should be at least a little dubious when disinvestment activists insist that all these workers and witnesses are wrong.

Individual Americans have every right to crusade for or against whatever they choose, even when they dabble in the political and social complexities of distant countries that they little understand. Some countries, including South Africa, are susceptible to the pressures of outside opinion and such pressures can sometimes produce positive results.

But the American government will usually not be the appropriate body to do the pushing. And even when Americans act as private citizens, there is nothing to justify weakening the economic growth that has been and will probably continue to be South Africa's most powerful force for change.

Disinvestment in South Africa is not moral politics but moralistic selfindulgence. Its proponents have no right to claim the ethical high ground.●

MORRIS UDALL'S VOTING RECORD

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it has become my practice from time to time to list my votes in the House of Representatives here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I strongly believe that the people of Arizona have a right to know where I stand on the issues decided by the House, and I have found that printing my record here is the best way to provide that information.

This is not an all-inclusive list. I have omitted noncontroversial votes such as quorum calls, motions to resolve into the Committee of the Whole House, and motions to approve the Journal of the previous day.

The descriptions are necessarily somewhat short, and I am sure that some of my constituents will have additional questions about the issues described here. So I invite them to write me for specifics, or to visit my district office at 300 North Main in Tucson or 1419 North Third Street, Suite 103, in Phoenix.

The list is arranged as follows:

KEY

1. Official rollcall number;
2. Number of the bill or resolution;
3. Title of the bill or resolution;
4. A description of issue being voted on;
5. The date of the action;
6. My vote, in the form Y-yes, N-no, and NV-not voting;
7. The vote of the entire Arizona delegation, in the form (Yes—No—Not Voting);
8. An indication whether the motion or amendment was passed or rejected; and
9. The total vote.

251. H.R. 2957. International Recovery and Financial Stability Act. Adoption of the rule (H. Res. 249) providing for House floor consideration of the bill to increase U.S. participation in the International Monetary Fund by $8.4 billion, to extend authority for the Export-Import Bank and to provide multilateral development assistance. Adopted 369-42: Y(4-1-0), July 21, 1983.

252. H.R. 622. Death Benefits for Policemen and Firefighters. Kilkee, D-Mich., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to provide a $50,000 lump sum death benefit to survivors of federal law enforcement officers and firefighters killed in the line of duty. Motion agreed to 390-33: Y(3-2-0), July 26, 1983. A two-thirds majority of those present and voting (282 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules.

253. H.R. 2498. Congressional Advisory Commission on Boxing. Florio, D-N.J., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to establish a federal agency to regulate professional boxing and set national standards for licensing and regulating the industry. Motion rejected 167-254: Y(2-3-0), July 26, 1983. A two/thirds majority of those present and voting (281 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules.

254. H.R. 2957. International Recovery and Financial Stability Act. Schumer, D-N.Y., amendment to require the U.S. representative to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to vote for plans imposing lower interest rates and longer maturities on private bank debt when that debt is being restricted under IMF direction. Rejected 157-268: N(1-4-0), July 26, 1983.

255. H.R. 2969. Department of Defense Authorization. Skelton, D-Mo., substitute to the Schroeder, D-Colo., amendment, expressing the sense of Congress that U.S. allies should pay more of the cost of alliance defense. Adopted 329-82: Y(4-1-0), July 26, 1983. (The Schroeder amendment would have reduced the number of U.S. troops stationed abroad to the level so deployed at the end of fiscal 1980).

256. H.R. 2969. Department of Defense Authorization. Shannon, D-Mass., amendment to limit the number of U.S. military advisors in El Salvador to 55 and to limit the number of active duty U.S. military personnel in El Salvador to the number of present on July 25, 1983. Rejected 170-247:

NV(1-3-1), July 26, 1983. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

257. H.R. 2969. Department of Defense Authorization. Price, D-Ill., motion to end debate on the Markey, D-Mass., amendment and all amendments thereto in 20 minutes. Motion agreed to 213-195: Y(4-1-0), July 26, 1983. (The Markey amendment, to bar the deployment of U.S. combat troops to El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras, Guatemala or Costa Rica unless authorized by joint resolution, intended to evacuate U.S. citizens or to respond to a clear and present danger of military attack on the United States, subsequently was adopted.)

258. H.R. 2969. Department of Defense Authorization. Markey, D-Mass., amendment to bar the deployment of U.S. combat troops to El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras, Guatemala or Costa Rica unless authorized by joint resolution, intended to evacuate U.S. citizens or to respond to a clear and present danger of military attack on the United States. Rejected 165-259: Y(2-3-0), July 26, 1983. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

259. H.R. 2969. Department of Defense Authorzation. Dellums, D-Calif., amendment to bar deployment in Europe of Pershing II missiles before Dec. 31, 1984. Rejected 101-320: N(0-5-0), July 26, 1983. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

260. H.R. 2969. Department of Defense Authorization. Hertel, D-Mich., amendment to allow the allocation of up to $7 billion worth of defense procurement contracts to firms in areas of high unemployment. Adopted 218-201: N(1-4-0), July 26, 1983.

261. H.R. 2969. Department of Defense Authorization. Passage of the bill to authorize $187.4 billion for weapons procurement, military research and operations in fiscal 1984. Passed 305-114: Y(5-0-0), July 26, 1983.

262. H. Res. 267. Committee Funds. Adoption of the resolution to provide not more than $200,000 from the contingent fund of the House for further expenses of investigations by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. The money would be used to continue the ethics committee's examination of drug use at the Capitol. Adopted 407-3: Y(5-0-0), July 28, 1983.

263. H.R. 2973. Interest and Dividend Tax Withholding/Caribbean Basin Initiative. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to repeal interest and dividend withholding requirements due to take effect August 5; to impose new tax compliance requirements and penalties; and to provide trade and tax incentives to certain Caribbean nations. Adopted 392-18: Y(5-0-0), July 28, 1983.

264. H.R. 2760. Prohibition on Covert Action in Nicaragua. Barnes, D-Md., amendment to the Young, R-Fla., amendment, to retain the prohibition in the bill on U.S. covert action in Nicaragua and to state the sense of Congress that the government should enter into agreements with other countries in Central America to halt support for anti-government forces in the region. Rejected 213-214: Y(2-3-0), July 28, 1983. A "nay" was a vote supporting the president's position. (The Young amendment, as amended by subsequent amendments, was later deleted by the Wright, D-Texas, substitute amendment.)

265. H.R. 2760. Prohibition on Covert Action in Nicaragua. Boland, D-Mass., amendment to the Mica, D-Fla., amendment to the Young, R-Fla., amendment, to terminate U.S. covert action in Nicaragua for 30 days, after which the president could submit a new plan to Congress for resuming such covert action, and Congress could approve such a plan by passing a joint resolution. Adopted 221-205: Y(2-3-0), July 28, 1983. (The Young amendment, as amended by this and subsequent amendments, was later deleted by the Wright, D-Texas, substitute amendment.)

266. H.R. 2760. Prohibition on Covert Action in Nicaragua. Broomfield R-Mich., amendment (offered on behalf of Mica, D-Fla.), to the Young, R-Fla., amendment, to permit U.S. covert action in Nicaragua to continue if the President submitted to Congress a new plan for interdiction of arms being shipped from or through Nicaragua to antigovernment forces in El Salavador. Rejected 203-223: N(3-2-0), July 28, 1983.

267. H.R. 2760. Prohibition on Covert Action in Nicaragua. Hyde, R-Ill., amendment to the Wright, D-Texas, amendment, to make the prohibition on U.S. covert action in Nicaragua effective 30 days after the House Armed Services, Foreign Affairs and Intelligence committees had held hearings on the feasibility of section 802 of the bill, which authorized overt aid to countries in Central America for the interdiction of cross-border arms shipments. Rejected 194-229: N(3-2-0), July 28, 1983. (The Wright amendment subsequently was adopted by voice vote.)

268. H.R. 2760. Prohibition on Covert Action in Nicaragua. Bereuter, R-Neb., substitute for the Wright, D-Texas, substitute, to prohibit U.S. covert action in Nicaragua after October 1, 1983, unless before that date the President submits to Congress a new plan for interdiction of arms transfers from Nicaragua to guerrillas in El Salvador. The new plan would not be implemented, and the covert action prohibition would take effect, if the President or the Organization of American States verifies that the Government of Nicaragua had ceased to aid antigovernment groups elsewhere in Central America and had taken steps to carry out the promises it made to the Organization of American States in July 1979. Rejected 196-228: N(3-2-0), July 28, 1983. (The Wright substitute subsequently was adopted by voice vote.)

269. H.R. 2760. Prohibition on Covert Action in Nicaragua. Broomfield, R-Mich., motion to recommit the bill to the Foreign Affairs and Intelligence committees. Motion rejected 189-234: N(3-2-0), July 28, 1983.

270. H.R. 2760. Prohibition on Covert Action in Nicaragua. Passage of the bill to prohibit, at a classified date specified by the House Intelligence Committee, support by U.S. intelligence agencies for military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua and to authorize $30 million in fiscal 1983 and $50 million in fiscal 1984 to help friendly countries in Central America interdict cross-border shipments of arms to anti-government forces in the region. The bill also directed the President to seek action by the Organization of American States to resolve the conflicts in Centeral America and to seek an agreement by the government of Nicaragua to halt its support for anti-government forces in the region. Passed 228-195: Y(2-3-0), July 28, 1983. A "may" was a vote supporting the President's position.

271. H.R. 3069. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1983. Adoption of the rule (H. Res. 284) providing for House floor consideration of the conference report on the bill to provide supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1983. Adopted 267-138: Y(2-3-0), July 28, 1983.

272. H.R. 3069. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1983. Frost, D-Texas, motion to table (kill) the Gephardt, D-Mo., motion to reconsider the vote by which the rule, providing for House floor consideration of the conference report on the bill to provide supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1983, was adopted. Motion agreed to 271-125: Y(2-3-0), July 28, 1983.

273. H.R. 3069. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1983. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to appropriate $7,038,061,267 in new budget authority for supplemental funds for various government programs in fiscal 1983. Adopted 257-133: Y(3-2-0), July 28, 1983. The President had requested $15,138,053,808 in new budget authority for fiscal 1983 supplemental funds.

274. H.R. 2957. International Recovery and Financial Stability Act. St Germain, D-R.I., motion to limit debate on the bill to increase U.S. participation in the International Monetary Fund by $8.4 billion, including $5.8 billion in the U.S. quota in the fund and $2.6 billion in the General Arrangements to Borrow; to extend authority for the Export-Import Bank; and to provide multilateral development assistance. Motion agreed to 242-145: NV(2-2-1), July 29, 1983.

275. H.R. 2957. International Recovery and Financial Stability Act. St Germain, D-R.I., amendment to require the U.S. executive director to the International Monetary Fund to negotiate lower interest rates and longer maturities on private loans in debt restructuring agreements, to give other new instructions to the director, and to place restrictions on international lending by U.S. banks. Adopted 332-76,: Y(3-2-0), July 29 1983.

276. H.R. 2957. International Recovery and Financial Stability Act. McCollum, R-Fla., amendment to strike the $5.8 billion increase in the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund. Rejected 181-226: N(3-2-0), July 29, 1983. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

277. H.R. 2957. International Recovery and Financial Stability Act. Patman, D-Texas, amendment to strike the portion of the bill increasing the U.S. participation in the International Monetary Fund. Rejected 178-226: N(3-2-0), A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

278. H.R. 3069. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1983. Whitten, D-Miss., motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment striking House language to make rented land eligible for the Payment-In-Kind (PIK) acreage reduction program and concur with an amendment that restored the language and directed the agriculture secretary to reopen bids for cotton. Motion agreed to 204-191: Y(5-0-0), July 29, 1983. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

279. H.R. 3069. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1983. Conte, R-Mass., motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment appropriating $8,464,008,776 for the International Monetary Fund and concur with an amendment to reduce the amount by $40 million. Motion rejected 165-213: Y(2-3-0), July 29, 1983.

280. H.R. 3069. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1983. Whitten, D-Miss., motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment to raise Senators' pay by 15 percent to $69,800 a year and cap, effective January 1, 1984 the amount of outside earned income a Senator may receive at 30 percent of salary. Motion agreed to 225-106: Y(4-1-0), July 29, 1983.

281. H. Con. Res. 153. District Work Period. Adoption of the concurrent resolution to provide for the recess of the House and Senate until September 12 or two days after members are notified, whichever comes first. Adopted 291-0: Y(4-0-1), July 29, 1983.

282. H.R. 1646. Railroad Retirement Solvency. Passage of the bill to increase taxes and change benefits so as to restore solvency to the Federal railroad retirement unemployment compensation programs. Passed 398-5: Y(5-0-0-), August 1, 1983.

283. H. Res. 256. Most Favored Nation Status for Romania. Frenzel, R-Minn., motion to postpone indefinitely consideration of the resolution to disapprove renewal of most favored nation trade status for Romania. Motion agreed to 279-126: Y(3-2-0), August 1, 1983.

284. S. 675. Omnibus Defense Authorizations. Price, D-Ill., Motion to close the conference committee meetings on the bill to authorize appropriations for Defense Department programs in fiscal 1984. Motion agreed to 396-10: Y(4-1-0), August 1, 1983.

285. H.R. 3409. Federal Supplemental Unemployment Compensation. Rostenkowski, D-Ill., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to limit the number of weeks of unemployment compensation any state could lose as a result of strictures in the extended supplemental unemployment compensation program that took effect April 1, 1983. Motion agreed to 338-84: Y(3-2-0), August 2, 1983. A two-thirds majority of those present and voting (282 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules.

286. H.R. 3564. Early Agriculture Program Announcements. De la Garza, D-Texas, motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to change dates for required federal announcements of crop acreage limitations or set-aside programs, as follows: for 1984 and 1985 feed grain crops, the announcement must be made by September 30 (instead of November 15) of the year before that in which the crop is harvested; for the 1985 wheat crop, announcement must be made by July 1, 1984 (instead of August 15, 1984). Motion agreed to 329-93: Y(2-3-0), August 2, 1983. A two-thirds majority of those present and voting (282 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules.

287. H. Con. Res. 40. Federal Nutrition Programs. De la Garza, D-Texas, motion to suspend the rules and adopt the concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that federal nutrition programs should be protected from budget cuts, that the supplemental food program for women, infants and children (WIC) should be funded to maintain the number of cases carried at the end of fiscal 1983, and that the federal government should maintain current efforts in nutrition programs to prevent increases in domestic hunger. Motion agreed to 407-16: Y(3-2-0), August 2, 1983. A two-thirds majority of those present and voting (282 in this case) is required for adoption under suspension of the rules.

288. S. 64. Irish Wilderness. Seiberling, D-Ohio, motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to establish as federal wilderness and protect from development the Irish Wilderness Area of about 15,500 acres in the Mark Twain National Forest, Missouri. Motion agreed to 406-18: Y(4-1-0), August 2, 1983.

289. H.R. 3706. Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday. Hall, D-Ind., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to designate the third Monday of every January as a Federal holiday in honor of the late civil rights leader, the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Motion agreed to 338-90: Y(2-3-0), August 2, 1983. A two-thirds majority of those present and voting (286 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules.

290. H.R. 2780. Revenue Sharing. Horton, R-N.Y., amendment to reauthorize the general revenue sharing program for three years, through September 30, 1986, rather than five years in the bill as reported. Adopted 226-202: Y(5-0-0), August 2, 1983. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

291. H.R. 2780. Revenue Sharing. McCandless, R-Calif., amendment, to the Horton, R-N.Y., amendment to reduce entitlement funding for local governments from $5.02 billion annually as proposed by the Horton amendment to $4.6 billion, the level requested by the President. Rejected 176-248: N(3-2-0), August 2, 1983. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

292. H.R. 2780. Revenue Sharing. Horton, R-N.Y., amendment to reduce entitlement funding for local governments to $5.02 billion annually, the level assumed in the first fiscal 1984 budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 91), from the $5.3 billion under the bill as reported. Adopted 381-43: Y(5-0-0), August 2, 1983.

293. H.R. 2780. Revenue Sharing. Williams, R-Ohio, amendment to distribute any increase in funding over $4.6 billion only to localities in countries where the unemployment rate for the previous year, the formula to be weighted to the advantage of countries with the highest unemployment rates. Rejected 154-259: N(0-5-0), August 2, 1983.

294. H.R. 2780. Revenue Sharing. McCandless, R-Calif., amendment to delete from the bill an annual authorization of $2.3 billion in revenue sharing of state governments that applied for funds and received an appropriation of them from Congress. Adopted 218-193: Y(5-0-0), August 2, 1983.

295. H.R. 2780. Revenue Sharing. Levin, D-Mich., amendment to change the factors used in the formula for allocating revenue sharing funds among the states for distribution to local governments so as to take into account all potential revenue availability in each state, rather than just personal income. Rejection 192-220: Y(4-1-0), August 2, 1983.

296. H.R. 2780. Revenue Sharing. Passage of the bill to reauthorize the general revenue sharing program from October 1, 1983, through September 30, 1986, and entitle governments eligible to receive such funds to share $5.02 billion per year. Passed 381-35: Y(4-1-0), August 2, 1983.

298. H.R. 3021. Unemployment Health Insurance. Adoption of the rule (H. Res. 276) providing for House floor consideration of the bill to authorize $4 billion in fiscal 1983-85, for block grants to states for health insurance plans for the unemployed, and for grants to hospitals caring for needy, uninsured people. The bill also required certain changes in employment-based private group health insurance plans to continue coverage for laid-off workers. Adopted 227-196: Y(1-4-0), August 3, 1983.

299. H.R. 3021. Unemployment Health Insurance. Tauke, R-Iowa, motion to recommit the bill to the Energy and Commerce Committee with instructions to substitute a $1.8 billion authorization for block grants to states for health insurance plans for the unemployed, with funding contingent on appropriations and without mandated state contributions and certain other requirements. Motion rejected 171-255: N(3-2-0), August 3, 1983.

300. H.R. 3021. Unemployment Health Insurance. Passage of the bill to authorize $4 billion in fiscal 1983-85 for block grants to states for health insurance plans for the unemployed, and for grants to hospitals caring for the needy, uninsured people. The bill also required certain changes in employment-based private group health insurance plans to continue coverage for laid-off workers. Passed 252-174: Y(2-3-0), August 3, 1983. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.●

PINELLAS COUNTY STUDENTS LEAD BY EXAMPLE IN DONATING THE GIFT OF LIFE

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's parents and teachers traditionally have sought to set an example to teach our youth. I am happy to report, however, that in Pinellas County, FL, which I represent, the students are the ones setting the example.

One in every ten Pinellas County residents who donates blood to the Community Blood Bank of St. Petersburg is a student. Last year along, students donated more than 3,000 pints of blood.

These students have set an example not only for the county's adults, but also for their peers in school who learn the importance of donating blood and who will retain that lesson throughout their lives.

This program has attracted so much interest that the county's 14 high schools compete for a traveling trophy awarded to the school with the greatest participation in the blood drive. Because blood banks experience shortages during the summer months, many students even are volunteering to donate while on summer vacation.

Following my remarks, I would like to include a copy of a story from the April 7, 1984, edition of the St. Petersburg Evening Independent concerning the high school blood drive. It should serve as inspiration to all Americans and emphasizes the importance of donating blood, the gift of life.

[From the St. Petersburg Independent, Apr. 7, 1984]

BLOOD BANK VALUES ITS STUDENT DONORS

(By Bettineta Harris)

About one of every 10 persons who donates blood in lower Pinellas County is a high school student.

That's why Community Blood Bank officials appreciate high school students. They know students represent the largest blood donor group in the county, according to Kevin Lindberg, blood bank spokesman.

"High school students are such an important part of our program," Lindberg said. "We're conscious of making the experience as pleasant as possible, because this isn't a short-term thing with us."

Last year, the blood bank collected about 32,000 units of blood from lower Pinellas County. Of that amount, high school students donated more than 3,000 pints. Lindberg said projected blood needs in the county for this year have increased to 35,000 pints.

Lindberg said the bloodmobile units make several visits to the 14 county high schools, which compete with each other to donate the largest number of pints for larger schools, or the highest percentages for smaller schools. The winner of each category receives a traveling trophy. School-based civic groups at the different high schools sponsor the blood drives.

Leader of the south-county schools during 1982-83 was Dixie Hollins High School, which collected more than 400 pints.

James Hardy, Dixie Hollins senior, said he started donating blood after he was in the hospital for a month because he'd been hit by a motorcycle as he jogged.

"I didn't need blood, but it had a lasting effect on me," said Hardy, who is president of the Junior Civitan Club, which sponsors the blood drives at Dixie Hollins. "I also try to encourage other people to give blood."

Senior Marci Anderson said she donates blood because: "I want to help people. I know if I need blood, I'd want people to donate to me."

Senior Timothy Ross said he was afraid to give blood at first because he thought it would hurt. However, the first experience was good, Ross said, so he continued to donate because it gave him a good feeling to be able to help somebody.

"I'll continue to donate blood even after I graduate," Ross said.

Besides wanting to help, students are aware of the incentives of giving blood, according to Chris Elliott, Dixie Hollins facility adviser of Junior Civitans.

Ms. Elliott said the high schools are given one credit for each pint of blood donated by students or faculty members. To divert the cost of blood and blood products, credits can be transferred to a student or his family members' account should they ever need blood.

Admiral Farragut Academy's blood drive program, which is less than two years old, began because a faculty officer's wife had cancer and needed surgery, according to Maj. James Harris, chairman of the program.

"A few of us went down and donated blood," Harris said. "We didn't have an account then, but we had one soon after."

Since then, Harris said that the program has been able to help students and family members. He said the academy had accumulated about 200 credits.

Traditionally, blood banks throughout the country have experienced shortages during the summer months because regular donors are on vacation and schools are on summer break. However, Lindberg said blood bank officials are working on a program to avoid the summer slump in donations.

Blood bank officials will ask students to sign pledge cards to give blood when they are contacted by officials during the summer.

"We want them to continue helping even if they're not in school," Lindberg said. "If we do a good job, then we've not gained a blood donor for a day, but for as long as the student lives."●

LAWLESS STATES AND THE MISUSE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the International Court of Justice has under submission a complaint filed by the Government of Nicaragua against the United States of America. The Sandinistas, by their petition, would ask the World Court to issue a protective order to secure their right to oppress the Nicaraguan people free from retribution. That totalitarian government, which knows no law, and respects no right, would seek immunity from aggressive acts against its neighbors, under the color of international law.

The Sandinistas are outraged that ships carrying weapons and military supplies may be deterred from unloading their lethal cargo at Nicaraguan ports. I wonder what depths of hypocrisy are required for a regime to seek protection from small-scale arms interdiction when the weapons that continue to arrive are turned against peaceful neighboring states? And I wonder further about commentators in the United States whose own outrage is turned not against the aggressive acts of the Marxist government in Nicaragua, but against their own country for declining to participate in what would be a judicial charade.

In late February this year, George Will wrote a thoughtful column on the uses and abuses of international law. Of the liberation of Grenada, he writes, "It would have been mere right mindedness * * * to have allowed our values to be extinguished in Grenada so that we could be said to be 'paying attention' to our understanding of 'the law of nations'." The people of Grenada would surely agree.

Increasingly, lawless states have come to practice a new cynical craft: the exploitation of international law for unjust purposes. They would take the most precious values of Western thought, the essence of honor in our culture, and use our very virtue to undermine our strength and to paralyze our ability to defend our values. Because the Soviet Union and its surrogates like Cuban and Nicaragua have no tradition of law or respect for the sovereignty of other states—or the integrity of the individual—they appeal to the best within us, using our honor as a weapon against us; and while we are held in check, they have free rein to destroy that which we would champion.

If our values are to survive, we must be prepared to defend them, and to know that what we are doing is right. I believe that U.S. support for the "Contras" in Nicaragua must be placed in this philosophical context. In preparation for this debate, I urge my colleagues to consider the insights offered by Mr. Will.

[From Newsweek, Feb. 27, 1984]

THE PERILS OF LEGALITY

(By George F. Will)

Pat Moynihan is a traditionalist, but a liberal traditionalist, a keeper of Woodrow Wilson's flame. His loyalty, as elegantly explained in his fine new book "Loyalties," is to the idea of the rule of law in international affairs. He believes the United States pays too little attention to international law. I believe it pays too much.

Decrying what he calls the 'Sovietization" of U.S. policy, he says recent administrations have accepted normalessness, meaning policy insufficiently oriented toward standards of international legality. The role of law, says Moynihan, is to provide proportionate responses to violations of norms. But the very idea of international law is problematic, partly because there is no international consensus about norms. Besides, can there be law among sovereign nations—law where there is no sovereign to adjudicate and enforce judgments?

When the United States invaded Grenada to replace a government, Moynihan said the United States had no "right" to do so and indeed had a "positive obligation not to" because the charter of the Organization of American States declares that no state has a right to intervene, for any reason, in another state's internal affairs. When he said we also had violated the United Nations Charter, I wrote in this space that "it is bad enough we pay for the United Nations; surely we do not have to pay attention to it." Moynihan now rejoins: "Paying attention to the U.N. Charter is paying attention to our understanding of the law of nations." Oh? Says who? Moynihan says the charter imposes a dual obligation on governments "to be law-abiding in their relations with one another" and to protect " 'fundamental human rights' as these were understood by British and American constitutional lawyers in 1944." But the charter was a mockery from the moment in 1945 when Stalin's government subscribed to "our understanding" of the law of nations.

VALUES

It would have been mere right-mindedness—a moral pose rendered immoral by its consequences—to have allowed our values to be extinguished in Grenada so that we could be said to be "paying attention" to our understanding of "the law of nations." Had there been no invasion, Grenadians would be groaning beneath a dictatorship imposed with the indispensable help of Cuba, which cares not a fig for the OAS Charter, and the Soviet Union, which is in violation of virtually every clause of the U.N. Charter. In order to seem to be conforming to the forms of international law, Reagan talked rubbish about the invasion being a rescue mission for medical students. The lie reflected misplaced respect for a codification of national obligations that makes no sense in a world menaced by regimes like those in Havana and Moscow. Reagan should have said: international law, such as it is, is an intramural code, useful among nations that share common values but not germane to dealings with totalitarian or gangster regimes.

Moynihan wishes the Reagan administration had approached the Korean airline massacre "as a violation of a treaty, specifi-

cally the Chicago Civil Aviation Convention of 1944," which obligates signatories, including the Soviet Union, to help a lost plane, not shoot it down. Well, OK: it is useful to remind Westerners how little such obligations mean to the Soviet Union. But that is a use of the modalities of law to improve the Western mind, not Soviet behavior. And the Western mind is itself at risk because of certain uses of internaitonal law.

The "Helsinki process" might seem to be a use of law, or at least its forms, to do what Moynihan favors. That ongoing process asserts norms in relations between nations and between governments and citizens. But, as Moynihan says, in doing so it fosters a "denial of reality." The 1975 Helsinki accords on human rights were frauds because there was no accord about anything, from the meaning of freedom to the definition of a trade union. In 1976 Moynihan declared that "it has become unmistakably clear that the West was utterly deceived." Surely not. No one thought the Soviet regime had agreed to dismantle itself and its empire, which it would have had to do to comply with the accords. This was détente, the willful suspension of disbelief.

Moynihan cites the International Labor Organization as "the largest single initiative" extending Western, liberal ideas into international law. Well. In 1948 the ILO adopted a convention protecting labor's right to organize free unions. Ninety-four countries have ratified it. Perhaps half of them are not violating it. Many members forbid unions, within the Western meaning of the term. But Western meanings are casualties of participation with communist regimes in things like Helsinki and the ILO. The West seems to agree that there are two diametrically opposed but equally eligible meanings for the crucial words in the political lexicon.

DELUSION

It is said that even organizations like the ILO (the very name is a lie: many member regimes deny representation to labor) and "agreements" reflecting no real agreement are useful as mechanisms for indicting the Soviet. But that sterile exercise does not change Soviet behavior. Signing documents that one side violates in every particular demoralizes—literally, demoralizes—the West. The public is desensitized by a minuet of diplomacy that fosters the delusion that the two sides share a frame of reference. It is said: "But we have to talk to them." Yes, but not at the cost of eviscerating the language of politics.

Many people who are incensed by Reagan's obviously accurate description of the "evil empire" applaud the charade of the Helsinki process, which is meretriciousness institutionalized. Reagan was elected, in part, to restore realism to the language of East-West relations. But he has been too respectful of corruptions perpetrated in the name of international law. At last year's Madrid event in the Helsinki process, all participants, including the Soviet Union and Poland, solemnly vowed respect for worker's rights to free unions and to "the prerogatives that are recognized by international law." Consider the denial of reality required for participation in such a burlesque—a charade conducted in the name of law. The real danger is not the Sovietization of U.S. policy but of the world's vocabulary, and hence its mind.●

BEAUTIFUL BUILDING NAMED FOR A BEAUTIFUL WOMAN

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have in my district a very fine institution of higher learning, Barry University. Recently, Barry announced that it will honor a great friend of the university, Inez Andreas, by naming the new school of business building after her.

Mrs. Andreas chairs the university's board of trustees and she has been extremely active on behalf of the school. The Flame, which is published by Barry, described the groundbreaking for the new building and listed the many accomplishments of Inez Andreas. I know my colleague will enjoy reading about this remarkable woman who serves as an example to us all. She knows how to give of herself and work on behalf of others.

The article follows:

BEAUTIFUL BUILDING NAMED FOR A BEAUTIFUL WOMAN

There's no business like school business for Inez Andreas. In her book, it steals all the bows and applause. She enjoys school so much she even dug ground for Barry's new building to house the School of Business.

It is with pride and gratitude that Sister Jeanne O'Laughlin, president of Barry University, announces the name the new building will carry when dedicated—the D. Inez Andreas School of Business Building.

Inez Andreas has chaired the Barry University Board of Trustees since 1977. She is an alumna, having earned the Master of Science in Education, 1975. She and husband Dwayne O. Andreas are deeply involved with Barry University's progress and future.

Andreas has been a dynamic and influential leader in attaining the enrichment and academic goals of Barry University. She has initiated many programs and communication groups relative to the university.

In 1980 she was recognized by the presidents of Florida's 18 independent colleges and universities as the recipient of the Champion of Higher Education in Florida Award (C.H.I.E.F.)

When Inez Andreas becomes involved, she gives of her heart and high energy. Nothing is half-way. She handles things with vigor, aplomb and dignity, plus a tremendous amount of expertise and intellect.

The active and visible chairman of Barry's trustees knows the campus and its students, faculty, staff and administrators, due to her personal contact and interest.

However, with her deep involvement at Barry, she respects the difference between governance and administration. Just as she is unique, so is her service to Barry University unique.

In addition to a B.A. from the University of Minnesota and the M.S. from Barry University, Andreas holds honorary doctor of laws degrees from Hamline University and Barry University.

She is vice chairman of the board of public television, WPBT Channel 2; a former member of the Governor's Conservation Commission; served on the boards of Pillsbury Citizens Service, Citizens Council on Delinquency and Crime, Northwestern Hospital Auxiliary, and former president of the Youth Council of Mound, Minnesota.

Andreas was named Citizen of the Day, May 31, 1975, and the 1982 Community Headliner by the Women in Communications, Inc., Miami. The list of her service and accomplishments locally and nationally goes on. She's a worker and a family women.

Andreas is also a woman of the world. It's commonplace for her to climb into a helicopter, dash for a jumbo jet and take off across the Atlantic or wherever.

When she conceived the idea of holding a tented dinner dance annually on Barry's campus, she walked all over the Barry campus in the hot August sun, seeking the right spot. Thus the Starlight Ball, Barry's major fund-raising event, came into being.

Known nationally and internationally, Inez Andreas still is the Midwest girl at heart. She can whip up a batch of hors d'oeuvres in a minute's notice. If necessary, she can plug in an iron and press the wrinkles out of husband Dwayne's shirt. She is equally adept at entertaining world leaders. Attending dinners and receptions at the White House is an ordinary occurrence for Inez and Dwayne Andreas over many years.

In Proverbs 31, it is stated that the value of a good woman is far above rubies . . . "give her of the fruit of her hands; and let her own works praise her in the gates."

The works of D. Inez Andreas are being praised rightfully by Barry University. The fruit of her hands is being appropriately named: the D. Inez Andreas School of Business Building.●

IN PRAISE OF THE USPS

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, an April 2 article in Time magazine gives a good account of the U.S. Postal Service. It praises the USPS and the work of Postmaster General Bolger.

It also talks about the increased productivity of postal employees an increase of 43 percent productivity since the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970. That is an incredible track record.

Our Postal Service has been able to make these improvements while increasing their work load. I want to praise the hard-working employees of the USPS and Postmaster General Bolger for the good work, and I would like to include the April 2 Time article for my colleague's perusal.

The article follows:

[From Time magazine, Apr. 2, 1984]

FIRST CLASS: POSTAL SERVICE DELIVERS

"You just can't stand still in this world any more," says William Bolger. "It can change faster than your mind can change." Such pronouncements would be routine from the boss of an ordinary company, but this one comes from the U.S. Postmaster General, talking about what at one time was the bumbling, inefficient, overstaffed, deficit-ridden, money-losing U.S. Postal Service.

No more. In the 13 years since its conversion into a Government corporation with a

mandate from Congress to become financially self-sustaining, the Postal Service has turned first class. It is handling more mail than ever: 119.4 billion pieces last year, 400 million pieces every workday, up 4.7% from 1982. That is more by far than any other postal system in the world. Since 1971, the service's load has increased by 35 billion pieces, to 18 million new addresses.

The Postal Service corporation is carrying that load with fewer people: 678,845 vs. 741,000 in 1971. Employee productivity has gone up 43%, chiefly because of mechanical mail sorting. In 1971, a postal worker processed 120,212 pieces a year; now a person handles 172,320. Output will go up even more when high-speed optical scanners, which read addresses, convert them into printed bar codes and then send them off for automatic sorting into 136,000 carrier routes, are fully installed.

Perhaps most important of all, the Postal Service has stopped losing money. In 1979, for the first time since World War II, it took in more than it spent. Last year the Postal Service generated a profit, without subsidies, of $616 million, its third in five years. In the early 1970s, it lost as much as $200 million annually.

None of that good news, however, came free. The cost, in part, was sharply increased postal rates for both businesses and individuals. The price of a first-class stamp, a mere 4¢ a generation ago, has risen since 1971 from 8¢ to the current 20¢. The Postal Service has applied to the Postal Rate Commission, which reviews requests for rate increases, for a raise to 23¢ for first-class stamps. It could come as early as October, but probably will not take effect until a few months after the November elections.

The postal system, first headed by Benjamin Franklin in 1775, continues to enjoy a legal monopoly on the delivery of first-class letter mail, although exceptions allow competition from such private organizations as Federal Express and Emery Worldwide. But unlike a few years ago, when the Postal Service sat and waited for business to come its way, it is now aggressively courting customers. For example, it is countering the new overnight carriers with its fast-growing Express Mail, which for $9.35 promises next-day delivery. Another new service is E-COM (for electronic computer-originated mail), which allows transmission of messages to 25 special post offices throughout the U.S., where they are printed and distributed as first-class mail. The Postal Service, though, has yet to make it profitable.

The bulk of the Postal Service's revenues still comes from old-fashioned mail. Despite the computer age and talk about electronic messages doing away with letters, more, not less, mail is being sent. Christmas volume last year ran 800 million pieces ahead of the 1982 rate. U.S. banks and brokers had to send out millions of Internal Revenue Service W-9 forms this year to comply with new requirements on reporting interest income. The Postal Service earned $100 million just on those bank mailings alone.

Bolger, 61, who joined the post office in 1941 as a clerk, has spent his entire career with the system. He is expected to quit at year's end for a job in private industry. Along with the improved efficiency, Bolger's six years as Postmaster General have won more friends for the U.S. mail. A Roper poll last year showed that most Americans give the Postal Service higher marks than the telephone company, insurance firms or hospitals.●

THREE TO BE CITED BY GLASSPORT LEGION

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, American Legion Post 443 of Glassport, PA, has scheduled a testimonial dinner May 5 to honor the organization's "life" members and past commanders.

During the proceedings, officers and members of the post will pause to pay special tribute to three individuals for their outstanding contributions to the work of the legion and to residents of the community.

Awarded "life" memberships because of dedicated service to their comrades-in-arms will be Albert Halucha, a Legionnaire for 33 years, and Raymond Krills, a member of post 443 since 1973.

Cited for her interests and many endeavors on behalf of the citizens of Glassport will be Rita D. Stinner, a lifelong member of the community.

Mr. Halucha and Mr. Krills are veterans of World War II; Mr. Halucha, an infantryman with the Army, and Mr. Krills with the 8th Air Force. Both men also have served as commanders of post 443.

During Halucha's term in office, membership in the post topped the 500 mark for the first time and he had the distinction of being chairman of the building committee when the post burned its first mortgage. Presently, he is chairman of the Vietnam and Korean Memorial Monument committee. His wife, Rose, also has been active in legion activities and has served as president of the post's ladies auxiliary.

In addition to his legion work, Mr. Halucha has been busy in local government, serving four terms on Borough Council and 4 years as president of that body.

Mr. Krills twice served as commander of post 443 and also has held every other major office in the organization. He has been a member of the home association and its board of directors and been the guiding force on numerous legion committees, including the annual Memorial Day observance.

Rita Stinner has been active in both civic and community work. Originally appointed borough auditor in 1974 to fill a vacancy, she remained in that office until 1980 when she was elected to borough council. As chairperson of the recreation department, she initiated an annual fishing contest and a community "light up" night for the holidays. Since leaving council, Rita has directed her energy on behalf of senior citizens and presently serves as legislative chairperson of the local AARP chapter.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the Congress of the United States to join me in extending official congratulations to Rita Stinner, Raymond Krills, and Albert Halucha. They are to be commended for their dedication and service to others.●

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, though we are well into an election year, some of the behavior evidenced by politicians who should know better has been reprehensive. The article that follows should prove thought provoking to every responsible elected Representative. It appeared in the Wall Street Journal, March 29, 1984, and I commend it to your attention.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 29, 1984]

UNHINGING OF THE LIBERAL DEMOCRAT

(By Irving Kristol)

As one looks at Washington, D.C., today, the question that springs to mind is not, "Are our representatives in Congress capable of governing the country?" but, "Are they capable of governing themselves?" Not even at the height of dissent over the Vietnam war did so many members of Congress behave in so unruly and irresponsible a manner. Not since the era of Senator Joseph McCarthy have the rules of political civility been so contemptuously violated. All sense of collective purpose and discipline seems to have been eroded.

True, it is an election year, and allowances must be made. But when was the last election year in which the majority leader of the House publicly called the president a "liar"? And this from a congressman generally regarded as a relatively sober and moderate person, and over such a trivial issue as who had been more forthcoming in budget negotiations. When, too, was the last time, even in an election year, that the speaker of the House said of the president that he was unqualified to hold that office—and this, too, over a routine policy disagreement?

SOUR, MADDENING CLIMATE

Are there really votes to be won by such uncivil behavior over perfectly ordinary and traditional clashes of views? No one outside Washington is likely to think so. The American people do not wish to see their president casually vilified in this way—not even those who may be prepared to vote against him. All of the opinion polls reveal far more temperate attitudes, as do passing conversations in bar rooms, taxis and offices. So why is the climate in Washington so sour, so maddening?

My own diagnosis takes its cue from the fact that, this time, it is mainly the liberal wing of the Democratic Party that seems out of rational control, with the Democratic majority being intimidated into going along. And here, once again, there is a reminder of the McCarthy period. Then, a significant segment of conservative opinion felt frustrated and enraged at the way the postwar world was shaping up. Today, it is a signifi-

cant segment of liberal opinion that is frustrated and enraged by the way the post-Watergate world is shaping up.

For this segment of liberal opinion, Watergate was supposed to be a watershed, signaling a return to a revivified liberalism after an absurd conservative interruption. It is a minority segment, even of liberal opinion, but it now includes the Democratic activists who dominate primary caucuses, and who will—as a result of the post-McGovern party reforms—dominate the convention as well. It also includes the swollen staffs of Democratic congressmen and the bulk of the press—the one busily constructing "news" (usually involving a measure of character assassination) that is promptly leaked to the other. (What we now call "investigative journalism" rarely amounts to anything more than publicizing those leaks.)

In general, the Democratic Party in Congress today makes little effort to stay in tune with the larger Democratic electorate, but instead seizes, desperately and almost randomly, on "issues" generated by what one was once able to call its "ultra-liberal" (or "left-liberal") activists. Now, of course, they are simply "liberal."

Most of these "issues" are either transient or of little real interest to the electorate, and in any case will vanish from the public agenda the day after the election, no matter who wins. It has been truly pathetic to watch the Democratic candidates strive to establish primacy on the issue of a "verifiable nuclear freeze." This is a phony issue, without content, but which does express the utopian hopes and apocalyptic fears of the activists. There is not going to be a "verifiable nuclear freeze."

The Soviets have never permitted onsite verification of their military installations and, in any case, will not today accept a freeze that does not involve the dismantling of the intermediate-range missiles recently emplaced in Western Europe. After all, it was to prevent the installation of those missiles that the Soviets so vigorously encouraged the "nuclear freeze" movement. That was the only meaning the movement had for them, and ever since the deed was done, they have lost interest. (So, coincidentally, has the movement itself.) The American electorate, in its majority, has always sensed the utter pointlessness of the "freeze" issue. It will, in fact, play little or no role in the post-primary campaigns for office. Nevertheless, the party's leaders have, almost without exception, rallied under this banner, though in private conversation they show either a sensible lack of interest or an embarrassed cynicism.

Are there not issues of substance that can constitute a viable "liberal" agenda? No, there are not—and this explains the frustration and rage that is now shaking the party and threatening to cripple it. The liberal activists are willing to accept trade-union money and the endorsement of union leaders, but they can barely hide their contempt for traditional trade-union concerns. They will routinely advocate an increase in taxes for those in the upper brackets, but they can no longer believe that this will have the effect of "reshaping" American society according to some vague principles of "social justice." (After all, we have had such taxes before, with no such larger consequence.) They can talk about "reducing tensions" in foreign affairs but they dare not say a kind word about the U.N.

Behind every liberal claim and assertion today there is the haunting presence of the Carter administration. That was the liberal's administration, as much as a Mondale or Hart administration is likely to be. And it was judged by the electorate to be a miserable failure, in both domestic and foreign policy. The liberal activists are psychologically unable to confront this fact and draw any useful inferences from it. So they talk of "new ideals," but have none.

What they do have is a reactive, destructive urge against any conservative president, all of his appointments and all policies emanating from a conservative administration—even when, as is often the case in foreign policy, these are in no way partisan. The Kissinger Commission, a truly bipartisan body, very accurately reflected majority opinion, in Congress and out, as to what our Central American policy should be. All the leading Democrats on the panel subscribed to its theses, but not a single Democratic candidate has dared endorse it, and Democrats in Congress now pretend it never happened.

Since American politics really do need a responsible, two-party system to function effectively, this state of affairs is deplorable. It is also exceedingly dangerous. For once a political ideology—whether liberal or conservative or radical—becomes unhinged from political reality, it will behave like a loose cannon, wreaking much mischief before its momentum expires.

The reality of American life and American politics today is that we are in a relatively conservative phase of the political cycle. There are no big issues in domestic policy that can electrify the electorate. The biggest issue, presumably, is the budget deficit and, ironically, the voters persist in seeing this as a conservative issue. Most young Americans are now far more career-minded than they are issue-oriented. They are also more patriotic, even somewhat nationalistic. The welfare state is now taken for granted, and specific budgetary allocations to specific programs are not something most people can get terribly excited about.

So these are hard times for liberals, and one can appreciate their frustration. But American liberalism has survived hard times before, and the political cycle always redeems their patience. Why such furious impatience today?

The answer, I think, is that American liberalism has, in the past 15 years, moved markedly to the left, as the exhaustion of the traditional liberal agenda has become more apparent. Its pragmatic temper has diminished, its ideological passions have been exacerbated. And as a result, the political vehicle of American liberalism, the Democratic Party, has become ever more irresponsible.

Such irresponsibility is beginning to assume alarming proportions. This is especially the case in foreign policy, where "new ideas" are indeed available. Actually, they are not new at all, but are novel twists on a very old idea that, for half a century now, has found its home on the extreme right of American conservatism. What is new is that it has suddenly acquired a left-wing hue. To put it plainly: We are today witnessing the emergence of a left-wing American isolationism that threatens to become the orthodoxy of the Democratic Party.

CRUCIAL DIFFERENCES

This new left-wing isolationism differs in some crucial respects from the older, conservative version. The latter was nationalist and believed that America should have adequate military strength to maintain its splendid isolation. The new version believes we should be militarily weak, a weakness to be compensated for by a noble-spirited diplomacy that will shame the world into respecting our interests and rights. It believes, too, that backward and wayward peoples of the world probably have to go through a Marxist-Leninist phase—have to surmount the wave of their immediate future—before they can evolve into decent, self-disciplined, self-governing nations. Its policy, therefore, vis-a-vis the Soviets and their surrogates and all Communist rebellions, is some form of therapeutic appeasement. Thus, it opposes the sending of American arms and, still less, troops, to El Salvador. Or to Honduras. Or to Guatemala. Or to anywhere in the Caribbean. Or to the Persian Gulf. Or, inevitably, to Western Europe or even Mexico.

This new left-wing isolationism does not as yet dare declare its name. It remains in the closet of congressional committees where it festers, finding release in occasional congressional resolutions and general obstructionism. But it is in truth the only new idea on the Democratic agenda of the moment, an idea fatal to the future of democracy, either in the U.S. or in the world at large.●

REMEMBERING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, today we are commemorating the 68th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Let us not deceive ourselves. Let us not use semantics to obscure reality. There was a premeditated attempt to exterminate the Armenian people in 1915 and if that, by definition, is not genocide, then what is?

Mr. Speaker, the accuracy of the historical record is not the issue. That there was a genocide has been documented by more historians, in more archives and engraved indelibly upon the hearts and souls of more survivors than there is time to recite before this House today. What I would like to place clearly on the record is the startling accusation made in this body 2 weeks ago regarding the passage of a simple commemorative resolution. House Joint Resolution 247 was to commemorate a day of man's inhumanity to man, especially noting the massacres of the Armenian people during 1915 to 1920, by the Ottoman Turks. Although there were objections on a variety of grounds, the most disturbing was the claim that the genocide of the Armenians was undocumented.

The passage of a commemorative resolution is a small thing but suppression of the truth is not. Richard Cohen, a columnist for the Washington Post, wrote, "to control the present and shape the future, you have to first alter the past—take possession of it and rob it of its lessons."

It is a point worth pondering, and one that totalitarian governments understand well. After the confusion over the passage of House Joint Resolution 247, I am beginning to fear not that we are ignorant of this, but rather that perhaps we are beginning to understand it too well.●

TAX CUTS AREN'T WORKING AS PROMISED

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, some of our colleagues and the administration have been making new claims about the wonders of the 1981 tax cut.

The fact is that the tax cut has and is continuing to split America into two classes: the very rich and the rest of society. That is not my idea of a tax cut that worked.

April 22, the Washington Post carried an article analyzing the data and concluded that the "tax cuts aren't working as promised."

I include the full text of the article at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 22, 1984]

TAX CUTS AREN'T WORKING AS PROMISED

(By John M. Berry)

Supply-siders jumped with glee recently when the Internal Revenue Service released preliminary statistics from 1982 individual income tax returns. The IRS figures showed that even with tax rates cut sharply for upper-bracket taxpayers, their share of total taxes went up while the share paid by lower-income individuals went down.

Because 1982 was the first year in which a significant part of the Reagan personal income tax cuts was effective, the supply-siders immediately concluded that the world was working exactly as they had predicted. Apparently lower rates were drawing the rich out of tax shelters and encouraging them to channel more of their income into taxable investments. Crowed a Wall Street Journal editorial, "The numbers are in on 1982 and . . . they vindicate the supply-siders."

And in a column by Warren Brookes distributed by the Heritage Foundation for newspaper use, Rep. Jack Kemp (R-N.Y.), one of the original sponsors of the tax cut, was quoted as saying, "These figures prove what we have argued all along. If you really want to soak the rich, as some of my liberal colleagues are always proposing, the best way to do it is to lower all tax rates, and make it more profitable for them to invest their money in profitable enterprises than to hide it in unproductive tax shelters."

Last week some administration officials were urging that President Reagan cite the numbers in a forthcoming speech as evidence that his tax cuts were working exactly as promised, sources said.

The only problem with these claims of victory is that the evidence proves the opposite. The tax burdens of the 62 percent of all taxpayers with incomes under $25,000 went down because their incomes went down. Their taxes naturally went down, too, but by less than their incomes.

Adjusted for changes in their share of total income, the tax burden of the under-$25,000 group went up, not down, in 1982.

In addition, the figures show conclusively that the increase in income for upper-bracket taxpayers is not the result of some burst of entrepreneurial activity or of the rich getting out of tax shelters. Instead, it probably is the result of the surge in stock prices in the latter half of 1982 and a one-time "unlocking" effect on investment assets from the cut in the maximum capital gains tax rate from 28 to 20 percent.

Total reported income went up by $75 billion from 1981 to 1982, while, as a result of the tax cuts, taxes paid were virtually unchanged.

As a result probably of both inflation and the recession, actual income fell from 1981 to 1982 for taxpayers reporting less than $25,000 in adjusted gross income, or AGI. As a share of total reported AGI, the under-$25,000 group also suffered a decline. This group included 59 million, or 62 percent, of all taxpayers. They had 42 percent of total income.

The drop in the number of taxpayers in this group is part of an ongoing trend related to rising incomes due both to inflation and an increase in real incomes. The recession and the lower rate of inflation in 1982 than in 1981 apparently slowed this movement toward higher-income categories.

At the top end of the scale, taxpayer incomes rose strongly from 1981 to 1982 almost entirely as a result of a sharp increase in reported capital gains.

A big jump in capital gains realizations can be inferred—the IRS figures include no separate data on capital gains—because of what happened to other major sources of income for the high-bracket taxpayers. The average level of interest and dividends and of business income declined for each upper-bracket income group. So did the average level of wages and salaries for those above $500,000. For other upper-bracket groups, average wages and salaries generally rose less than the rate of inflation.

With rents and royalties not significant items and partnerships undoubtedly continuing to generate tax losses as they did in 1981, the only possible reason for the increase in income shown by the upper-bracket taxpayers is an increase in capital gains realizations.

For taxpayers with AGIs above $1 million in 1981, 33.7 percent of their reported income was from capital gains. (Actual gains were much higher, because 60 percent of a gain is normally excluded from AGI.) Out of $11.1 billion in AGI reported by that group, $3.7 billion was capital gains. Another $6.5 billion came from wage and salaries, interest and dividends and business income, leaving less than $850 million from other sources.

In 1982, the AGI for the $1 million-and-up group jumped to $17.6 billion, by far the largest increase in percentage terms for any income group, and the number of returns in the group rose 55 percent. The IRS data shows that wages and salaries, interest and dividends and business income totaled $9 billion. If the remaining portion, other than capital gains, bore roughly the same relationship to the group's total AGI as it did in 1981, the other non-capital-gains income amounted to $1.3 billion.

If this conservative assumption is correct, then capital gains for this group were about $7.3 billion, or almost twice the 1981 level. The average capital gain on the returns filed by this group, according to this arithmetic, was almost $900,000, about $180,000 more than in 1981.

Because long-term capital gains, by definition, can be realized only on assets held for one year or longer, it is not very likely that any large share of the assets sold in 1982 were purchased after the tax cuts were enacted in August 1981. In other words, the lower tax rate and higher after-tax gain encouraged taxpayers to sell some assets they had held for some time and might otherwise have continued to hold.

In such cases, the tax cut left the taxpayer with a higher after-tax gain and represented a windfall relative to what most investors would have expected when they made their investments. The investments themselves were not made as a result of the tax cut.

The other really striking story in the IRS numbers is the increase—not a decrease as claimed by the supply-siders—in the tax burdens in the under-$25,000 taxpayer group.

While total AGI was rising 4.2 percent in 1982, from $1,773 billion to $1,848 billion, that for taxpayers below the $25,000 level dropped $23 billion, or 3 percent.

Meanwhile, as that group's share of total income fell, so did its share of total taxes paid—but not by as much. The group's income share went down by 3 percentage points while its share of total taxes paid fell only 2.1 percentage points.

In other words, when 1981 and 1982 tax burdens are adjusted for changes in income shares, the supply-side story is indeed turned on its head. And why not? Common sense would tell you that when tax rates are cut more for those in the top brackets, tax burdens will rise for those in lower brackets.

The supply-siders argue that by reducing tax rates the government somehow can raise national income above what it otherwise would have been by stimulating the desire to work, save and invest. That way, even though rates have been cut more at the top, after-tax incomes at the bottom could still be higher than they otherwise would have been.

So far there are precious few signs of that happening. Certainly there is nothing in the 1982 IRS figures to indicate that it has.

But on the possibility that it could happen, President Reagan and Congress cut tax rates while cutting domestic spending and rapidly increasing defense spending. The resulting huge budget deficits mean that interest payments on the national debt are rising by leaps and bounds. And that means that taxes in the future will have to be higher than they otherwise would have been just to meet those interest payments.

Assume for a moment that the tax cuts eventually do pay off as the supply-siders still claim they will, and that national income is raised by some increment. Will after-tax incomes be higher than they otherwise would have been once that bigger interest bill is taken into account? Incomes could be up, but taxes could be up still more.

Of course, whatever the level of income, the relative burden of taxes will still have been shifted toward lower-income taxpayers. That is doubly true after counting the Social Security payroll tax.

Perhaps even the supply-siders' faith is being shaken these days. Why else are they so anxious to jump to conclusions about the meaning of preliminary 1982 tax figures?

WHO PAYS THE TAXES—THE BURDEN BY INCOME LEVEL

[Dollars in thousands]

All returns	AGI 1981 (billions)	AGI 1982 (billions)	Change 1982/1981 (billions)	1982 tax as pct of total tax	1981 tax as pct of total tax	Change in tax burden 1981 to 1982
Under 5	$46.8	$44.2	−$2.6	0.25	0.20	0.05
5 under 10	131.4	126.4	−5.0	2.42	2.61	−0.19
10 under 15	175.6	176.7	1.0	5.56	5.96	−0.40
15 under 20	191.5	182.1	−9.4	7.15	7.95	−0.80
20 under 25	204.2	197.1	−7.1	8.77	9.57	−0.80
25 under 30	197.4	208.6	11.2	10.05	10.03	0.03
30 under 40	317.4	338.2	20.8	17.77	18.22	−0.45
40 under 50	185.3	207.9	22.6	12.47	12.27	0.20
50 under 75	164.3	182.1	17.8	12.89	12.78	0.10
75 under 100	55.1	59.5	4.4	5.23	5.18	0.04
100 under 200	67.7	75.6	7.9	7.82	7.57	0.24
200 under 500	33.3	40.7	7.4	5.04	4.49	0.55
500 under 1,000	9.8	14.7	4.9	2.00	1.44	0.56
1,000 or more	11.1	17.6	6.4	2.43	1.72	0.71
Total	1,772.6	1,847.8	75.2			

Source: Internal Revenue Service.●

HONORING REGINALD M. BROWNE, EAGLE SCOUT

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, as a Life Scout who aspired to be an Eagle Scout, I would like to commend my constituent, Reginald M. Browne, for his outstanding accomplishment in earning the Eagle Award, the highest award in Scouting. On April 28, 1984, his achievement will be officially honored in Philadelphia. I am proud to see a young member of my community excel to a level which merits the recognition of such a prestigious body as the Boy Scouts of America.

Since its establishment in 1910, the Boy Scouts have provided over 64 million American youth with valuable training and experience to carry them through their lives. Through its many programs, the Boy Scouts strengthens character, develops mental and physical agility, fosters leadership, and is an excellent preparation for civic responsibilities. My own Scouting experience helped lead me to pursue a public service career.

The Eagle Award is a performance-based achievement award. To earn this prestigious award, a Scout must demonstrate proficiency in the areas of leadership, service, and outdoor skills and must pass rigorous tests. The candidate must earn a required number of skill awards, which cover the outdoors, family life, and citizenship responsibilities. To qualify for Eagle Scout, the candidate must also earn merit badges which include citizenship in the community, citizenship in the Nation, citizenship in the world, communications, management, and camping. Finally, the Scout must demonstrate participation in increasingly more responsible service projects, and demonstrate leadership skills by holding one or more specific youth leadership positions in his patrol or troop.

The Eagle Award is awarded to less than 3 percent of all Boy Scouts, which means that no more than approximately 900,000 Scouts have achieved this award since 1911. For this reason, it carries a special significance, not only in Scouting, but also in higher education, business and industry, and community service. There are numerous examples of Eagle Scouts who have gone on to distinguish themselves in business and public service. Among these are Senator WILLIAM W. BRADLEY and Representative BARBER E. CONABLE, both currently serving in the 98th Congress.

For joining this distinguished company, I extened my most sincere congratulations to Reginald M. Browne.●

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, through the following statement, I am making my financial net worth as of March 31, 1984, a matter of public record. I have filed a similar statement for each of the 5 preceding years I have served in Congress.

ASSETS

Real property	Value
Single family residence at 701 Kings Court, Alexandria, Va., at assessed valuation. (Assessed at $235,000. Ratio of assessed to market value, 100 percent.) (Encumbered)	$235,000.00
Condominium at N76 W14726 North Point Drive, Village of Menomonee Falls, Waukesha County, Wis., at assessor's estimated market value. (Encumbered)	68,400.00
Undivided 2/3 ths interest in residence at N52 W32654 Maple Lane, Village of Chenequa, Waukesha County, Wis., at assessor's estimated market value. (Unencumbered)	39,600.00
Interest in land contract in two-family residence at 1601 East Lake Bluff Boulevard and 4330 North Newhall Street, Village of Shorewood, Milwaukee County, Wis., sold July 1, 1982 to Timothy Bleach	57,614.22
Total real property	400,614.22

PERSONAL PROPERTY

	Number of shares	Value
COMMON STOCKS		
First Interstate Bancorp. at $40.125	450	$18,056.25
American Telephone & Telegraph at $15.625	337.337	5,270.89
Idaho Power Co. at $33.375	131.410	4,385.81
American Information Technologies at $65.50	31.210	2,044.26
Bell Atlantic at $70.375	31.210	2,196.40
Bell South at $91.625	31.210	2,859.62
NYNEX, Inc. at $59.875	31.210	1,868.70
Pacific Telesis, Inc. at $57.375	31.210	1,790.67
Southwest Bell, Inc. at $57.25	31.210	1,786.77
US West, Inc. at $57.75	31.210	1,802.38
Tenneco Corp. at $41.125	409.215	16,828.97
Nevada Power Co. at $27	236.225	6,378.08
Anchor Hocking Corp. at $24.625	300	7,387.50
General Mills, Inc. at $46.625	360	16,785.00
Kellogg Corp. at $30.125	400	12,050.00
Dunn & Bradstreet, Inc. at $57.875	1,000	57,875.00
Halliburton Co. at $42.875	1,000	42,875.00
Kimberly-Clark Corp. at $91	1,508	137,228.00
Insilco Corp. at $16.50	424	6,996.00
Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing at $72.75	200	14,550.00
Rank Organisation, Ltd. ADR at $3.50	100	350.00
Exxon Corp. at $38.625	616	23,793.00
Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) at $55.50	480	26,640.00
Dart & Kraft, Inc. at $72.875	170	12,388.75
Eastman Kodak Co. at $63.625	480	30,540.00
General Electric Co. at $54.875	200	10,975.00
General Motors Corp. at $65	204	13,260.00
Moerck & Co. at $94.125	600	56,475.00
Warner Lambert Co. at $33.875	200	6,775.00
Carnation Corp. at $54.375	286	15,551.25
Continental Corp. at $29.875	100	2,987.50
Sears Roebuck & Co. at $33.875	200	6,775.00
Sperry Corp. at $41.375	213.003	8,813.00
Ogden Corp. at $25.625	455	11,659.38
OMI Corp. at $3	455	1,365.00
International Business Machines Co. at $114	287	32,718.00
Inland Steel Co. at $28.25	900	25,425.00
Monsanto Corp. at $89.75	168	15,078.00
Wisconsin Securities Corp. of Delaware at $200	26	5,200.00
Benton County Mining Co. at no value	333	0
Total common stocks at $		667,784.18

LIFE INSURANCE POLICIES

Company and number	Face amount	Cash surrender value
Northwestern Mutual, No. 4378000	$12,000	$9,717.49
Northwestern Mutual, No. 4574061	30,000	23,040.17
Massachusetts Mutual, No. 4116575	10,000	2,465.00
Massachusetts Mutual, No. 100,000		36,340.49
Old Line Life Insurance Co., No. 515950	25,000	13,430.00
Total life insurance policies		84,993.15

BANK AND SAVINGS AND LOAN ACCOUNTS

	Amount
Marine Bank, N.A. of Milwaukee, checking account No. 4000–9368	$74.30
Marine Bank, N.A. of Milwaukee, checking account No. 0046–2366	776.74

BANK AND SAVINGS AND LOAN ACCOUNTS—Continued

	Amount
Marine Bank, N.A. of Milwaukee, money market account No. 4011-5247	227,644.72
Marine Bank, N.A. of Milwaukee, saving account No. 418-986	300.19
Marine Bank, N.A. of Milwaukee, saving account No. 497-525	397.51
Freedom Savings & Loan of Menomonee Falls, tax escrow account No. 2-0033192	760.19
Freedom Savings & Loan of Menomonee Falls, savings account No. 2-0033206	6,489.41
Sergeant at Arms, U.S. House of Representatives, checking account No. 748	100.21
Burke & Herbert Bank of Alexandria, Va., checking account No. 601-301-5	327.35
Freedom Savings & Loan of Menomonee Falls, individual retirement account Nos. 001-6236335, 001-6238281 and 001-6900847	6,562.42
Total bank and savings and loan accounts	243,562.42

MISCELLANEOUS

	Amount
Bank of America, N.A. travelers checks	$1,200.00
1978 Ford LTD automobile (at Blue Book trade-in value)	1,725.00
Office furniture and equipment	1,000.00
Furniture, clothing and personal property (estimated)	90,000.00
Stamp collection (estimated)	16,000.00
Interest in Wisconsin retirement fund	15,572.13
Deposits in congressional retirement fund	25,769.71
Total miscellaneous	151,226.84
Total assets	1,548,180.81

LIABILITIES

	Amount
David E. Krasno and Lisa Roebuck-Krasno (amount due on land contract purchasing Menomonee Falls, Wis., condominium)	$53,613.90
Perpetual American Federal Savings of Washington, D.C. (amount due on mortgage on Alexandria, Va., residence)	137,915.20
Miscellaneous 30-day charge accounts	2,000.00
Total liabilities	193,529.10
Net worth	1,354,651.71

STATEMENT OF 1983 TAXES PAID

	Amount
Federal income tax	$44,917.00
Wisconsin income tax	15,188.00
Menomonee Falls, Wis., property tax	1,529.90
Alexandria, Va., property tax	3,102.00

I further declare that I am a direct beneficiary of one trust and a contingent beneficiary of one trust. I have no control over the assets of the trust of which I am a direct beneficiary and am a cotrustee of the other trust. Further, my wife, Cheryl Warren Sensenbrenner, and I are trustees of separate trusts established for the benefit of our minor sons, F. James Sensenbrenner III and Robert Alan Sensenbrenner.

Also, I am neither an officer nor a director of any corporation organized under the laws of the State of Wisconsin or of any other State or foreign country.●

BIRMINGHAM/JEFFERSON COUNTY ACADEMIC ALL-STARS

HON. BEN ERDREICH

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, the performance of two teams of high school students from the Birmingham and Jefferson County public school systems in the 1984 National Academic Superbowl in Jacksonville, FL, recently gives us not only good reason to be proud of them, but also, good reason to be positive about our schools' ability to prepare our young people for the challenges that will face them in the years ahead.

The quest for excellence in education, so important to our economic growth and future job opportunities, is clearly exemplified by the academic performance of these young men and women. They and their school systems are to be congratulated for their emphasis on academic excellence.

The citywide team of high school students from the Birmingham public school system, after defeating nine other school systems and winning the preliminary competition, finished a close second in the finals. This was a particularly outstanding accomplishment in light of the fact that it was only the second time students from the Birmingham school system have competed in the competition. U.S. Secretary of Education Terrel Bell and Jim Coyne, a special assistant to President Reagan, were among those in the audience in Jacksonville who watched our academic all-stars compete.

Included among the high school students from Birmingham who participated in the Academic Superbowl were David Whitfield and Robert Gregg from Huffman High School, Richard White and Richey Halphen of Ramsay Alternative High, Calvin Johnson of Phillips High, William Bryars of Ensley High, and Kevin Powe of Parker High.

A second area team, representing the Jefferson County school system, also participated in the Jacksonville competition. Although they did not reach the final round of competition, these students beat out other county high schools in order to reach the Jacksonville finals, and they deserve our commendation for their outstanding showing in this national academic competition. The students on that team, all from Gardendale High School, were Cheryl Moman, Phyllis Gamble, Rod Hardiman, Brian Anderson, Ginger Ramsey, and Tim Green.

As a recent Birmingham Post-Herald editorial saluting these young people pointed out, it is important that our schools enhance our children's ability to find solutions in an accurate and expedient manner to questions that often have no ready-made answers. We face an urgent need for new, trained minds to carry us through these rapidly changing economic times and over the competition of other scientifically and technologically advanced nations.

Our efforts today to help the youth of Alabama and the Nation become assets to our communities, States, and Nation will determine our place among world powers and our quality of life tomorrow.

I commend all of the youth in Birmingham and Jefferson County who represented the people of the Sixth District of Alabama so well at the National Academic Superbowl in Jacksonville. And we all should especially salute the parents involved, so vital to a healthy school system, and our school systems, for giving priority to academic achievement.

I would like to include the text of the Birmingham Post-Herald editorial which salutes these young people and notes the importance of achieving excellence in academic pursuits to our Nation's future:

The editorial follows:

[From the Birmingham Post-Herald, Apr. 7, 1984]

ACADEMIC STARS

A proper education does more than teach how to answer specific questions within a given amount of time. It teaches methods for discovering solutions to problems that have no clear-cut answers and even how to formulate proper questions in the first place.

But developing the ability to respond quickly to questions provides the base from which these higher goals can be reached. That is what makes events like the recent Invitational Academic Bowl in Jacksonville, Fla., so praiseworthy.

Not only do the participants learn many bits of information in preparing for the contest and practice the verbal abilities that they will need later in life, but the attention the competition receives serves as a useful counterweight to the more frequent attention paid to athletic competitions. The idea that one can earn trophies for academic achievement is an important one for young people who are not athletically inclined.

This year's Academic Bowl was the second in which high school students from the Birmingham school system competed. The all-star team did better than anybody expected, finishing a close second to the champions from Duval County, the host team.

Robert Gregg and David Whitfield, both of Huffman High; Richey Halphen and Richard White, both of Ramsay High; Calvin Johnson, Phillips High; Kevin Powe, Parker High; and William Bryars of Ensley High should be proud of their achievement. We know we share the pride of their parents and teachers in this outstanding performance.

Nor should we overlook the accomplishments of a second area team, which represented the Jefferson County school system. The team from Gardendale High School is the first from the county system to participate in the Jacksonville competition. It was eliminated in earlier competition.

But in order to make the trip, Gardendale had to win in competition with other county

high schools. Cheryl Moman, Phyllis Gamble, Rod Hardiman, Brian Anderson, Ginger Ramsey and Tim Green deserve congratulations for this performance and for paving the way for future teams from the county system.

The members of both teams represent the very best of the rising generation.●

LIFE-AND-DEATH LOTTERY IN THE NURSERY

HON. MARK D. SILJANDER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post edition of April 19, an op-ed piece by Nat Hentoff vividly portrayed how far certain Americans have strayed from the constitutional recognition of human rights. Despite the fact that this House has declared the nontreatment for purposes of killing handicapped children to be a form of child abuse, and despite the active opposition of the White House to infanticide, certain doctors believe they can ignore God, ignore the Constitution, and ignore the Hipocratic oath in their attempts to eliminate all those who do not measure up to their quality of life standards.

The last paragraph in the column offers a chilling indictment of this country's civil rights organizations and this Congress. Mr. Hentoff writes:

The Constitution does not appear to base its provisions for due process and equal protection under the law on someones "quality of life", actual or projected. . . . Yet there is not one mumbling word of protest from the civil rights or civil liberties establishment. And Where is Congress?

Mr. Speaker I urge all my colleagues to read this column and consider just how far the United States has strayed from its fundamental basis of justice and liberty for all.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 19, 1984]

LIFE-AND-DEATH LOTTERY IN THE NURSERY

(By Nat Hentoff)

The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights has fastidiously avoided involvement in any of the Baby Doe cases. And not one of those infants on death row in the neonatal intensive care units has been visited by a lawyer for the American Civil Liberties Union.

Yet, both these guardians of the Bill of Rights might consider examining a medical program in Oklahoma that has been determining which infants handicapped by spina bifida are to live and which are to die. Among the criteria used in the selection process are the economic status of the baby's family and the degree to which society, at this point in time, is willing to provide sufficient resources for whatever care the handicapped child will need in the years ahead.

A prideful account of this "early selection" program appeared in the October 1983 issue of Pediatrics (published by the American Academy of Pediatrics). The authors are some of the medical personnel directing the study, and they recommend that other pediatricians and hospitals around the country follow their prescription for deciding which infants are to be terminated because the odds are that their "quality of life," if they were to survive, would be dismal. Particularly if their parents are poor.

From 1977 to 1982, a team from the University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center and Oklahoma Children's Memorial Hospital evaluated 69 spina bifida babies. The team included physicians, nurses, physical and occupational therapists, a psychologist and a social worker. It set aside 36 infants for "early vigorous treatment." With regard to spina bifida babies, that means an operation to close the lesion in the spine so infection can be prevented. It also means, most of the time, implanting a shunt to drain excess fluid from the brain so mental retardation can be prevented.

Another group of babies, 24 at last count, was given a failing grade and marked for "supportive care" only. That means no treatment. No surgery, no shunt, no antibiotics to deal with the almost inevitable infections. And indeed, as the Oklahoma doctors say, no "active treatment" for other acute illnesses. And no sedation for the babies as they died.

One of the doctors, Richard Gross—interviewed by journalist Carlton Sherwood during a Cable News Network investigative report of this Oklahoma contribution to advanced pediatrics—said: "We . . . found that virtually all of the babies that were treated survived and virtually all of the ones who had no treatment died." A brilliant contribution to medical research.

In the Pediatrics article, Gross and the other doctors write that in making their selections among the infants, they were influenced by a "quality of life" formula developed some years ago by Dr. Anthony Shaw, director of the Department of Pediatric Surgery at the City of Hope National Medical Center in California. The way it works, if two infants have the same degree of spina bifida and otherwise virtually identical national resources, one might be pushed off the edge of the universe for no medical reasons, according to this formula.

This is Dr. Shaw's handy guide for perplexed physicians:

$QL = NE \times (HS)$.

QL is the infant's estimated quality of life. It equals his natural endowment, physical and intellectual (NE), multiplied by the amount of support he is likely to get from his home (H) and the society (S).

Dr. Shaw has provided an illustration of how this works: ". . . . A child born normally formed but [with] the misfortune of being born in an urban ghetto to an unwed teen-age drug addict" gets zero under H and another zero under S "if society turns its back on this child." Therefore, his QL, alas and alack, is also zero.

Dr. Shaw, who is chairman of the Ethics Committee of the American Pediatrical Surgical Association, has told me that he did not intend his formula to be used as a means test to decide which babies live and which die. But any way you look at it, the formula can help lead to doctors, as in Oklahoma, telling certain parents that they are not "obligated" to have their infants treated.

The parents of the babies picked for death were told of their children's medical conditions, but, according to Sherwood's interviews, were not told by the doctors about the "quality of life" formula that was part of the life-and-death arithmetic. Eight of these parents refused to be intimidated by the authoritative doctors and insisted on full-scale treatment of their babies. Six of the eight survived. How many of the untreated might have survived if they had been seen as human beings?

The Constitution does not appear to base its provisions for due process and equal protection under the law on someone's "quality of life," actual or projected. However, formulas like Shaw's are being applied this very day in hospitals around the country. Yet there is not a mumbling word of protest from the civil rights or civil liberties establishment. And where is Congress?●

THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, This month marks the 41st anniversary of the heroic uprising of the Warsaw ghetto. The story of the Warsaw ghetto represents both one of the most tragic examples of brutal inhumanity and one of the most heroic examples of resistance against overwhelming odds in the annals of human history.

The statement made in one of the underground publications several months before the struggle began was prophetic:

Warsaw ghetto lives in the shadow of constant danger. Indeed, it must live like a besieged fortress * * * The spirit of our daily actions must be that of Masada.

Their spirit was indeed like that of Masada, and we today honor their heroism and sacrifice. We must never let that memory die. As we remember the Holocaust, may their example ever remain with us.

Yisrael Gutman was one of the Polish Jews confined in the Warsaw ghetto. He took part in the courageous resistance there and has written a firsthand account of those events. His excellent book was reviewed by Arthur K. Steinberg recently for the Jerusalem Post. I commend it to my colleagues in the House.

POLAND INDICTED

(By Arthur K. Steinberg)

Yisrael Gutman's The Jews of Warsaw takes in more than its title may indicate. For it documents Polish indifference to the Jews of pre-World War II Poland, and Polish disregard for those immured in the Warsaw Ghetto.

Gutman begins his study of Polish-Jewish relations with a brief reference to the Kingdom of Mazovia and its incorporation into the Kingdom of Poland in 1527. The city of Warsaw was granted the privilege de non tolerandis judaeis, whereby Jews were not permitted to settle in the city itself, but had to restrict their residential area to the suburbs of Praga. Gutman provides information about other discriminatory practices but observes that in 1860, Jews were finally al-

lowed to live within the city proper. In fact, Polish-Jewish relations were such that approximately 60,000 Jews emigrated from Poland yearly in the period from 1921 to 1931.

When one keeps in mind the general attitude of the Poles towards Polish Jews, it's easier to understand why there was little or no Polish resistance to the establishment of the Warsaw Ghetto. The focal point for opposition to establishment of the Ghetto's boundaries was Polish opposition to the inclusion of certain residential districts in the Ghetto. Gutman provides also a map of the intended boundaries of the Ghetto at different periods.

The establishment of the Ghetto was a prime concern of the Germans. Shortly after receiving his post, Governor-General Hans Frank observed: " . . . under the just regime every man will be able to earn his living by his labours. But there is no place for agitators, profiteers, or Jewish parasitism in the area that has been placed under German Sovereignty." The comparsion of Jews to bacteria was acceptable to many Poles, especially those who observed their business competitors disappear virtually overnight. Since the Germans were pursuing a policy that no Polish organization opposed, within a short time 450,000 Jews were confined in an area the size of a small town.

Adam Czerniakov, the head of the Judenrat, was then moving Jews into the Ghetto. These unlucky individuals were eventually denied the right to take many of their personal belongings with them, and lost their businesses outside the Ghetto walls. By order of the Germans, an Aryan trustee was appointed for many of these businesses. The local Polish-Catholic population was informed that the Ghetto was necessary because Jews transmitted diseases which had to be contained. This was the principal German justification for guaranteeing the Jewish population of Warsaw.

Gutman has a detailed discussion of forced labour and of the Ghetto "shops." Following the German invasion of Russia, the Reich found it needed more manpower for its factories. The Poles were intermenschen but considered physically acceptable for work in German factories within the Reich proper. According to Gutman, there were approximately a million Poles in Germany at one period.

At the same time, the SS and the Wehrmacht had conflicting notions of how to deal with the Jews. For the SS thought the Jews should be disposed of after a short period of use; the Wehrmacht thought Jewish labour should be employed in the factories.

A large part of this excellent book describes the conflict about how the Jews were to be used in the Warsaw Ghetto, and other ghettos under German control. In fact, in the Warsaw Ghetto, many shops existed as branches of the SS and the Wehrmacht for manufacture of items needed for the war effort. Those employed in these "factories," because of their importance to the Germans, were not exposed to the Aktions, for a time anyway.

There were several thousand converts to Christianity who were classified as Jews according to Nazi racial laws. Many of them had been fully assimilated into Polish society. Yet, "as Jews," they found themselves confined to the Ghetto, and subject to German legislation and to its implementation by Poles. The Germans did not yield to constant appeals by Polish-Roman Catholic sources to release these people. These converts were the only individuals who received any degree of support from certain elements of the local Catholic hierarchy.

During the early Ghetto period, the authorities encouraged the Jews to feel that, if they adhered to German regulations, no one would be physically harmed. The Self-Help Associations were allowed to feed as many people as possible. Life continued. The majority of Jews placed their hope in the German promise of resettlement, although many Jews died of starvation and exposure to the elements. Comparatively few Jews disappeared or were hauled off the streets by the Germans. Some tried to escape and live on the Aryan side of the wall. Others were executed because, through smuggling food into the Ghetto, they violated the cordon sanitaire imposed by the Germans.

Germans were not seen performing any tasks in the Ghetto. Its policing was left to the "Blue (the Polish) Police." The miscreant Jewish police, who were identified by their cap and club, were instructed to surrender any perpetrator to the Blue Police. The Poles were then allowed to prosecute individuals for whatever crimes had been committed. Later, it would be these same Poles, with their Ukrainian, Latvian and Lithuanian allies, who would be among the first to enter the Ghetto in the round-up for the first mass deportation to Treblinka II.

A small percentage of the Jewish population in the Ghetto became increasingly aware of the impending disaster for the community of three and a half million Jews—the largest European Jewish community. The Ghetto majority, though, maintained their hope of resettlement and, later, of rescue by the Allies. This notion of approaching disaster became more and more a subject of discussion in the clandestine Ghetto press. Although the Germans did not authorize political parties, there was considerable political activity in the Ghetto. Many inhabitants showed their disapproval of the Judenrat by opting for action in word or deed. Others believed the Jews should attempt to escape. A few did make the attempt, in order to set up branches of their respective movements throughout Poland that would resist the Germans.

The various underground parties maintained as many as 47 publications representing different political persuasions. At least one publication, the Dror He-Halutz *Yediot*, issued a warning to the Ghetto population, and called for action. In June 9, 1942, it stated that the "Warsaw Ghetto lives in the shadow of constant danger. Indeed, it must live like a besieged fortress . . . The spirit of our daily actions must be that of Masada."

Other statements made shortly before the first mass deportation illustrated youth movement attitudes more than the views of the majority of the population. The youth movements felt they had to keep in training for what was inevitable, with or without the assistance of the Ghetto masses.

Despite Ghetto hopes that the German invasion of Russia would usher in better times for Jews under German control, the Germans began dispersing the Ghetto population in 1942. They chose July 22 (the ninth of Av, that is, the day of fasting when Jews remember the destruction of the First and Second Temples) to begin the initial mass deportation. Approximately 250,000 Jews were deported over a period of seven weeks.

It was with dismay that the Jews observed Germans, Poles, Lithuanians and Latvians enter the Ghetto. Rumours had been rife of deportation. There had been promises of immunity but the Germans chose to ignore them, and began to remove Jews for "resettlement." Only some of the workers needed for the German-owned "shops" were granted a temporary respite. More than half the total Ghetto population was included in the first mass deportation. In fact, the final solution envisaged for the Ghetto would have preserved only 10% of its population, who would have laboured for the state.

Gutman includes in his study an account of Janusz Korctzak, also known as Dr. Henryk Goldszmidt, who managed an orphanage in the Ghetto. The Germans, especially anxious to dispose of young children and older persons (those groups who were of no further use to the Reich as labourers), closed the orphanage, and sent off the children to Treblinka II. There were rumours that Treblinka was a death camp. Korctzak, who wanted to shield his charges, escorted them on their one-way train trip.

As news reached the Ghetto of Treblinka and the elimination of various ghettos previously established by the Germans, a core of resistance began to form. It was small and not well organized. Only when the Germans suspended the first deportation did the majority of the remaining Jews realize that their hopes of Russian parachutists, Polish military intervention, and American-British bombing, were illusory. Another deportation followed, and attitudes among the survivors rapidly changed. The Jews began to think for themselves rather than allow the Germans to think for them.

Young Jewish people established fighting units. Gutman devotes several chapters to detailed analyses of these and similar groups, and to their views. They responded to the Germans with a resolution unknown since the final Jewish resistance to the Romans.

When the Germans reentered the Ghetto in April, 1943, they were faced with a situation for which Jurgen Stoff, their commander, was ill-prepared. The elimination of the Ghetto was to have taken three days. It took many months, thanks to the young people of the various Jewish fighting units. They were pitifully small, and lacked weapons, but they gave the Germans a good account of themselves.

The Polish government in exile, which refused to provide any tangible assistance to the Jews, admitted that it was shocked at the resistance of the Ghetto fighters. Doctor Guan provides a quotation which illustrates dismay, surprise and the endemic Polish anti-Semitism: "The last time the Jews fought was 1800 years ago. Who knows whether the Jews will not emerge from the fire purified; if the wandering, parasitical, dangerous Jews will not return to being a normal people. . . ."

Although they would refer occasionally to the bravery of the Jewish fighters, the Poles still refused to provide tangible help for them. During the Aktions, the Polish leadership did not even refer to the Ghetto deportations, and to the uprising, until they were virtually concluded. The Free Polish radio station, Swit, in London, received information about the Ghetto and its situation, yet it transmitted few or no bulletins about the situation of the Jews in the Ghetto. However, the Poles did insinuate that the Jews hadn't fought at all. Rather, Russian Communists had been parachuted into the area, and/or it was the Poles themselves who had penetrated the Ghetto. They, and not the Jews, did the real fighting, and led the revolt against the Germans.

Gutman is an excellent source for anyone interested in the daily life of the inhabitants of the Warsaw Ghetto, in the uprising and in Jewish-Polish relations during this period. His bibliography lists Ghetto to press sources, Polish newspapers and books, and German sources. He combined the many facets of daily life in the Ghetto in one detailed, but highly readable study. He includes discussions of the economic calculations of the Germans in connection with the Ghetto, of Polish duplicity in allowing so many Jews to be slaughtered, and of the lack of material assistance provided by the Poles in resisting the common enemy.

This work does more than portray the life of the Jews of Warsaw prior to, and during the period of, the Warsaw Ghetto. It is an indictment of the Polish people for their behaviour towards the Jews confined to the Ghetto. The indictment is persuasion because Yisrael Gutman himself was confined to the Ghetto and took part in the uprising. He writes with first-hand knowledge.●

LAW IS AT THE BREAKING POINT IN CIA AID TO THE CONTRAS

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, recently I spoke at Harvard University, and while I was there I met Mr. David J. Scheffer of Harvard's Center for International Affairs. Since then, Mr. Scheffer has published an article in the Los Angeles Times, which documents how the United States is failing to observe the rule of law in its actions toward Nicaragua. This article was written before the CIA's involvement in the mining of the ports became public, and before our withdrawal from the jurisdiction of the World Court. Obviously, Mr. Scheffer's argument would be even more powerful now.

I wish to include a copy of the article in the RECORD. I hope my colleagues will read it carefully and, particularly, will ponder the last sentence, which reads as follows: "Perhaps this year enough members of our legislature will agree that it is in the highest national interest to observe the rule of law."

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Tuesday, Apr. 3, 1984]

LAW IS AT THE BREAKING POINT IN CIA AID TO THE CONTRAS

(By David J. Scheffer)

This week Congress continues its debate over the Reagan Administration's request to funnel $21 million via the Central Intelligence Agency to rebel forces battling Nicaragua's Sandinista government. The operation, still officially "covert," raises serious questions about the Administration's willingness to comply with U.S. and international law.

In its stated goal to protect "our strategic interests" against the spread of communism in Latin America, the Administration has so far bent at least four legal strictures to its purpose—or ignored them altogether.

First, there is the problematical CIA mandate, which was overhauled in the late 1970s in response to agency excesses. In addition to intelligence-gathering functions the CIA is empowered to conduct "special activities approved by the President" (this under Executive Order No. 12333, signed by President Reagan in 1981). These activities are to be "in support of national foreign-policy objectives abroad which are planned and executed so that the role of the U.S. government is not apparent or acknowledged publicly." But they should not be intended to "influence U.S. political processes, public opinion, policies or media."

In public references to the so-called contras' activities, Administration officials have almost exhausted their lexicon to admit the unadmittable. Reagan speaks in general terms of "supporting" the contras, describing them as democratic elements of the Nicaraguan revolution who have been shut out by the Sandinista government. Off the record, Administration officials confirm that the CIA is training and equipping the contras. Members of Congress routinely give reporters details about the size and type of the aid.

Is there any doubt that CIA support for the contras is both "apparent" and, with any reasoned interpretation of Administration admissions, "acknowledged publicly"? Isn't it clear that the effect of the CIA operations is to influence not only Managua, Havana and Moscow but also U.S. public opinion, Congress and, perhaps, the 1984 elections?

The purpose of Executive Order No. 12333 has thus been abandoned.

Second, Congress has been clear in its intent that covert assistance should not be used to overthrow the Sandinista government. Until last December, the law explicitly prohibited use of funds by the CIA or the Department of Defense for that purpose, or for "provoking a military exchange between Nicaragua and Honduras."

Last year the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence labored for months to restrict the CIA operations to interdicting the flow of arms from Nicaragua to guerrillas in El Salvador. The Administration asserted that it would not try to overthrow the Sandinista government, with which it still maintains diplomatic relations. With that understanding, Congress scrapped the legal restrictions on the purposes for which the covert aid could be used. To meet its oversight role, Congress then imposed a limit—$24 million—on 1984 expenditures for "military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua."

Congress was misled; at a minimum it should restore explicit prohibitions on use of aid to overthrow the Nicaraguan government.

The contras' recent attacks on major oil and industrial facilities and their mining of Nicaraguan ports arouses deep suspicions about the actual use of CIA assistance. On Monday an anonymous "well-placed U.S. official" was quoted in this newspaper as predicting that an entire Nicaraguan army unit—3,000 men—would soon join the contra forces. To employ a favorite Reagan buzzword, how does the United States "verify" what the contras are doing? Are they using CIA training and supplies—and risking their lives—exclusively to stop the arms flow to El Salvador, rather than to further their expressed objective of toppling the Sandinista government?

Perhaps it doesn't matter. Regardless of the contras' true intentions and performance, Washington can continue to insist that whatever they do they are thwarting Nicaragua's ability to aid the Salvadoran insurgents.

Even if that somehow could be proved, U.S. participation in Nicaragua's guerrilla war and the U.S.-Honduran army maneuvers have undoubtedly heightened the possibility of a military exchange between Nicaragua and Honduras, where the anti-Sandinista rebels find sanctuary (and, presumably, their CIA advisers).

Third, the 1794 Neutrality Act makes it a criminal offense to furnish money or prepare for a military enterprise against a country at peace with the United States. Last November a federal district judge in San Francisco found enough merit in a lawsuit alleging violation of the Neutrality Act to order the attorney general to conduct a preliminary investigation into U.S. support for the anti-Sandinista rebels. The Justice Department has not commenced that investigation because the judge's ruling is still on appeal.

Finally, CIA support for the contras challenges international law. The charters of the United Nations and the Organization of American States, the Rio Treaty and various U.N. resolutions and declarations make a strong case for prohibiting U.S. military support to guerrilla groups seeking to overthrow the legitimate recognized government of a sovereign state.

Of course, Nicaragua also violates international law when it lends military assistance to guerrillas in El Salvador. But the CIA's "covert" operations are doubly unjustifiable, both in terms of international law and in the spirit of executive and legislative oversight of covert activities.

On both sides of the debate over aid to the contras, senators and members of the House typically argue whether such aid is in the national interest of the United States. They either ignore the legalities or attach them as addenda to their main arguments. Perhaps this year enough members of our legislature will agree that it is in the highest national interest to observe the rule of law.●

ARMENIAN MARTYR'S DAY

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in remembrance of the horrible genocide perpetrated on the Armenian population of Turkey in the years 1915–20. The horror of the crime cannot be erased from the minds of the one-half million Americans of Armenian descent, some of whom remain to tell of eyewitness accounts of the absolute brutality and inhumanity inflicted in that first terrible genocide of this century. And it must not be forgotten by all people who attest to a moral dignity in mankind.

As a cosponsor of House Resolution 171 which will affirm recognition by the Congress of the facts of the genocide, I remind my colleagues that just as we cannot ever forget Hitler's attempt to annihilate the Jewish race

during World War II, or the horrors perpetrated on untold millions in the Soviet Gulag, we also cannot deny history and ignore the Armenian genocide of 1915. Some totalitarian governments attempt to rewrite history. But America is the world's leading democracy and defender of freedom from tyranny. How can it be that our State Department would try to intervene in House Joint Resolution 247, which would set aside a day of commemoration for victims of the genocide, as Representative COELHO relates to us, for fear of mucking up relations with Turkey. If we are to maintain a moral backbone in our affairs with other nations then we cannot afford to deny a fact of history for the sake of expediency.

Furthermore, the idea that a remembrance of this sort could inflame terrorists to further acts of violence is absurd. Nobody can be mistaken as to the revulsion and condemnation felt by the United States for all acts of terrorism. The Congress must condemn terrorism wherever and whenever we see it. However, lest anyone argue the fact of the massacre of 1.5 million men, women, and children during the Armenian genocide, I request that they read up on the subject in the book, "Ambassador Henry Morgenthau's Story," written by Ambassador Morgenthau, who served in Turkey during that period. I commend this book to my colleagues attention, and urge them to stand by the facts of history and affirm that our foreign affairs must be carried out with an acceptance of the truth of past events.●

CREATION-EVOLUTION AND THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, not too long ago, on March 5, 1984, as a matter of fact, the President of the National Academy of Sciences, Mr. Frank Press, sent out a letter to all Members of Congress enclosing a booklet entitled "Science and Creationism: A View from the National Academy of Sciences." Although this booklet was neither prepared nor mailed at Government expense, it is nonetheless worthy of comment, especially since more than 40,000 copies were sent to school district superintendents, science department heads and other educators around the country.

The gist of the booklet is that the study of evolution has a place in the science classrooms of America but not the biblical theory of creation. While I can understand members of the scientific community believing in evolution, although I do not share their belief, it puzzles and concerns me that a quasi-official organization as prestigious as the National Academy of Sciences should go one step further and attempt to dismiss the theory of creation altogether. Not only is there scientific evidence to support the theory of creation but there is no scientific "proof" of the theory of evolution. Moreover, education is of little value unless students have some idea of the purposes to which it is to be put, and those purposes cannot be divorced from our system of values which, in turn, are derived from the Judeo-Christian principles set forth in the Bible. And where does the Bible start; with the story of creation of course.

There is something else that troubles me, and should trouble other Members, about all this; a sense of deja vu if you will. It is almost as if those promoting the theory of evolution are admitting that they are afraid, as advocates of creationism once were, of letting their theory be examined on its merits and judged accordingly. If it is so appropriate, then surely they should have enough confidence in teachers and students alike to recognize that fact. But if it is not, then all the more reason for teachers and students to be able to examine competing theories and other explanations for the same phenomenon. After all, what is education if it is not the search for truth and how can the cause of education be advanced if its would-be proponents try and take it out of the larger context into which it fits.

Mr. Speaker, so that Members can refresh their memories as to the contents of Mr. Press's letter and reflect on its implications, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter and my response to it be inserted in the RECORD at this time.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES,
Washington, DC, March 5, 1984.

Hon. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. DANNEMEYER: The high level of Congressional interest in science education, along with the ongoing public debate concerning introduction of biblical creationism into science classrooms, has prompted me to send you a copy of "Science and Creationism—A View from the National Academy of Sciences." Contents of the booklet concern the question of whether science, creationism, or both should be taught in the science classroom. This booklet is directed toward educators, parents and others concerned with science education at the secondary level. It offers a special perspective on the issue, which we hope you in the Congress will find useful as the debate continues.

The purpose of this publication is not to attack creationism, as a belief but, rather, to present information in support of science and to make the distinction between creationism and the scientific study of evolution. To teach these as equally sound and valid alternative scientific theories is both misleading and inaccurate. At a time when science is important to the strength of the nation, ignorance and misunderstanding of science and its methodology undermine our ability to achieve greatness.

More than 40,000 copies of this booklet, prepared with private funds, are being mailed to school district superintendents and secondary school science department heads, as well as to organizations such as the National Science Teachers Association and members of the U.S. Congress. Additional copies are available from the National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20418.

Yours sincerely,

FRANK PRESS, *President.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 30, 1984.

Mr. FRANK PRESS,
President, National Academy of Sciences,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESS: Thank you for your letter of March 5, 1984, and the booklet "Science and Creationism", published by the National Academy Press, Washington, D.C., 1984

As a proponent of the theory of creation, which I believe to be a fact, it is comforting to know that persons who share your conviction have gone to the expense of preparing a color product to support the theory of evolution. Our side must be doing something right! What is a little puzzling is that you do not stop at supporting evolution. You also oppose teaching the theory of creation in the public schools as an element of science teaching. Stated another way, you are advocating that courses in science in public schools refer only to the theory of evolution as to the source of all life and matter. Your stated justification for this point is that:

1. The tenets of "creation science" are not supported by scientific evidence;

2. Creationism has no place in a science curriculum at any level;

3. Its proposed teaching would be impossible in any constructive sense for well-informed and conscientious science teachers;

4. Its teaching would be contrary to the nation's need for a scientifically literate citizenry and for a large, well-informed pool of scientific and technical personnel.

A brief rebuttal to your position would include:

1. Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. Why should something in part based on faith be declined a hearing just because you claim it may not be scientifically proved? Can you scientifically prove the "theory of evolution"?

2. A mere conclusion—the issue in dispute;

3. You underestimate the intellectual capacity of teachers—particularly science teachers;

4. You underestimate the intellectual capacity of students—particularly science students.

Let me explain briefly why I believe that science classes in public schools should teach both the theory of creation and evolution.

Education has two equally important goals. The education of competence and conscience.

Every civilization from the beginning of time has been rooted on a moral or ethical base of some sort. The philosophical underpinning of Western Civilization is the Judeo-Christian ethic. The source of this ethic is the Bible. The book of Genesis ac-

counts for the creation of the world and of man. The concept of God and his relation to man, the relation between parent and children, marital fidelity, respect for human life, protection of private property, and personal integrity stem from this source.

For a science teacher in a public school to ignore the philosophical underpinning of Western Civilization on the origin of man is like trying to explain sex between humans without marriage. Marriage is certainly not a condition precedent to sex between humans but it happens to be God's plan for family creation and perpetuation of the human race. Can you imagine a world in which children are raised without the love and discipline of parents? It is just as realistic to expect man to comprehend God's creation without God as the author as it is to expect children to become well-rounded citizens without parents. Science can theorize on the concept of evolution but can never begin to deal with the mystery of life without at least considering the possibility that an omniscient being is behind it all. To deny this insight is an unfortunate development which at this time produces the conflict which causes your publication to be printed.

Secular humanism and Judeo-Christian beliefs are in direct conflict in our culture. The vast majority of Americans believe in a Supreme Being and incidentally produce the tax revenues which pays your salary as head of the National Academy of Sciences. A basic part of secular humanism is that there is no God and that evolution is the theory of how the universe and man came into being. When you advocate, in your capacity as "designated advisor to the Federal Government in matters of science", that only the theory of evolution is to be taught in science classes in our public schools, you are pursuing a course, perhaps unwittingly, which advances a philosophy, secular humanism, which is at variance with the whole basis of Western Civilization.

It is my sincere hope that Federal Judge Overton's view of the unconstitutionality of an Arkansas state law requiring equal treatment for the two theories in the scientific classrooms of the public schools of that state will be reversed by the U.S. Supreme Court. Additionally, it is my hope that the distinguished scholars who serve on your academy will come to realize that there can be no effective education of the conscience of the students of America without at least considering the possibility in science classes that God created the world and man in his own image.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER,
Member of Congress.●

SOCIAL PRESSURE ON BAHA'I COMMUNITY

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the following short story, "The Day Light Came to Our House," appears in the latest edition of Liberty, a magazine sponsored by the International Religious Liberty Association.

The story indicates the intense pressure that is placed on the Baha'i community inside Iran today. The ever-present threat of death is well known, following the murder in the last 2 years of 160 innocent followers of the Baha'i faith. Lesser known is the ostracism that faces Baha'is. Families are not allowed to worship with their children or teach other Baha'i children the tenets of their religion. They are treated as "unclean," as less than human.

The short story is a true account of the "conversion" of a Baha'i widow following her husband's murder, so that her children would be accepted by the community and their friends. I recommend it to Members' attention, especially in light of the hearings being held soon on Iranian religious discrimination in the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations.

THE DAY LIGHT CAME TO OUR HOUSE

(By Bahereh—translated by Bizhan Torabi)

The change came suddenly: My father's corpse, black with stab wounds and floating in its stench of decomposition, was taken away early in the morning and buried without our being told. The corpse had been lying there for what had seemed to us an eternity. It had been refused burial. "This is an unclean corpse," the bearded man from the Komiteh explained to my mother, who had sought a burial license. "If we bury him in the soil of the True Faith we shall provoke the anger of Allah."

My father had been "punished," the bearded man explained, for his refusal to abandon his "filthy beliefs." The man used other Arabic-sounding words which I did not understand. He made it clear that my father's corpse could not be incinerated either as this would cause "fumes over the land of Allah."

My father had been cut down by young men playing their part in spreading the true faith. They stabbed my father 53 times, one stab for each of his years. They delivered the mutilated body to our house, followed by a veritable procession of chanting men and women. I saw them through the upper-floor window. They exchanged a few words with my mother, who had to bring the corpse in with the help of Riaz, my eldest brother, who was in tears. The young men then crossed our garden into the street. They were carried on eager shoulders. Men and women tried to kiss their hands, to get blessed. These were the hands that had meted out the justice of Allah.

Mother ordered me, Riaz, and our two younger brothers, both kids really, not to cry. We were not allowed into Father's room either. When Mother caught Riaz sneaking into the ill-smelling room she rebuked him severely. She tried to fight the stench by pouring rose water on the corpse. But this didn't help much. She stayed awake most of the night, reading the green-covered book from the mantelpiece in our sitting room. We were not allowed to leave the house. Riaz was no longer asked to go on shopping errands, as he had always done during school holidays. "They would sell nothing to us," Mother told us. Not even bread. And a telephone call soon told us that we would have our electricity, water, and phone cut off in three days. Mother talked to the caller, who introduced himself as someone from the Committee to Combat Evil and Promote Good. She listened, her face pale, without uttering a word. Before putting the receiver down she had said only, "But the children."

From the upper-floor window I could see and hear people in the narrow street in front of our house. There were girls from our school. But they avoided looking in my direction as soon as they noticed me. Even Sahba, my best friend, looked away when I called her. I just wanted to tell her that Mother had forbidden us to leave the house. I heard people say that our house would be burned down in three days and that all of us would be "chopped into pieces." Neighbors came to look at our house as if it were a great curiosity. Among them I recognized many of my father's patients. Agha Hassan came, who had always said my father had given him "a second life" by ridding him of an "incurable disease." I heard him tell the crowd that our house should be razed so that a mosque could be built in its place.

And then everything changed. It was the third day. My mother had answered the door. We could see her outside talking quietly to a bearded man. She came inside for a moment while the bearded man waited. We saw her return with the green-covered book in her hand. She put it on the ground, struck a match, and set it on fire. The book burned quickly. The bearded man grinned. A crowd had gathered. A man wearing a turban shouted, "Allah is the greatest." Then he gave my mother a book with a black leather cover. The crowd shouted, "Allah is the greatest." Quickly, our house filled with activity. Bearded men delivered food. There were even flowers and candies. Neighborhood women embraced my mother and talked to her. They helped clean the house. Children came also, at first timidly. Agha Hassan brought melons and black grapes. Sahba brought her stamp collection and the book in which she kept dried butterflies. I had always loved to go through them, but now this gave me no pleasure. I felt I had been taken away from Sahba, to a distant star and forever.

My mother served tea to the women who visited us. We all listened to the man in the turban who told us stories and chanted beautiful songs in Arabic. Before leaving he caressed my hair, saying, "You are quite a lady, my child. You must wear the chador." He also talked to Riaz, telling him to "become a volunteer in the service of Allah." We had visitors until late at night. Sahba was one of the last to leave, almost dragged away by her mother. "I missed you," she told me before leaving. "I am glad you have become like us."

Late into the night I could hear my mother sobbing quietly downstairs.●

INTRODUCTION OF CLEAN WATER ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. GUY V. MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that is intended to once again affirm our commitment to reinstate and reinforce the biological integrity of our Nation's waters.

Although much work has been accomplished under the Clean Water Act, what remains to be done is of

vital importance. This bill will direct our efforts toward some of those important goals.

It provides for research designed to continue investigating the harmful effects upon people's health by various water pollutants.

It places particular emphasis upon research aimed at eliminating contaminants from valuable sport and commercial aquatic species. Studies will focus on how best to reduce and remove bioaccumulation from these species in order to insure safe consumption and protect human health.

Additional funds may soon be allocated into the Clean Water Act's 208 program, yet the number of 208 programs that are currently being implemented is far from adequate. The 208 plan is a sound concept which should be vigorously pursued. This legislation will reaffirm congressional intent to ensure that the goals of the 208 program are achieved.

Section 208 was designed to provide for comprehensive areawide waste treatment management plans which would consider many variables that otherwise might go unaddressed. More than $200 million have been spent on compiling the data necessary to understand the complex nature of these geographic areas, and to develop a workable methodology that would achieve our goals. This bill would provide the States with a 2-year time limit within which they would come into compliance with section 208. After that time-period, the EPA would be prohibited from issuing any treatment works grants unless an approved 208 plan is in effect for the area and is being fully implemented.

Sections 303 and 305 of the Clean Water Act are designed to assure that this Nation will continue to move forward in its pursuit of biologically healthy and sound waters. Section 305(b) requires an inventory of existing water quality for each State which is used to develop a plan of action to carry out the act's goals. The plan, which is good for 2 years is produced under section 303(e).

It is imperative that these tools be fully utilized by the various States. This bill would require that a project requesting funds under the act must first be included into an approved and fully implemented 303(e) plan, which itself reflects and is in compliance with that State's section 305(b)

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the difficulty both the EPA and the various States have been experiencing while attempting to keep up with the ever increasing number of water discharge permits. While we must do all that is possible to help alleviate this condition, we cannot afford to allow the gains made thus far to become reversed.

This bill would provide that relief by extending the current 5-year discharge permits to 10 years. It will however, provide protection to our waterways by requiring a midpoint review of both the thermal and the physical discharge components of the permit.

For those waters that are not achieving applicable water quality standards, the bill would require reductions in the level of pollutants being discharged. Additionally, in areas where the waters are not meeting thermal standards, dischargers would be required to reduce their thermal contribution.

Too often the language of the act is less clear than Congress had intended, leaving the interpretation to the discretion of the EPA. The legislation which I introduce today provides clarifying language for a number of terms within the act which have been subject to varying definitions. The term "leachate collection system" has been added to the definition of point source discharge. The terms "balanced indigenous population", "balanced indigenous community", and "balanced population" have been added.

These terms will not affect any existing permit, nor any permit applied for prior to January 1, 1984. For those applications, the current regulatory difinitions will prevail.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in cosponsoring this important legislation that will allow us to move closer toward fulfilling our goal of a biologically viable aquatic environment.●

MEDICAL DEVICE LEGISLATION

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to clarify and reaffirm the statutory authority of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to investigate certain procedures of companies manufacturing medical devices governed by the medical device amendments to the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. The bill would enhance FDA's authority to require companies to make available to the agency records of their procedures for handling product complaints, analysis of device failures, and the return of devices.

It is important that the Congress enact this legislation, despite the fact that FDA has broad existing authority to regulate in this field, including procedures for handling product complaints. This bill is necessary for two reasons. First, it will clarify the law in view of a Federal district court decision holding that FDA could not compel a company to disclose such procedures in the absence of specific authorizing regulations. Matter of Medtronic, Inc., 500 F. Supp 536 (1980). Second, it will send a clear message to the agency that Congress intends that complaint file procedure regulations be promulgated.

Under existing regulations, FDA requires manufacturers to make available to the agency the content of complaint files. But it does not require that information regarding procedures for handling complaints, analysis of product failures, and returned products be made available to the agency. Thus, a serious potential gap exists that in certain circumstances could thwart FDA's ability to determine whether a particular device is hazardous to the public.

The problem is that while FDA can examine complaint files, it has no way of assessing the quality of the information in those files if the company decides to be uncooperative with the investigation. Information in the files may be unreliable or misleading, yet FDA has no way of making such a determination. The current situation is analogous to attempting to assess the validity of a study without knowing anything about its methodology.

The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Energy and Commerce Committee conducted a hearing on March 13, 1984, into the reasons why a seriously defective pacemaker lead, which carries electrical impulses from the pacemaker into the heart, was marketed for a substantial period of time. Medtronic, Inc., the manufacturer of the lead, persisted in maintaining until recently that there were no serious problems with the lead.

It was only widespread press attention and the prospect of an upcoming hearing before the subcommittee that prompted Medtronic to acknowledge the problems with the lead. Significantly, the company's complaint files were haphazardly maintained and did not reflect numerous complaints that were, in fact, made to the company. Moreover, the company defined product failures in such a way that the actual failure rate was substantially understated.

In this more recent case the company did not attempt to block totally FDA's access to complaint file protocol; although it had in the earlier litigation. Nevertheless, the problems with the files clearly demonstrated the potential difficulties that could be created for FDA in attempting to assess whether a medical device posed a threat to the public health. The legislation that I have introduced, by clarifying and reaffirming FDA's authority in this area, will resolve this problem and can help prevent any needless tragedy.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, 1984, I was absent from the floor of the House of Representatives because I had been in the 23d Congressional District of Pennsylvania attending a Small Business Conference in State College. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following fashion:

Rollcall No. 91: S. 373: Arctic Research/Critical Materials Policy, the House passed the measure to provide comprehensive national policy dealing with national needs and objectives in the Arctic, "Yea".●

MAJ. GEN. JOHN J. KOEHLER, JR.

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, few men have impressed me more during my 3 years in Congress than Maj. Gen. John J. Koehler, Jr., who is about to retire as commander of the U.S. Army's Test and Evaluation Command. General Koehler has served this country in the best possible spirit and I would like to call your attention to the numerous contributions he has made during his long and productive career.

Of course, you had a chance to see many of those contributions for yourself when you accompanied me to the Aberdeen Proving Grounds in 1981. You told me then how impressed you were both with General Koehler's management of the base and with his explanation of APG's role in maintaining a strong national defense.

APG, where the Army tests all of its major weapons systems, had benefited tremendously from General Koehler's able leadership. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the base is located in Harford County in my district, and General Koehler and I developed a close personal relationship while working together to improve conditions at the base. That was one of General Koehler's top priorities, and he did an excellent job.

Working closely with General Koehler, I was able to convince Congress to appropriate more than $50 million to begin construction of new barracks and family housing at the base. These projects will mean greatly improved living conditions for 4,000 enlisted personnel and 1,000 officers and their families. Even more importantly, they will improve morale at APG by providing the almost 12,000 men and women there with the assurance that the base has a secure and stable future for generations to come. General Koehler can retire with the assurance that these projects are well underway.

General Koehler's other goal was to strengthen ties between APG and the community outside the base. Here again, he was tremendously successful. In fact, the Hartford County Chamber of Commerce now sponsors an annual celebration called Military Appreciation Week to pay tribute to the huge economic benefits of APG's presence in Hartford County.

Of course, as commander of Tecom, General Koehler was responsible not only for APG but for four other major Army installations as well. All in all, General Koehler oversaw an organization that manages and controls more than 6 million acres of real estate and associated air space. He was also responsible for an annual operating budget exceeding $750 million.

When I first arrived in Washington, I was already familiar with General Koehler's reputation as an innovative thinker and an able leader. He was an active commander who inspired respect and pride in the men and women at APG and he was also a very personable man with an excellent sense of humor and an ability to make visitors to the base feel instantly at ease.

General Koehler joined the army in 1944. After 27 months as an enlisted man, he entered the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and was commissioned a lieutenant of field artillery on graduating in 1950.

His decorations include the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal with "V" device and first oak cluster, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Joint Service Commendation Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, and the Purple Heart.

In November 1979, he became Tecom's eighth commander and his tenure was the longest in the command's 22-year history. Off the base, General Koehler has given more than 100 speeches across the country on topics ranging from the Soviet threat to the importance of patriotism and I am sure that his speaking abilities will serve him well in the future.

His diplomatic skills have impressed both American and foreign visitors to the base, including visitors from the People's Republic of China, the United Kingdom, Japan, Turkey, Egypt, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, South Korea, India, Austria, and other countries.

General Koehler has also been an important contributor to the peacemaking process. In 1969 and 1970, he served with the office of the Assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for Strategic Arms Negotiations and participated as an adviser to the U.S. SALT delegation at Helsinki and Vienna.

Mr. Speaker, Gen. John Koehler will be greatly missed by the thousands of men and women at APG who have benefited so much from his able leadership. I know I speak for everyone who is acquainted with General Koehler when I wish him all the best in his retirement.●

BEYOND THE NUCLEAR FREEZE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report for Wednesday, April 25, 1983, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BEYOND THE NUCLEAR FREEZE

One of the more curious events of this political year is the rancorous debate on arms control between Walter Mondale and Gary Hart, the two frontrunners for the Democratic presidential nomination. The controversy is odd because both these men are strong proponents of arms control and have the public record to prove it. In a way, it is unfortunate that the campaign's demands have made fidelity to the nuclear freeze the litmus test of commitment to arms control for many people. This development could make it much harder for the President, whoever he may be, to get arms control moving again in 1985.

The nuclear freeze movement has made an admirable contribution to the cause of arms control. Without pressure from the movement, it is unlikely that the Reagan Administration would have moved as far as it has toward a realistic negotiating position. Even more important, the movement has played a pivotal role in mobilizing public opinion to insist that our leaders attach the highest priority to arms control and the prevention of nuclear war.

At the same time, it is important that we not view the nuclear freeze as an end in itself. The freeze would do nothing to reduce the danger of war posed by the thousands of nuclear weapons already in the superpowers' arsenals. Nor would it permit prudent modernization of nuclear forces that could help create a more stable and solid strategic relationship. Despite the freeze's seeming simplicity, negotiating it could be a very prolonged process. Moreover, given the likely post-election makeup of the Senate it is doubtful that an arms control treaty based on the freeze alone could muster the two-thirds majority needed for ratification. This raises the frightening prospect that yet another arms control agreement might not pass the acid test of political acceptability in the United States.

For all these reasons, we must leave aside the sterile debate about loyalty to the nuclear freeze. Instead, we must lay out a step-by-step approach to strategic arms control that the President, whether Republican or Democrat, might implement immediately following Inauguration.

First, the incoming administration might propose a pause in the testing and deployment of new multi-warhead ICBMs. If these missiles cannot survive attack, they are the

most destabilizing and dangerous of all nuclear weapon systems. If agreed to by the Soviets, such a pause would halt testing of our MX and the Soviets' SS-X-24. This would address weapon systems not yet deployed.

We should then proposes to Moscow a compromise approach to strategic arms reductions to address asymmetrics in deployed weapon systems. It is in our interest to accept the Soviets' proposals for cuts in the combined total of missiles and bombers and for more restrictive limits on cruise missile programs, but only if such proposals result in a substantial cutback in nuclear warheads on both sides. The compromise might be the subject of an interim agreement similar in form to the Vladivostok Accord of 1974, with the details of a treaty to be thrashed out in subsequent talks. As an element of an interim understanding, we could propose a permanent ban on testing and deployment of multi-warhead ICBMs. If accepted by Moscow, a temporary halt could evolve into a full-fledged freeze on testing and deployment of the most destabilizing and dangerous weapon systems.

To maintain the strategic Triad, the incoming administration should accelerate development of a small, single-warhead missile, as recommended by the Scowcroft Commission. We would accept the Soviets' development of their new, single-warhead missile, the SS-X-25. Because such missiles may be based in ways that allow them to survive attack, they would preserve an effective retaliatory capability on each side, but at the same time would minimize the incentive to make a first strike. We should also modernize our conventional forces in order to raise the nuclear threshold in Europe. To date, we have not stressed nearly enough the strategic implications of conventional strength.

In view of its own designs and the announced intention of some of the presidential candidates to cancel the MX, Moscow may, at least initially, resist a pause followed by a permanent ban on testing and deployment of multi-warhead ICBMs. Therefore, it must be made clear at the outset of negotiations that, with or without MX, we will do whatever is necessary to maintain deterrence and preserve strategic stability. One way to increase the chances of Soviet acceptance of our proposals is for us to begin active exploration of highly stable alternatives to the MX, which we might adopt should we find ourselves face to face with Soviet intransigence. These might include a greater role for the Stealth-technology bomber and the development of a smaller, quieter, ballistic-missile submarine.

The incoming administration should complement its strategic arms initiatives with effective efforts to move forward in other areas of arms control. For example, it should seek Senate ratification of the 1974 Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the 1976 Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty. These treaties, which we observe but have not ratified, contain provisions for an exchange of geological data necessary for verifying compliance. Therefore, ratification could facilitate verification and create an environment conducive to negotiation of further limits on nuclear testing.

Some of the Presidential contenders have called the nuclear freeze an integral element of arms control. This is proper given the positive role that it might play in limiting certain highly destabilizing technologies. But the freeze must fit within a broader approach to the basic goal we seek: maintaining deterrence in a progressively less threatening strategic environment. The candidates for the Presidency have an obligation to put the freeze in perspective, so that November's winner can restart the arms control process with greater confidence of success.●

WILLIAM L. DEVRIES: DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SMALL BUSINESS PERSON OF THE YEAR

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor an outstanding citizen, civic leader, and businessperson in the District of Columbia, William L. Devries. Mr. Devries, president of Honor Guard Security Services, Inc., has been named Small Business Person of the Year for the District of Columbia by the U.S. Small Business Administration district office.

Mr. Devries was selected for the annual award on the basis of his success in building and expanding several small businesses in the Metropolitan Washington area and his contribution to improving life in the District. Mr. Devries' business interests include, in addition to Honor Guard Security Services, Career Consultants, Ability Search, and Career Temporaries.

Career Consultants operates two companies in the personnel and security fields. Ability Search and Career Temporaries are technical and professional recruitment firms which match temporaries and executives with firms in need of their services for the short and long term. Ability Search maintains offices in Washington, New York, and Los Angeles. The company is a recognized innovator in the field of executive search.

Honor Guard Security Services began as a one-man operation and today has grown to employ over 800. The company's expansion has had a very positive effect on the private sector job market in the District of Columbia. Honor Guard is a private police company which emphasizes government work. The company not only operates in the District of Columbia but also in 11 States and Puerto Rico. Annual sales exceed $6 million.

The U.S. economy was built on the efforts of small business people like William Devries. His efforts offer an example to us all on the continued vitality of this sector of the American economy. Entrepreneurship lives in the District of Columbia and helps to continue the upward swing of the American economy.

However, Mr. Devries' tireless efforts to improve the District of Columbia's economic climate do not stop there. He is a citizen in the fullest sense of the word. In 1983 Mr. Devries spearheaded a nationally recognized drive to "Give an Officer a Life Jacket," a fundraising campaign which provided $630,000 for the purchase of 3,700 bulletproof vests for Metropolitan Washington Police officers. In endorsing Mr. Devries' nomination, District of Columbia Police Chief Maurice Turner wrote:

> It is always wonderful to see a small business person take valuable time away from running his business to spend that time helping our community * * * there are a lot of police officers out there who are grateful to Mr. Devries for spearheading the MPDC Vest Fund Drive.

Clearly, Mr. Devries embodies the type of citizen with a public consciousness. His selflessness should be an example for all Americans. Too often, business persons' efforts center on self-interest without much thought for community development. Mr. Devries contradicts this view and makes the residents of the District of Columbia proud to call him their Small Business Person of the Year.●

NATIONAL NURSES' RECOGNITION DAY

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today it gives me great pleasure to introduce a House joint resolution to honor our Nation's professional nurses.

There are 1.7 million registered nurses in the United States, nearly 1.3 million of them are actively employed in the profession. They work in hospitals, nursing homes, home health agencies, schools, industry, clinics—in fact, wherever health care is delivered. They are the largest group of health care providers in America.

Nurses make a significant contribution to the health and well-being of the citizens of this country. These dedicated and compassionate professionals seldom receive the credit they deserve.

Nurses are a key factor in the quality of our health care system. They provide immediate, life-saving intervention in a crisis. They are support staff which facilitate continuity of care. They serve as patient advocates.

Their sevices touch the lives of all of us and our families. Therefore, it is appropriate that we recognize the important contribution of nurses by designating May 6 as "National Nurses' Recognition Day."●

BILL TO PROTECT AIR TRAVELERS INTRODUCED

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to continue protections for air travelers afforded by current rules relating to such matters as bumping, smoking, discrimination against the handicapped, and baggage practices. Without this legislation, these important protections would lapse with the sunsetting of the Civil Aeronautics Board at the end of 1984. I do not believe Congress ever meant for this to happen, and I am confident there is a consensus supporting the continuation of these protections for consumers.

My bill provides that after January 1, 1985, the specified rules would be enforced by the Federal Trade Commission. The rules in question are for the protection of consumers and rest in large part on this authority of the CAB over unfair and deceptive practices. This statutory authority of the CAB was modeled on the language of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Therefore, it is particularly appropriate that with the sunset of the CAB, responsibility for the rules adopted under this authority and for other related rules should be transferred to the FTC.

It is my understanding that the transfer of responsibility for most of these rules to the FTC is supported by both the FTC and the Department of Transportation, to which other former CAB responsibilities will be transferred.

I would like to say a special word about the importance of the bill's transfer to the FTC of responsibility for certain Federal regulations that protect handicapped travelers against discrimination by the airlines. Currently, Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) regulations require all airlines to provide adequate service to meet the needs of our country's 22 million handicapped individuals. National surveys indicate that 60 percent of all people in the United States take at least one trip of 100 miles or more each year. For the 1 out of 10 Americans who is handicapped, however, the percentage is much smaller. It is essential, therefore, that we not cut back requirements which are intended to increase travel opportunities for the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, the consensus supporting the continuation of these important rules reflects a significant lesson which we have learned during the last decade. From nearly all points on the political spectrum there is recognition that the public must continue to have protections that deal with externalities and market failures—the economist's terms for those goods that are not adequately produced by the automatic operation of the unregulated market.

In fact, the ultimate purpose of both economic deregulation and the continuation of such rules as those protecting the public from unfair bumping and the adverse effects of smoking should be the same—the advancement of the welfare of consumers. After a period of years in which the interests of consumers have been under almost constant attack, I am hopeful that the consensus supporting these rules is a sign of a brighter future for the consumers of America.

My bill provides that after responsibility for the specified rules is transferred to the FTC, there would be a 1 year period of evaluation during which the rules would not be changed. After that, the FTC could amend them following procedures under the Administrative Procedures Act.

Finally, I would like to say a word about the question some have raised of whether the consumer protection rules should be transferred to the Department of Transportation instead of the Federal Trade Commission. I believe that in supporting transfer to the FTC, the Department correctly perceives the desirability of consolidating consumer protection in the agency that has this responsibility across the board for other industries. It is the FTC that has the mandate and the experience in consumer matters. Moreover, as an independent agency like the CAB, it is in a better position to maintain the stability from one administration to the next that would be desirable for both the industry and air travelers.●

ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, reports of growing, State-sponsored anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union raise new fears about the worsening plight of Soviet Jewry. There now appears to be in effect a near-total prohibition on the teaching of the Hebrew language, Jewish religious instruction, and the celebration of Jewish holidays in the Soviet Union. In the view of some observers, the Soviet authorities have embarked upon a campaign of cultural genocide with the aim of eliminating any vestige of Jewish culture within the borders of the Soviet Union.

Coinciding with the increase in official harassment of Soviet Jews has been a precipitous decline in Jewish emigration. In 1983 only about 1,300 Jews were allowed to leave the Soviet Union, and only 3,000 the year before. By comparison, in 1979 approximately 51,000 Soviet Jews were permitted to emigrate.

The Union of Councils for Soviet Jewry, sponsor of the Congressional Call to Conscience Vigil, and the Student Coalition for Soviet Jewry are among the U.S. groups working year round to provide moral and material assistance to Jews living in the Soviet Union. Both organizations have called on Members of Congress to speak out about the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union and to remind the Soviet leaders of the commitments they have made to respect human rights and facilitate family reunification through immigration. I am proud to associate myself with the work of these fine groups, and commend them for their efforts on behalf of Soviet Jewry.

Mr. Speaker, there are an estimated 500,000 Jews in the Soviet Union seeking permission to settle in other countries. Among them is Ida Nudel, a courageous 53-year-old woman who first applied to immigrate to Israel in 1971. Denied permission to leave, she continued to press her case while also serving as the guardian angel of jailed Jewish Prisoners of Conscience, giving them food, medicine, and encouragement. In 1978 these actions led to her being arrested for malicious hooliganism and sentenced to 4 years exile in Siberia. Her first year in Siberia, she was confined to a men's hostel with 60 hardened criminals. She subsequently was allowed to live alone in a tiny hut in the forest. It was a life of difficult days and long, cold nights in complete isolation, and her health deteriorated greatly.

Ida Nudel completed her sentence of exile in Siberia in 1982. Her application to return to Moscow, her hometown, was denied, however. The authorities told her she would be sent back to Siberia if she dared set foot in the capital city. After months of sleeping in railway station waiting rooms, she was finally permitted to settle in the city of Bendery in the Moldavian Republic, where she lives to this day. Although a trained economist, she has been denied a job because of her efforts to join her family in Israel.

In 1975 the Soviet Union became a signatory to the Helsinki accords, pledging to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion, or belief and to work in a positive and humanitarian spirit with the applications of persons who wish to reunite with members of their family.

Ida Nudel is living proof that the Soviet authorities are brazenly ignoring the pledges they made when they signed the Helsinki accords. As the leader of the free world and the symbol of freedom for oppressed peo-

ples throughout the world, it is incumbent upon the United States to protest the odious actions of the Soviet Union. We must raise this issue again and again, at every opportunity, to impress upon officials in the Kremlin our concern for the fate of Soviet Jews and to pressure them into living up to their international commitments.

In a letter smuggled to friends in the West during her exile in Siberia, Ida Nudel wrote:

What the Soviet authorities did to me was base. . . . I still don't know whether they will ever let me get out of their firm grip. But this does not mean that you should keep silent, resigning yourself to the evil reality. I beg you, in the name of those who are locked behind the iron doors of jails, who cannot or dare not raise their voices. . . . I beg you, do not be silent!

To remain silent about the mistreatment of Soviet Jews is to give tacit approval to the actions of the Soviet Government. I urge my colleagues to lend their voices in support of Soviet Jewry so that officials in the Kremlin will have no doubt about how we view their actions.●

15TH DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS TABULATED

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for 20 years I have sent questionnaires to residents of the 15th District. Some of the questions have been repeated over the course of several years to establish trends and patterns. Polling constituents has been an excellent way for me to gauge their feelings on issues before the Congress as well as critical problems at home and throughout the Nation.

The enormous deficit and the state of the ecomony are two issues causing the greatest concern to the residents of the 15th District. A 65-percent majority finds itself in worse financial shape or in about the same shape after 3 years of Reaganomics, while only 35 percent feel they are better off. Still another indication of their concern for economic conditions is the fact that a majority of the respondents listed the economy as the most critical problem facing Congress and the President today.

Fifty percent feel that defense expenditures are too high, while 31 percent believe that the current level of Pentagon spending is about right. Only 19 percent felt that military spending was too low. These statistics are extremely important because the House will consider, in the near future, the 1985 Department of Defense authorization bill which appears to be over the financial limit set by the House budget resolution. I agree with my constituents and believe that Congress can substantially reduce the President's proposed defense budget and still strengthen national security.

I was encouraged by the 63-percent positive response to my question asking whether Congress and the administration should develop and implement an industrial policy. The dramatic recovery of the Chrysler Corp. is proof that the Federal Government can play an important role in assisting vital industries and preserve American jobs. I am pleased that the House Banking Committee recently approved legislation that would make industrial policy a reality and strengthen the competitiveness of American industries. The bill would create a council of Government, business and labor leaders to coordinate efforts to insure that all sectors of our economy are healthy.

Of the several thousand responding to the 1984 questionnaire, a majority of the respondents—45 percent—felt that the U.S. military support in the Middle East should be decreased. At the same time, 55 percent disapprove of the way the President is handling our foreign involvement in Central America. Since mailing the questionnaire, there is additional reason to believe that the executive branch of the U.S. Government is operating independently and secretly in Central America. The time has come for Congress to investigate whether the Central Intelligence Agency's involvement in mining Nicaraguan harbors and other U.S. activities in Central America are violating United States or international law.

Also in the area of foreign affairs, 67 percent of 15th District residents disapprove of President Reagan's action in North Atlantic Treaty countries, while 53 percent of them approve of his actions in Asia and Soviet bloc countries.

In the field of education, a 64-percent majority favors a greater commitment to improving the quality of our schools. In letters and comments attached to the questionnaires, there were requests for expanded support for secondary and postsecondary vocational education programs, increased Federal funding for local programs serving pupils with special educational needs, and recommendations that a thoughtful and comprehensive educational policy be established to assure our future as a democratic nation in the world community.

Many of the citizens who responded said the budget cuts of the past 3 years have hurt them in many areas. More than 36 percent of the respondents experienced cuts in their medical services; 32 percent felt severe cuts in the areas of housing and education and 31 percent in unemployment benefits and senior citizens programs. Food programs received a 29-percent rating and cuts in veterans' benefits only affected 26 percent.

Each year, the number of constituents responding to my annual questionnaire grows, as does the number of individual letters. This questionnaire is the single most effective means I have to learn how 15th District residents feel about the issues before us in Congress. I am heartened that my constituents take so much time and effort to report their views to me, and I recommend this procedure to my colleagues who really want to keep in touch with their districts.●

CONGRESSIONAL VIGIL FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to participate in the Congressonal Vigil for Soviet Jewry.

The oppressive treatment of the approximately 3 million Jews currently living in the Soviet Union is both unjustifiable and inexcusable. The Government of the U.S.S.R. follows a policy of blatant antisemitism. Soviet laws ban even the most fundamental religious practices. Yet, the most heinous offense the Soviet Union commits is denying these people their principal right to emigrate. Not only does this policy defy accepted moral and ethical standards, but the stringent restrictions placed on emigration, even in cases involving the reunification of families contradict past international agreements—such as the Helsinki accords—which the Soviet Union has signed.

While Jews are among the few who may apply for exit visas, those who do submit applications are subsequently subjected to brutal, often terrorist responses from the Government: KGB searches, the loss of one's job, and even imprisonment and exile are just some of the possible consequences facing Jews who wish to leave the country. Today I would like to address the plight of Lev, Raisa, and Tatyana Ulanovsky, just three of the many who are victims of Russian persecution.

In October 1979 Lev Ulanovsky arrived in Israel from the Soviet Union. A refusenik for 5 years, Mr. Ulanovsky left the Soviet Union in the hopes of being later reunited with his mother, Raisa, and bedridden grandmother Tatyana. In 1980 Raisa Ulanovsky filed an exit visa application for herself and Tatyana. She consequently lost her job and has remained unemployed since that time. In 1981, 1 year after it was filed, her application was denied on the grounds that joining her only

child in Israel was an "insufficient reason" for emigration.

Since that time, Raisa and Tatyana Ulanovsky have reapplied, and have been rejected again. Mr. Ulanovsky is currently a researcher at the Weizman Institute of Science in Israel, and is still hoping for the release of his mother and grandmother from the Soviet Union.

We of the United States must not allow such treatment, such flagrant violations of human rights, to continue unabated and unanswered. We must not let the plight of the Ulanovsky family, and others like them, be forgotten. I know my colleagues will want to join me in calling for immediate reforms of such abusive practices, so that Soviet Jews, and all other Soviet citizens who wish to emigrate, may be allowed to leave their country.●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE LEON C. ASADOORIAN, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL UTILITY CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with many of my colleagues here in the Congress in seeking a high production strategy to rebuild America on the premise that a strong and growing economy is the basis of our prosperity, our social stability and justice, our national security, and our influence in the world. We believe that Americans are seeking a common vision and a practical plan to rebuild our economy. Although not all of us agree with every proposal we describe, we believe they offer direction and options Americans must consider if we are to rebuild and restore our economic vitality and growth. Economic growth and maximum production require a healthy and dynamic private sector aided by an efficient and humane public sector. Under Federal leadership, business, labor and Government must be brought together to work cooperatively to create a climate for growth.

An integral basic element of any high production strategy to rebuild America is the investment we must make in our Nation's infracture—the foundation of roads, bridges, water, and sewer systems upon which our Nation depends to deliver essential services to our people. It is critical to the life and livelihood of every citizen and a key element in future economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, as we contemplate our strategy and seek solutions, I would like to call your attention to the National Utility Contractors Association (NUCA) and commend to you the newly elected president of this most prestigious organization, the Honorable Leon C. Asadoorian, and their untiring dedicated efforts to achieve a comprehensive infrastructure rehabilitation program for our Nation's water and waste water systems. NUCA represents 2,500 companies nationwide involved in building water delivery systems, waste water treatment systems and underground construction projects, particularly pipeline projects.

With your permission I would like to insert at this point in our historic journal of Congress, the opening statement of President Leon Asadoorian to the members of NUCA which is eloquently and poignantly summed up in the title: "American Ingenuity Will Prevail," as follows:

AMERICAN INGENUITY WILL PREVAIL

To be named President of the National Utility Contractors Association at this particular time is both an honor and a decided challenge. As Art Linkletter so aptly put it in Dallas; "We're not riding the winds of change—its tornadoes we're talking about!"

And the change I see is, in large measure, change of the positive sort. Our knowledge revolution, and the ability to instantaneously tap that data base, grows by the minute. Due to these new technologies we can now work smarter, not harder.

I have a very positive outlook for our industry. The lengthy depressed construction market and related conditions has kept our industry in a "survival" mode. Today, the improving economy allows us to enter an "aggressive" mode, however, it will take the synergistic efforts of our entire association to again make this one of America's great industries.

Our opportunity is here, now. If you look at the period of time that we're in right now, this is basically a period of "re"-everything-rehabilitate, rebuild, reconstruct. It's a period of catching up on maintenance; it is a period of adjustment.

One of the most encouraging signs on the horizon is the growing recognition that America's deteriorating infrastructure has to be addressed and, addressed soon.

Here is the challenge of the Eighties—our challenge. America's staggering needs must be transformed into a reality. Politicians everywhere are vitally concerned. However, it will require strong pressure from their constituencies before they have the courage to tackle the tremendous creative financing program needed. It is not a job for your association officers and directors alone. Each of you—and your companies—has a personal stake in this communications job.

The level to which we meet this challenge is directly related to our combined abilities to get this infrastructure communications job sold to the general public.

I personally believe in each of you and in this industry. And, I believe that American ingenuity will again prevail.

In testimony to the successful attainment projected for NUCA's goals and objectives under the quality leadership of Leon Asadoorian, I would also like to present the statement prepared and published by his colleagues in a recent issue of NUCA's magazine, The National Utility Contractor, as follows:

MEET NUCA'S 1984 PRESIDENT—LEON C. ASADOORIAN, A MAN OF ACTION

"My goal for the upcoming year is to set ideals founded on professionalism, optimism, and a mutual commitment to the continued growth of our industry and our association," says incoming NUCA President, Leon C. Asadoorain. "I am committed to a strong National Association responsive to the needs of every chapter first and to their members in turn. I am also committed to helping make NUCA contractors the most profitable contractors in our industry. I want every member to look with pride to our association and our industry."

These quotes capsulize the theme and priorities of the man who will be installed as NUCA's Eighteenth President on March 3rd in Dallas. At 41, he is one of the youngest men to take the helm of NUCA. Asadoorain will strive to give NUCA effective leadership and strengthen further the Association's financial resources.

Having spent the past year visiting with many local chapters on NUCA's behalf, Asadoorain listened to renewed hope in the economy and the construction industry as voiced by the local contractors. He agrees with financier Malcolm Forbes, who recently said, "The rebuilding of America's infrastructure is going to be one of the primary economic booms over the next ten years." Drawing from these resources, he intends to build a strong network among NUCA chapters and echo their needs in Washington.

Often when visiting with chapters he has quoted Theodore Roosevelt who said, "Every man owes a part of his time and money to the business or the industry in which he is engaged. No man has a moral right to withhold his support from an organization that is striving to improve conditions within his sphere."

"The major challenge our industry faces this election year, in Washington, D.C., and state governments is to maintain an adequate presence and continue to educate the Administration and Congress of the importance of rebuilding America's underpinnings," explains Asadoorian. "All of this must be done in balance with rising deficit budgets. It is impossible if the priorities of that underpinning and its importance to the future of our country is not kept at the same level as entitlement programs, the defense budget, and the implications of a tax increase. 'Good Water, America' and NUCA's special report on the nation's water and sewer systems, 'Ticking Timebombs,' have been good starts in exposing this problem to the public and Congress. More of the same must be continued during this coming year."

Those close to Leon describe him as a fundamentalist: "No bells and whistles, just straight ahead and stick to the basics." He brings to the NUCA presidency the same "can do" attitude and boundless energy with which he served as president-elect and chairman of NUCA's government relations committee. Active in both state and federal government affairs, he is keenly aware of the need for a continued strong voice to affect more favorable conditions in the construction industry, both in the legislative and the regulatory agencies.

Asadoorian hopes to nurture existing coalitions with other construction organizations throughout the country to promote community and governmental awareness of what contractors do for the country. This

awareness can only serve to broaden the financial support for construction projects and improve relations with the general public. He summarized his commitment to this by saying. "We are in a unique position to reshape our own destiny, the need is there, and it is our responsibility to communicate that need through the proper channels."

With these goals, a sense of vision and commitment, Leon Asadoorian accepts the challenge of leading NUCA through this election year. He brings a wealth of experience and successful innovation that will be a strong asset in developing support for NUCA.

Leon Asadoorian is President and owner of Methuen Construction Company, Inc., located in Methuen, Massachusetts. The business was founded by his father Leon G. Asadoorian in 1960, performing small sewer and water contracts. Leon's mother, Elizabeth Asadoorian, handled the bookkeeping responsibilities for the company.

Working with his father on a part-time basis while he attended Northeastern University, a cooperative education college, Leon received invaluable field experience. He completed his studies in 1964 receiving a Bachelor of Science degree in Civil Engineering. He then channelled his efforts full time into the construction business.

In 1964, Methuen Construction Company's annual volume was in 5 figures, with two employees. Upon his father's retirement in 1974, Leon took over as President. Doing business throughout New England and in Phoenix, Arizona, the company has grown considerably. Methuen Construction employs approximately 175 people under the direction of General Manager, Michael Chace.

"It's my personal philosophy that people make any operation, association or business work," he explains, adding that most modern equipment and facilities are not a substitute. He also has found from experience that a person gets out of something only as much as he contributes.

Consistent with his philosophy for NUCA, Asadoorian encourages participation and communication among his employees. Methuen Construction's most important asset is its people. Every employee's birthday is remembered and acknowledged. Company policy is to promote from within and upward mobility is encouraged. The names of operators and truck drivers are attached to the equipment they operate. Many employees have been with the company over ten years; most over five years.

The company prides itself with creating a family atmosphere, responsive to its employees. Leon's daughters, Elizabeth and Margaret, and all employees' families are included in company functions and to share in the company's success.

Liz and Margaret Asadoorian are most important to him. Because business and school often restrains the time spent together, it is not unusual for the girls to attend UCA meetings, or for him to scurry off for a few minutes in the middle of the day to catch Liz running in a track meet, or attend a school function with Margaret.

Asadoorian has served as president of his local chapter, the Utility Contractors Association of New England (UCANE). During his presidency, he implemented programs to improve communications with state, local and city agencies. He successfully initiated programs to promote membership and participation among smaller contractor members. He served on the Board of Directors and various committees including the Budget, Legislative, Executive and Specifications Committees. He continues to be an active member of UCANE as well as the Underground Contractors Association of Arizona. His commitment and involvement reaches out to other activities and organization's as well. He is an Arbitrator and a member of the American Arbitration Association; he is also a member of the AGC, ABC and the ARTBA associations.

Asadoorian, a Massachusetts native, is dedicated to community service. He serves on the board of directors of the Nevins Home, a nonprofit old age home in Methuen. And, is also a member of the Bon Secours Guild (a hospital support organization), the Massachusetts Governor's Infrastructure Task Force, the Management Advisory Group of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Ancient and Honorable Artillery.

"Leading the Association this year will be fun, an exciting and challenging task," Asadoorian enthusiastically noted. He will have a lot of help in that task. Working with him will be NUCA's dedicated staff under the direction of Bill Harley, Executive Director. With the energetic support of NUCA's Officers, Directors, Committee Chairmen and chapters throughout the country, President Leon C. Asadoorian intends to make 1984 a successful and important year for NUCA and each of its members.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed appropriate that we reflect on the deeds and achievements of our people who contribute to the quality of life here in America and I am pleased to seek this national recognition of Leon Asadoorian's lifetime of good works, his dreams and aspirations in concert with the members of NUCA—all directed to rebuilding America and our people's estate. As he carries on in his official position as President of National Utility Contractors Association, we do indeed salute a distinguished citizen, good friend and great American—The Honorable Leon Asadoorian—for his contribution to the quality of life for the people of our community, State and Nation.●

VA REGIONAL OFFICE SHINES IN DES MOINES, IA

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the exceptional work of the Veterans' Administration Regional Office in Des Moines, IA. The office has the primary responsibility for the administration of veterans benefits—except medical—within the State of Iowa.

Their work is truly outstanding. I know it is fashionable these days to tell only the horror stories which surface from time to time about the inefficiencies, inequities, and the overall inability of the Government's agencies to carry out their programs. The Veterans' Administration Regional Office in Des Moines, under the direction of Mr. Norman Bauer, is a shining example of an agency that serves its mission well. Its 123 Federal employees serve Iowa's 358,000 veterans with distinction. Of course, there are often disagreements regarding the final decisions they sometimes make, but my constituents are made fully aware of the basis of these decisions and they are completely informed about their right to appellate review.

I only wish all agencies operated as effectively as this one. Mr. Speaker, let the record show that the work done by these dedicated workers is clearly outstanding and is gratefully appreciated by this Member and by the people of Iowa's Fifth District.●

THE GREAT ENERGY GIVEAWAY

HON. JIM BATES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will soon consider H.R. 4275, the Federal Reclamation Hydroelectric Powerplants Authorization Act. Both the San Diego Tribune and the New York Times argue that there may be a more cost effective way for the Government to sell Hoover Dam power. Their editorials, which I encourage my colleagues to read, say the underpricing of Federal power is unfair and discourages conservation.

The editorials follow:

[From the Tribune, San Diego, CA, Mar. 28, 1984]

THE GREAT ENERGY GIVEAWAY

The Federal Government, while running a record deficit of nearly $200 billion, a year, is preparing to renew "sweetheart" contracts to sell Hoover Dam electric power for peanuts.

That's great for many consumers of electricity in the Hoover Dam marketing area, but not for San Diegans. Our power costs are among the highest in the nation, but we cannot participate in the government giveaway. If we could, we could save $10 to $30 million a year, which would help with the high utility bills.

Hoover Dam power sells for less than half a cent a kilowatt hour. The San Diego Gas and Electric Co. is paying six cents a kilowatt hour for the electricity it is buying in Arizona and New Mexico to bring here over the company's new transmission line to the east.

Why can't San Diegans share in the benefits of low-cost federal power? Politics is a big part of the answer. The utilities which contracted for Hoover power in the 1930s got a great bargain, and San Diego Gas and Electric wasn't one of them. The 50-year contracts are expiring in 1987, and the contractors claim the right of renewal. Legislation is being pushed in Congress, by Sen. James McClure, R-Ida., and Rep. Morris Udall, D-Ariz., to give them 30 years more at the trough.

The Environmental Defense Fund says this underpricing of federal hydropower is unfair and merely encourages consumption, increasing demands for coal and nuclear power. We agree.

Fairness demands that Hoover's electricity be auctioned off to the highest bidder.

The old pork-barrel laws for the distribution of public power are out of date. There is no good reason for Uncle Sam to take less than top dollar for the energy generated by the Colorado River. Why should customers served by municipal electric systems in Los Angeles, Glendale and Pasadena have access to low-cost power that is denied to us, merely because we are served by a private power company? They don't own Hoover Dam. The Colorado River belongs to all of us.

Federal officials say they aren't in the business of making a profit from the sale of power. But they aren't generating energy just for the fun of it. And energy is worth far more now than it was worth in 1937. It is the preferred users who are making giant profits, at the expense of the federal treasury and all of us.

Congress should not act hastily to perpetuate this giveaway of public money for another 30 years. The entire structure of federal power pricing needs to be brought up to date.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 21, 1984]

GREEDY FOR POWER

If a giant oil reserve were discovered under the Pentagon, would the Government give it away to voters who live in nearby Maryland and Virginia? That, in effect, is what President Reagan and many members of Congress want to do with the more than $400 million worth of electricity generated annually by Hoover Dam. The last hope of stopping that 30-year sign-away of a public resource rests with the House.

When it was finished in 1937, the giant hydroelectric facility on the Colorado River was still called Boulder Dam. Its size and power output made it one of the seven wonders of the modern world. The Federal Government signed 50-year contracts to deliver the power, at cost, to public and private power authorities in California, Nevada and Arizona.

This electricity was always a bargain; it sold over the decades at an average price of one-sixth of a cent per kilowatt-hour. Wholesale power in the same region now sells for as much as 7 cents a kwh. Hoover Dam power at half a cent is virtually a steal. No wonder that the three benefiting states are pressing for legislation that would lock in the bargain through the year 2017.

The Environmental Defense Fund, perceiving that the underpricing of hydropower discourages conservation and increases demand for coal and nuclear power, argues that Hoover's electricity should be auctioned off to the highest bidders. San Diego, paying very high electricity costs and denied any portion of Hoover power, supports the auction alternative. But these appeals have so far been ignored.

The Administration's budget office might have been expected to oppose such a giveaway of Government resources. But the President is apparently unwilling to upset his Western supporters in an election year.

The sign-away bill breezed through the Senate with bipartisan support. House Democrats, too, seem reluctant to end up on the wrong side of the politics of cheap hydropower. In this case their reluctance is probably reinforced by the fact that Representative Morris Udall, the Tucson Democrat who chairs the House Interior Committee, is a sponsor of the bill.

There are many ways to rationalize support for the measure: It only continues the existing system of power distribution . . . It's too late for effective opposition . . . Millions will benefit from the low-cost electricity. But beyond these rationalizations lies a simple truth. It's just not fair to treat national resources as pork to be sliced up for the neighbors. When California, Nevada and Arizona don't pay their share of energy costs, someone else must.●

NATIONAL SECRETARIES DAY

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, since April 25, 1984 is National Secretaries Day, I want to take this opportunity to recognize a good friend and dynamic lady who has been recognized as the Best Secretary on Delmarva in a contest sponsored by White & Leonard, Inc., of Salisbury, MD.

Mrs. Betty J. Sharpley is employed by Ahtes & Hanna Partners, Inc., one of the most highly respected and influential real estate firms on Delmarva. She is the secretary to the partners, Mr. Bill Ahtes and Mr. Henry Hanna.

During her 14 years of employment in the real estate business, she has experienced the fluctuations which are so characteristic of this industry without allowing it to affect her own good judgment, perserverance, and extraordinary stability. In her employers' words, she is "truly a partner in our business and our success would not be nearly so great without her efforts."

Mr. Speaker, there were over 70 candidates submitted for the honor as the Best Secretary of Delmarva. In addition to Mrs. Sharpley, Mrs. Donna Causey, employed by Occidental Chemical of Salisbury, and Mrs. Bobbi Bryon, employed by Peninsula Financial Services of Salisbury, were recognized.

I take this opportunity to congratulate these three fine and accomplished secretaries and to commend White & Leonard, Inc., for conducting such a successful contest.●

HALSEY C. BURKE

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Congressmen DON EDWARDS, ED ZSCHAU, and myself, I would like to speak in honor of Halsey C. Burke, an American who deserves our highest praise and respect.

Halsey Burke, whose public service in our community serves as a model for all citizens, will be honored at a special dinner during which he will receive the City of Hope's highest recognition—the Spirit of Life Award. Halsey will receive this award for his outstanding contributions to the City of Hope medical center.

The City of Hope is a National Pilot Medical Center which provides superb, ultramodern facilities, and free care for patients from around our Nation. Halsey's extensive efforts have helped enable the City of Hope to serve patients suffering from major catastrophic maladies such as cancer and leukemia. And the generous support offered by Halsey and others has helped make the City of Hope one of our Nation's leading medical research institutions.

Thus, with the help of people like Halsey, the City of Hope has been able to relieve pain, prolong life, and effect cures for thousands of people.

Yet Halsey's record of contribution extends beyond his important work for the City of Hope. He has served as president of the Rotary Club of San Jose, district governor of Rotary International's District 517, and he has been an active volunteer and member of numerous organizations, including the Santa Clara County Manufacturing Group, United Way of Santa Clara County, the Bay Area Council, and the Boy Scouts of America. In addition, Halsey served as one of the youngest captains in the U.S. Merchant Marines, and then he went on to become president and chairman of the board of Burke Industries, Inc., a leading manufacturer of rubber products for industrial applications.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ZSCHAU, and I have enjoyed working with Halsey, and we are honored to have him as our friend. It is obvious that Halsey C. Burke deserves accolades and thanks for his notable service to our community. In light of this fact, we ask you, Mr. Speaker, and all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to join us in extending thanks to our friend, Halsey C. Burke.●

WORLD DAY FOR LABORATORY ANIMALS

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to announce that this Saturday over 70 organizations from all over the United States are sponsoring a gathering to commemorate World Day for Laboratory Animals. The participants will pay respects to those animals that

have died, both in the past and the future, in scientific laboratories. The gathering begins at noon and will be held in Lafayette Park across from the White House, on April 28. I invite my colleagues to attend this important event to focus attention on the worldwide suffering of animals used in research and testing.

The International Association Against Painful Experiments on Animals began World Day for Laboratory Animals in 1978. April 24 was the day chosen as it is the birthday of the late Air Chief Marshal Hugh Dowding. Lord Dowding, commander-in-chief of Fighter Command, Royal Air Force, in the Battle of Britain, spoke frequently before the House of Lords on the use of laboratory animals.

This day is an opportunity to reflect on the profound moral dimension to the issue of laboratory animal experimentation. It is time to raise the public conscience on the current use of laboratory animals. As our society has become more sophisticated, we have a responsibility to question the so-called necessity of inflicting suffering to sentient beings. The pain and harsh treatment of animals must become a factor weighed against possible fruits of knowledge in research. I raise these difficult ethical questions in hopes that my colleagues will acknowledge the seriousness of this issue, and will join me in working toward a more humane society for all.●

WOMEN IN MINING HONORED

HON. FRANK McCLOSKEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1984, I had the opportunity to learn about an important segment of my constituency—women in mining. Not only were these constituents women employed in the mining industry, but they were representatives of a nationwide organization named Women In Mining.

This organization which just began its 11th year of service, is working on a grassroots level to educate the overall public about not only the importance of the mining industry in the United States, but the importance of the education of the individuals in the industry.

In addition to representing the National Organization of Women In Mining, Ms. Debra Schumacher and Ms. Molly Martin are members of two local chapters—The Kentuckianio Chapter headquartered in my district in Evansville, IN, and the St. Louis, MO, chapter.

Too many times those of us who are charged with making the laws of this Nation do not have the time to either learn from or express appreciation for the personal contributions our constituents make to their communities and the general public good.

Neither do we have many opportunities to honor and congratulate those individuals for their sacrifices and dedication.

Therefore, I take great pleasure in and am honored to announce that Joyce L. Fitzgerald, of Evansville, IN, has been named as president and chief executive officer of the National Organization of Women In Mining.

I wish Joyce and the entire national organization the best of luck and commend them on their fine and honorable mission.●

TRIBUTE TO CHARLIE SEALY

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues in the House of Representatives a story that appeared recently in the Tuscaloosa News, written by Rhonda Wooldridge of the paper's staff.

The article recognizes a very dear friend of mine, Mr. Charlie Sealy, and tells of his story to fight back from heart bypass surgery. Following is the article as it appeared in the newspaper:

BYPASS SURGERY ISN'T KEEPING DEVELOPER DOWN

(By Rhonda Wooldridge)

At 65, Charlie Sealy has no plans to slow down.

In fact, the local real estate developer is speeding back up as he recovers from heart bypass surgery he underwent last December.

"I feel good about myself," he said. "All I'd like to do is get my strength back and get back into things in the office and in the community."

Today is Heart Sunday, the beginning of the Heart Fund's annual fund-raising campaign.

Money raised during the campaign is used for education and research into heart diseases and their treatment.

Sealy had a heart attack about two and a half years ago, but he said he thought he had gotten over it pretty well.

"It was mild," he said. "The doctor told me if I had to have a heart attack it was the kind to have."

Sealy said he had let up somewhat on his schedule since his heart attack.

"Whenever I got tired I just quit," he said. "A lot of times we have a lot of excitement around here, but whenever things get real excited I just try to get out."

He did not smoke before the attack, so he didn't have that to give up, but he had watched his diet carefully and had taken up regular walking, Sealy said.

It was on one of his usual morning walks that his current trouble first surfaced.

"Normally I get up and walk every morning approximately three miles," he said. "This particular morning I decided to carry my bird dog with me. We went out to the edge of town and started off."

He said when he had gone about a quarter of a mile "at a pretty good pace," he reached a small incline.

"About three-fourths of the way up I began to have a shortness of breath," he said. "I knew going up that small incline that something was wrong."

Sealy said he walked "very slowly" back to his car and drove back home. By the time he got there he was feeling a bit better and decided to wait until the next day to go to the doctor, he said.

The doctor put him into the hospital for an arteriogram, a process by which dye is sent through the arteries into the heart muscle and pictures are taken that show how well the system is working. Sealy said.

"I got the report back Thursday morning with the recommendation that I have open heart surgery," he said.

He said he tried to persuade the doctors to wait until after the holidays, but they said they didn't recommend it because some of the arteries that carried blood to his heart were nearly closed.

He had the surgery—five bypasses and additional cleaning of one artery—on Dec. 19.

"I was well pleased," he said.

Sealy said he spent almost two weeks in Druid City Hospital after the surgery and was impressed with the quality of the treatment there.

"The hospital had wonderful equipment, wonderful nurses," he said. "And they all took a personal interest in me.

"I noticed that they took a personal interest in all of their patients there."

Within a few days he began to get his strength back, Sealy said.

"Before I left the hospital I began to walk up and down the halls, and as soon as I got home and the weather permitted I began to walk outside," he said.

"I started off walking about half a mile and I was exhausted," he said. "Today I'm up to three and a half miles and I'll try to pick that up to four miles next week."

Sealy said he thought his recovery was facilitated by the fact that he was in relatively good condition because he had already been walking regularly.

And the prayers of his pastor, Allan Watson, and his friends were "a plus," he added.

In recent weeks he has begun spending some time back in the office and resuming other activities, Sealy said.

"I'm on my way back to normal. Within a month or six weeks I'll be stronger than I was before I had my surgery," he said.

Sealy said since he has had both a heart attack and bypass surgery it would be easy to spend the rest of his life thinking about what else might happen.

"But I don't worry about that," he said. "I don't ride in rodeos and I don't climb mountains, but I expect to live a full, normal life."

I am confident that Charlie will continue to lead a full and active life. His past achievements and accomplishments are proof of his inherent characteristics of hard work and service to others.

Charlie "started from scratch" to build a prominent Tuscaloosa business, exemplifying the highest level of citizenship all the way. The year 1955 saw the formation of Sealy Realty Co., with business objectives to build and

sell real estate in the Tuscaloosa, AL, area. The most visible results of this venture are the more than 1,000 new homes and the more than 800 apartment units he has built for Tuscaloosans, and the 20 or so subdivisions developed by him.

As he has gone about this prolific work over 30 years, Charlie has contributed much to his profession and those who share it. In the early years of his career and the infancy of the modern real estate profession, Charlie attended meetings, seminars, and conventions all over the country, bringing back new ideas and methods which he shared with others in the profession.

Working with the University of Alabama, he was instrumental in the creation of the first real estate courses there many years ago. He has seen the University go from a 13-week, 26-hour first course to a funded chair of real estate, in which he played an instrumental part.

A partial listing of the leadership roles Charlie served in organizations working to further his profession follows:

Charter member, Homebuilders Association of Tuscaloosa; treasurer, Homebuilders Association of Tuscaloosa; president, Homebuilders Association of Tuscaloosa; director, Homebuilders Association of Tuscaloosa; national director, Homebuilders Association of America; State treasurer, Alabama Real Estate Association (Realtors); 3rd vice president, Alabama Real Estate Association (Realtors); 1st vice president, Alabama Real Estate Association (Realtors); State director, Alabama Real Estate Association (Realtors); president, Alabama Real Estate Association (Realtors); chairman, Education Committee, Alabama Real Estate Association (Realtors); president, Tuscaloosa Board of Realtors; national director, National Association of Real Estate Boards.

Indicative of his professional reputation are these highest awards from his professional peers:

Realtor of the Year 1963, presented by Tuscaloosa Board of Realtors; Realtor of the Year 1964, presented by Tuscaloosa Board of Realtors; Builder of the Year 1980, presented by Tuscaloosa Homebuilders Association; Ward McFarland, Sr. Community Development Award, presented by Tuscaloosa Board of Realtors 1981.

He is a founder and director of Security Federal Savings & Loan Association, and a founder and director of Peoples Bank of Tuscaloosa. The constructive energy Charlie has shown in his profession has overflowed into the community. In the course of gathering information for this tribute, a common thread of opinion came out in conversations with those who had worked with him on community projects—"If you give him a job to do, it will get done thoroughly and very successfully."

Some of his civic responsibilities over the years have included:

Director Tuscaloosa County Industrial Development Authority; division chairman, YMCA; division chairman, United Fund; chairman, Enlargement Campaign Drive, Black Warrior Council, Boy Scouts of America; Executive board member, Black Warrior Council, Boy Scouts of America; Institutional representative, Black Warrior Council, Boy Scouts of America; active member Northport Chamber of Commerce; active member Tuscaloosa Chamber of Commerce; executive committee, Tuscaloosa County Industrial Development Authority; chairman, Original City Commission; director, West Alabama Rehabilitation Center.

Charlie has also served through his church in the position of deacon, chairman of the board of deacons, and Sunday school superintendent of Forest Lake Baptist Church. He has also served as an executive board member of the Alabama Baptist State Convention.

For many years Charlie has worked to promote and develop Tuscaloosa and Tuscaloosa County. From heading fundraising drives, to working with sales presentations, to preparing grant applications for Federal assistance, Charlie has worked to help organize and construct projects that would serve others.

He has given so much of himself and not asked for anything in return. People like Charlie Sealy are hard to find these days when it comes to looking for a truly good person.

I want to take this opportunity to thank him for all that he has done for me. I have always known that I could turn to him for wise counsel, friendship, and support. He has never failed to respond with generosity of his time, talents, and compassion.

I feel deep warmth and affection for Charlie Sealy, treasure my associations with him, and look forward to many more years of continuing friendship.●

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in commemorating the 69th anniversary of the first genocide of the 20th century, the massacre of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire.

The pattern of torture, exile, and mass killing that was perpetrated by the Turkish Government against the Armenian people was, unfortunately, not the last manifestation of genocide that the world was to witness during this century. The hideous example set by the Ottoman Empire in 1915 has been followed by barbarous regimes from Nazi Germany to Pol Pot's Cambodia. In the now infamous quote, Adolf Hitler, before beginning his Holocaust against the Jews, referred to international indifference in the face of the Armenian genocide. "Who," he asked, "remembers the Armenians?"

We must continually and strongly respond to that question, whether it be spoken or unspoken, "We remember." We remember the Armenians by honoring their suffering. And in remembering, we stand against those forces that would try to rewrite history, asserting, as the current leaders of Turkey do, that reports of the genocide are "exaggerated" and "propaganda." It is unfortunate that despite our long record in the United States of condemning this heinous act, an official of the State Department has seen fit to label as "irresponsible" Representative COELHO's bill, which would have designated April 24, 1984, as "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man," and has suggested that it would have a negative impact on our relations with Turkey. It is interesting to note that, despite the fact that the President himself, in his proclamation in honor of the Days of Remembrance of the Holocaust, dated April 22, 1981, referred specifically to the Armenian genocide, one of the State Department's reasons for opposing Mr. COELHO's bill is that the genocide has not been documented. In order to help clarify U.S. policy on this issue, I have cosponsored Mr. PASHAYAN's bill, House Resolution 171, which declares that U.S policy embraces the historical events of the Armenian genocide. I urge my colleagues to join this effort to relieve the administration of its apparent confusion.

It is my hope that in honoring the victims of this barbarous act, we will help prevent further distortions of the truth in the matter of the Armenian genocide. We must continue to remember them so that no future tyrants see in our indifference an assurance that they may commit such atrocities against humanity with impunity.●

EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR PAC

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jim Hampton, editor of the Miami Herald, writing in his April 22 editorial pages stated:

The truest route to political equity, it seems to me, is not to limit PACs contributions to Presidential candidates. Rather, it is to assure that all ideologies have equal access to the process.

His editorial concludes:

Nor ought the Supreme Court limit Americans' right to speak their political minds freely, both individually and collectively. Rather, the Court ought to reaffirm the first amendment's free speech clause cannot be circumscribed except in extremes. That

case clearly does not obtain in the case now before the Supreme Court.

How sweet it is to see editors beginning to rediscover the first amendment or, perhaps, to discover that amendment applies to others than themselves.

Mr. Hampton's statement is dead right. He concludes PAC's free speech rights are not less than those of the individuals who comprise the PAC's, and that PAC's do not unduly influence Government.

Either the press is waking up, or editors are more clear-headed outside the New York-Washington editorial axis. In either case or in both, it is nice to find the Drew-Shields-Common Cause broadsides have not dulled all the editorial wit in America.●

QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE VIRGINIA WILDERNESS BILL NOT SUBSTANTIAL

HON. FREDERICK C. BOUCHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that H.R. 5121, the Virginia National Forest Wilderness Act of 1984, will reach the floor of the House for consideration within the next 2 weeks. The timing is clearly proper for preservation as wilderness of approximately 25,000 acres of national forest land in Virginia. These areas have been carefully selected by the Forest Service, and by hunters, fishermen, campers, hikers, and others interested in preserving these treasures of Virginia's national heritage.

The only questions raised concerning the advisability of declaring these areas as wilderness relate to the possibility that air quality standards may be raised from the current class II to class I in the areas declared as wilderness. It is suggested that should such a reclassification occur, future industrial growth in the area may be limited.

H.R. 5121 does not contain such a reclassification. Moreover, national environmental groups have stated that they will to seek such a reclassification, and I would wholeheartedly oppose such a reclassification occurring.

The insubstantial nature of the questions raised concerning H.R. 5121 are well stated in the following editorial which appeared in the Roanoke Times & World-News, the principal daily newspaper serving the counties wherein our proposed wilderness areas are located. I commend this careful statement of the appropriateness of H.R. 5121 to my colleagues:

[From the Roanoke Times & World-News]

WILDERNESS AND WESTVACO

Time is running out on a concerted effort—backed by the U.S. Forest Service and the Virginia Wilderness Committee, along with other citizens' groups—to give more than 70,000 additional acres the official designation of wilderness in 1984. The effort may founder on objections about clean air standards raised by Westvaco Corp., whose Covington paper mill is near some of the proposed wilderness areas.

Westvaco's objections seem to be based on speculation, undue apprehension and extreme defensiveness. They should not override the case for adding this acreage to the wilderness system.

The company recently announced a $325 million five-year expansion of its bleached board mill in Covington. Management's expressed concern is that if some of the surrounding area is designated wilderness, Westvaco's competitive position might be hurt by having to meet stricter clean-air standards.

For these times, it is a familiar conflict: environmentalists vs. industrialists, clean air vs. jobs. But the conflict may exist more in the minds of Westvaco than in reality.

Indications are that earlier, Westvaco was willing to accept a compromise that would allow wilderness designation for most of the area in question. The compromise provided that air standards for these wilderness regions would remain Class II. Under the Clean Air Act, Class I means, essentially, that the air cannot be made dirtier; Class II allows for as much as 20 times more pollutants than does Class I.

Wilderness proponents charge that Westvaco is backing down from an agreement already negotiated. Whether or not that's true, the company is now taking a strong stand against new wilderness designation in its vicinity. It says that Congress might sometime impose Class I restrictions. Besides, there is the acid-rain controversy, which might lead to a whole new range of limits on emissions.

The scenario might be titled something like "Westvaco strikes back." The company is rethinking its position on wilderness. A spokesman admits that it may come up with a counterproposal that no new wilderness area be designated within a 50-mile radius of Covington. This would not, of course, become a law: it would be a policy statement directed at members of Congress and others involved in the lawmaking process.

That would be extreme, to say the least. Westvaco does not have the evidence to support a claim that its plant—rather than the wilderness—should be given such sweeping protections. The regulatory future may be uncertain, but that's not reason enough to hold off action on wilderness.

Timing is vital. The Virginia Wilderness Committee wants a bill now because it has what a spokesman calls the right constellation of influences: citizen backing and Forest Service recommendations, plus two congressmen and two senators receptive to the proposal.

Westvaco apparently wants to temporize in hopes that the political climate will change and that the Reagan administration will make further inroads in its campaign to reduce government regulation. This is a fight that the company ought to lose.●

REMEMBERING THE ARMENIAN HOLOCAUST

HON. BOBBI FIEDLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, each year, we take time to remember the Armenian Holocaust, which started in April 1915. In the middle of spring, we stop and remember the horror human beings are capable of creating. We also remember that what happened to the Armenians is important to all of us today, and how the Armenian people have never faltered, despite genocide and hardship, in their belief in freedom.

It was spring in Armenia in 1915, not only of the new year, but of the new century, a century that held out the promise for a better life. The 19th century had been largely an era of peace and prosperity, and the hope for progress had reached the mountains of Armenia. There was not only increased literacy and lengthened life expectancy, but also the whisper of a free Armenia.

The Armenian people were no strangers to repression and massacre, but the events that started on that other April 20 were like a chasm opening in a smooth road. The 20th century brought to the people of Armenia not prosperity and liberty, but genocide and exile. Hatred and horror have been with us always, but only in 1915 were they first mixed with modern technology and modern government to produce genocide.

The scars of 1915 have not disappeared from the souls of the Armenian people. But neither has the hope for freedom. That is one of the reasons I am proud to be a cosponsor of House Resolution 171, affirming, and thus remembering, the Armenian Holocaust. Any people that have no past also have no future, and the Armenian Holocaust is one of the most significant events not only in the history of the Armenian people, but of all people. Tyrants can take life, they can take lands, but they cannot take the past. That is the one thing we possess absolutely. Not all of our inheritance may be attractive, but it is all important; and nothing more important than to remember what unreason and power unrestrained by law could attempt to do, starting on April 20, 1915. Yet even this could not destroy the Armenian people, their culture, and their vitality. Let us also remember these things on this Day of Remembrance.●

ARMENIAN MEMORIAL DAY

HON. SALA BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in observing the 69th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. If the world had acknowledged and condemned this atrocity, it may have prevented Adolf Hitler from committing genocide against the Jews. Today we honor the memory of 1½ million innocent Armenian citizens who were systematically slaughtered by the Ottoman Turkish Government. By doing so, we seek to insure that the horror of this crime remains fresh in the minds of all men and women so that such a tragedy will never occur again.

I am deeply troubled by the State Department's apparent efforts to deny the Armenian genocide. In the August 1982 issue of the Department of State Bulletin, an article appeared which suggested that the United States no longer recognizes the Armenian genocide. My husband Phillip and many other Members of Congress wrote to Secretary of State Shultz to protest any such change in policy. As a result of those efforts, the State Department subsequently published an "editor's note" denying any change in U.S. policy.

More recently, the State Department has obstructed another effort to recognize the Armenian genocide. House Joint Resolution 247, of which I am a cosponsor, would have designated April 24, 1984, as a day of commemoration for the victims of genocide, particularly those of Armenian descent. The State Department objected to the bill and prevented it from even being considered by the House of Representatives.

I believe the State Department's position is wrong. History is clear. The evidence is in our possession in the U.S. Archives. If our own State Department will not recognize the Armenian genocide, how will we ever convince the Turkish Government to do so?

I join my colleagues in commemorating this dark day. Let us rededicate ourselves to a future where such a tragedy will not occur again and let us not forget the millions who gave their lives for their faith and love of freedom.●

HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, the United States Holocaust Memorial Council has designated the week of April 29 to May 6 as Days of Remembrance to commemorate the victims and honor the survivors of the Holocaust. We, the Members of Congress along with the President and the Vice President of the United States, have joined the Governors of each State and the mayors of each city in making local commemorative events a national commitment. In California, the legislature already has adopted a resolution affirming and proclaiming the Days of Remembrance throughout the State. Sacramento Mayor Anne Rudin also will issue a proclamation at a city hall ceremony.

I am very pleased to note that significant steps are being taken in my district to educate the public as to the circumstances and ramifications of the Holocaust. The Sacramento City and County library system is preparing Holocaust reading lists categorized for children, teenagers, and adults. The Interfaith Service Bureau's weekly television show, "Capitol and the Clergy," will focus on the Holocaust, as will a local radio talk show. I am also very encouraged by the designation of May 3 as an interreligious National Day of Prayer and the Interfaith Service Bureau's suggestion to its representative congregations that special sermons and prayers be part of their religious services.

The Holocaust remains a stigma of horror, a blot upon the history of humanity which we must remember for as long as we desire to preserve civil liberty and moral decency in our society. I urge my colleagues, as well as the people of this Nation, to observe these Days of Remembrance and to recognize the profound impact the Holocaust has had upon the world and countless individual lives. Holocaust is defined as the attempted extermination of an entire people or group. The existence of mass, civilian murder today in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, and in our hemisphere casts an ominous, holocaust-like shadow upon our own relations with countries so preoccupied with the slaughter of innocent people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in dedicating this week of commemoration as a somber warning against the possibilities of another holocaust and a memorial honoring the victims of a holocaust whose marks of savagery will never fade away.●

CABLE TV

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to an op-ed piece written by Vernon Jordan, former president of the National Urban League. In the article, which was published in the Washington Post on April 6, 1984, Mr. Jordan cites the need for a national policy that fairly defines the rights and obligations of both local governments and cable operators. I believe we all would benefit from a careful reading of this sensible article, and I include it at this point for the information of my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Friday, Apr. 6, 1984]

UNTANGLING CABLE TV

(By Vernon E. Jordan Jr.)

What happened to the cable revolution that never took place? How can America benefit from its underutilized cable technology?

Those are important questions raising issues I've followed since the dawn of cable. My involvement started during my work in the civil rights movement, when it became apparent that cable technologies offered new opportunities for educational and skills training programming for poor people. It continued as public access channels suggested new ways for black and poor communities to break through the communications barriers of traditional media. And today, I am involved in cable issues as counsel to the industry.

How cable came to qualify as the nation's most visible underachiever is a fascinating lesson in economics and in local politics.

Despite prohibitive start-up costs, cable would still be economically feasible were it not for the twisted politics of cable franchise awards, which have almost strangled this infant industry. In many cities the franchise award process has led to excesses by both city governments and cable operators, each sucked into the quagmire by greed.

Some companies went into the franchise bidding process with blinkers on and promised far more than they could deliver. They were transfixed by the expectation of large profits that melted away in the heat of grossly overestimated potential profits and grossly underestimated real costs.

And they were led on by cities that unreasonably saw a cable franchise as a bottomless well from which they could draw a variety of fees, up-front payments and unrelated benefits, including donations of trees, swimming pools, and other amenities having nothing to do with the delivery of cable services.

All of this represents hidden taxes on cable consumers, who must pay for them in their monthly bills. It is estimated that over 20 percent of a cable subscriber's monthly bill consists of costs imposed by local regulations.

This self-defeating bidding game accounts for the absence of cable in many cities. Badly burned by the experiences of the past decade, cable operators are wary of blunder-

ing deeper into the morass. Faced with negotiating demands that may be politically appealing but economically disastrous, operators are now reluctant to overcommit themselves. And they fear heavy start-up costs while the danger exists that when their franchise expires it could become subject to more political games or awarded to another bidder.

Meanwhile, other technologies are flowing in to fill the vacuum. Microwave distributions, satellite master antenna systems and others are gaining ground, primarily because, unlike cable, they are not subject to local regulation.

There are exceptions to this scenario—in many cities local officials and cable operators negotiated satisfactory and economically sensible franchise arrangements. But there are too many other places where the promise of cable has degenerated into charges of political favoritism, economic extortion, broken commitments, and poor service.

Common sense suggests a national cable policy that preserves local autonomy while setting national guidelines for governing cable telecommunications that serve the public interest.

Congress is now considering a bill that would do just that. The bill would protect the public's stake in wider access to cable services by establishing uniform guidelines—a national regulatory framework that fairly defines the rights and obligations of both local governments and cable operators.

The bill would allow cable to compete with other technologies by freeing operators of some of the more unreasonable uneconomic demands of franchising authorities. Stability would be ensured because franchise renewals would depend on satisfactory performance, not on back-room deals or on meeting escalating local demands.

The cities would be big winners. They would be allowed to charge franchise fees of up to 5 percent of revenues—67 percent more than the Federal Communications Commission now permits. Last year such fees added over $150 million to city treasuries.

The cable revolution could finally become a reality with passage of this bill. Today's chaos would be replaced with a fair, balanced regulatory framework that would ensure public access to a technology that offers wider information and entertainment options as well as the advanced consumer services of the future.●

ARMENIAN MEMORIAL DAY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1984

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my distinguished colleague, Hon. CHARLES PASHAYAN, JR. of the 17th District of California, in commemorating Armenian Martyrs' Day.

April 24, 1984 marks the 69th anniversary of the ruthless Turkish massacre of the Armenian people. Between 1915 and 1923 more than 1.5 million Armenians perished in Turkey, and the descendants of those few who survived have to this day borne the horrors and the scars left from this genocide.

Almost seven decades after this heinous crime against their forefathers, those of Armenian descent are continuing their fight for recognition, retribution, and justice. To this day, the Republic of Turkey continues its campaign of denying the Armenian genocide of 1915-23, and this denial is a distortion of recorded history. However, it is public knowledge that our own State Department has irrefutable evidence in its own files of the Armenian genocide, along with Ambassador Henry Morgenthau's eyewitness reports which were cabled to the State Department at the time of the genocide.

Turkish efforts to revise history by attempting to erase the atrocities they committed against the Armenians must be thwarted, and in observing Armenian Martyrs' Day, we insure in large measure that the massacre of more than 1½ million Armenians will not be forgotten.

As a Member of Congress who has a large Armenian-American constituency in my 11th Congressional District of Illinois, I join my colleagues in commemorating this tragic event in world history, and in paying tribute to the memory and martyrdom of the innocent victims of the Armenian genocide.●

BEING SNOOKERED ON CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder the American people are confused about our policy in Central America: it's riddled with contradictions. While we preach respect for international law and democratic choice, we spurn the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and mine the territorial waters of neighboring Nicaragua.

You do not need to support Nicaragua's junta—which I do not—to oppose an absurd policy of not-so-secret military intervention. If we want to stop the reach of Cuba and the Soviet Union into our own backyard, then let us use the tools which work—not the weapons which fail. I do not suggest that we cut and run, but that we rather offer a civilized presence.

In the words of former Mexican diplomat Carlos Fuentes, let us remember that we will only win the fight for the partnership of our Central American neighbors when we "* * * equate freedom with bread, schools, hospitals, national independence, and a sense of dignity." Food, education, and medicine—not guns, bribes, and mines—should form the struts of our security bridge to the south.

I further commend to my colleagues the following Richard Cohen opinion article, "Contradictions," which shows why the Reagan administration's current policy is either callous, deceitful, foolish—or all three.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 25, 1984]

"CONTRA"DICTIONS

(By Richard Cohen)

Just imagine you are thinking about enlisting in the CIA-funded army now at war with the Sandinistas. Imagine, further, that you are interested in the contras not because the CIA will put a meal in your belly but because you so loathe the Sandinista regime you are willing to fight—which could mean to die—to topple it.

Now imagine you are the CIA recruitment officer. What do you say? Do you say that the contras will be used only to put pressure on the Sandinista regime? Do you say that the United States only wants to ensure that Nicaragua will relax press censorship, hold free elections and cease exporting revolution to El Salvador?

Now you are once again the potential contra, mulling over enlistment. Would you risk your life to stop Nicaragua from sending arms to the Salvadoran guerrillas? A lot of you care about El Salvador. Would you risk your life to end press censorship in Nicaragua itself. Hah! It's not the ACLU Brigade you're considering. Okay, would you risk your life so that Nicaragua has free elections? Did I hear the word loco?

This is what the Reagan administration is basically asking us to believe. United States policy, in so far as it can be discerned, is not to topple the Nicaraguan government, but to reform it—elections, a free press—and to force it to cease aiding the El Salvador guerrillas. If Nicaragua does all that, it not only will go to OAS heaven, but we will treat the Sandinista regime as any other.

The trouble, of course, is that no one is going to risk his life to implement a series of reforms. Men who fight, fight to win—and winning means a triumphal march into Managua. It means victory, a new government and the spoils of war, including, you can just bet, a regime that will censor the press and not hold elections—just like the one the Sandinistas toppled.

So either the administration is deceiving the contras, or it's deceiving us. It's not playing straight with someone. If a guess is allowed, we are the ones being snookered. There is just too vast an American military buildup going on in Central America merely to effect a reform in Nicaragua. The contra army alone has tripled in the last year and now boosts 15,000 men. Honduras has been turned into a palm-shrouded aircraft carrier. the jungle reverberates with the sound of American air bases being built.

There is, though, a third possibility—the administration is snookering itself. Possibly it thinks it can call the whole thing off—that it can create armies and militarize Central America and then make it all disappear if and when the Sandinistas become Rotarians. History, though, proves otherwise.

In the first place, every army the CIA ever created is either still in place (the golden triangle of Southeast Asia) or, more rationally, has turned to drug smuggling. Either way, through, men who try to topple their own government have a hard time going home again. The contras, in one form or another, will not go away.

And secondly, militarization does not take place in a vacuum. The militarization of Honduras will weaken its nascent democracy. Costa Rica, the Lebanon of Central America, will—like the real Lebanon—get drawn into a regional war not of its own making. (Already, like the PLO, the contras under Eden Pastora are using it as a base.) As for Nicaragua, it has responded to contras pressure with its own militarization. This is what the Salvador left has done, too. Since the Reagan administration started to squeeze the pincers, the number of guerrillas has increased, doubling in the last year alone.

So there you have it, contras are being told they are fighting to topple the Sandinista regime; the American public is being told the contras are fighting just to pressure Nicaragua, and the Reagan administration is telling itself it can, when it wants, simply pull the plug on the whole thing.

An administration that lies to get men to die is callous. One that lies to its own people is immoral. One that lies to itself is a fool. If power politics were hockey, the administration would get the hat trick. It appears to be doing all three.●

KIM COLLINS WINS VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, every year, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and their ladies auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy contest. This contest is designed to promote the ideals of a democratic system of government among our youth. Over 300,000 high school students participated this year in this national competition. I'm proud to announce that Kim Collins, who is from the city of Griffin in my district, has delivered the winning speech for the State of Georgia. Kim, who is 17 years old, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Collins of Griffin. She plans to pursue a career in journalism and her speech is a strong indication that she'll be successful in that area.

It's a great pleasure to present to my colleagues the speech that Kim gave to the VFW. It reminds all of us that ideals such as responsibility and loyalty are still present in the attitudes and values of our youth. As this younger generation grows older and assumes future leadership roles, it's reassuring to know that there are young adults like Kim who believe in and will uphold the guarantee of our basic rights: the Constitution. The text of the speech follows:

MY ROLE IN UPHOLDING OUR CONSTITUTION

The other day, as I was waiting for my grandfather to close his store, I glanced outside the window and noticed an elderly man crossing the street. In one hand, he firmly grasped what seemed to be an ordinary cane. But upon closer examination, one could see that the cane was handcrafted of the finest white oak. The unseen characteristics of the old man's cane provided the durability needed to give strength to the cane's security. To that man, his cane was his security; it supported him when his legs were weak. It strengthened him, enabling him to putter here and there. To that man, his cane was a concrete object upon which he could rely, and the cane shared the weight of his burdens.

We, the youth of America, are like that cane. We are America's cane. We support her, stand by her, strengthen her, and carry her. "But how," one might ask, "How can I, one teen out of many, uphold my constitution?"

I see my first and major support as a value one. It was with moral values that our constitution was written; it was upon strong beliefs in ethical principles that our Bill of Rights was framed. The constitution is based on fair principles; it does not delineate anyone, yet it protects the dignity and freedom of every American citizen. If I am to strive for excellence, then I must abide by certain principles and standards, such as honesty, virtue, love, respect and faith. And by doing so, I shall set an example for tomorrow's youth. I will not condone dishonesty, whether it is cheating on a test or exaggerating on a college entrance application. But I will hold my temper when I am tempted to tell my mother that she is wrong. I will continue to believe in my creed and my God, even when tempted to stray away from him. Only good men can achieve great things. Teens like me just live by values in order to support America's Constitution.

My second role is education. To achieve great things requires a strongly developed mind. It is the informed citizen who makes wise decisions; wise decisions which may include electing the best man for Student Body President, being asked to defend a minority, or solving an overcrowded lunchroom problem in Student Council. The informed citizen is also one who makes learning an everyday habit. Informed citizens are those who continue their student role throughout life—always learning, analyzing, solving. I must be willing to accept new ideas to understand the constant changing of my flexible constitution.

My third role is responsibility. The man who just sits and thinks, just sits and thinks; he does nothing! I must be willing to put my values and education to work by accepting responsibilities, such as being a safe, sober, defensive driver, paying my fair share of taxes, and contributing to a community cause. Even though my Constitution protects everyone, I must remember that a hungry man has fewer rights than a fortunate one. Through such organizations as the Salvation Army, or even a local church group, I can give the necessary essentials to those less fortunate so that they may one day share in the bounties of liberty. Man must labor to achieve great things.

To uphold my constitution, I must not only preach a good sermon, I must live one. I will continue my search for knowledge and understanding and I shall willingly accept the responsibilities of adulthood.

Just as the cane supported the old man, I help to support America. But just as the cane's durability depends on the wood from which it is made, America relies on the quality of her people. As a teenager, I must first become a good person; then I must become a responsible citizen; then I will be a protector of the source of my freedom—my United States Constitution.●

SOVIET UNION'S CONSISTENT DENIAL OF THE BASIC FREEDOM FOR ITS MANY CITIZENS

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, as a democratic nation, we possess an innate sense of empathy toward human rights practices around the world. This longstanding concern is a matter of record and continues to be of the utmost priority. The freedom and well-being of those less fortunate than ourselves is of significant importance and it prompts me once again to discuss the issue of human rights in the Soviet Union.

A matter that has been proven to be the antithesis of our own feelings is the Soviet Union's consistent denial of the basic freedom for its many citizens. It is a never-ending struggle for those in the U.S.S.R. whose sole desire is to enjoy basic civil and political liberties. Recent trends have provided the impetus for a renewed sense of urgency.

The problem of immigration which I am speaking has been growing increasingly worse. In 1979, 51,320 Jews were able to leave the U.S.S.R. and immigrate elsewhere. Compare this to an alltime low of 1,314 in 1983. And the requests are rising. In addition, in January 1983, only 81 individuals were granted exit visas, initiating a trend which will result with less than 1,000 emmigrants for the year—a two-thirds reduction from 1982. This figure is not indicative of all those who desire imigration, however, since thousands are not even able to obtain a definite refusal; they are denied access to the application process itself.

I am compelled to draw to the attention of Congress the plight of Yevgeny Liberman in the Soviet Union who is suffering as a result of his desire to freely worship the Lord. In November 1973, Mr. Liberman, a construction engineer who lives with his wife, daughter, and parents in a two-room apartment, applied for emigration papers from the Soviet Union. In March 1974, he became one of thousands of refuseniks denied a visa because of inspecific reasons. The excuse given to Yevgeny was secrecy.

Yevgeny's refusal came earlier than most because of the nature of his application. His name was immediately recognized as one of the 13 organizers of the Symposium on Jewish Culture, which was to be held in December 1976. This nonpolitical symposium, to which professors from many countries were invited, fell victim to official harassment, and Yevgeny himself was arrested. Even before his arrest, his home was searched and his material

was confiscated. The offending items were musical scores of Hebrew songs, films, and tapes, about Jewish culture.

Mr. Liberman is only one of many Soviet refuseniks who has been denied those guarantees we so often take for granted here at home. Mr. Liberman is a hard-working man who is being denied a basic freedom because of his belief. Their applications have been repeatedly refused, in spite of the fact that Mr. Liberman's brother Yuli has lived in Israel for 5 years.

Our Constitution has as its foundation the belief that each individual "is endowed with certain inalienable rights" upon which government, as defender of the common welfare, cannot encroach. In a world as interdependent as ours, it seems hypocritical for us to ignore the plight of those citizens of other nations whose sole crime is the pursuit of those liberties among which we have included the right to be free from government violations of one's personal safety and integrity; the undeniable right to the fulfillment of such vital needs as food, shelter, health care, and education; and finally the right to enjoy civil and political liberties.

In reflection of the recent feast of Passover and the joy and promise of Easter still fresh in our minds, I am moved to pray for Yevgeny, and hope that these words, before Congress, can bring him closer to the freedom that grants me the ability to address you today.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. MARGARETTE S. MILLER

HON. NORMAN SISISKY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Speaker, on April 7, Dr. Margarette S. Miller, of Portsmouth, VA, died of cancer, 8 years short of realizing her dream.

Dr. Miller's dream was to see a recreation in 1992 of the National Public School Celebration of 1892 which prompted Francis Bellamy to pen his 23 words we now know as the Pledge of Allegiance.

Dr. Miller devoted 48 years to proving that the author of the Pledge of Allegiance to the U.S. flag was Bellamy. In the course of her crusade, Dr. Miller became the authority on the Pledge of Allegiance.

Her quest began in 1936 when a campaign was begun to credit the pledge to the pen of James B. Upham. Being a skeptic, Miller wrote to a newspaper in Rome, NY, to check out the information it had on a hometown boy named Bellamy. The reply convinced her that Bellamy just possibly was the author of the pledge. From that day on, Dr. Miller was hooked.

In 1942, the 50th anniversary of the pledge, Dr. Miller established the Bellamy Award. This annual award was to present an American flag to a school in a different State each year.

Dr. Miller has been honored many times around the country. She is listed in a dozen volumes such as "Who's Who in America," the "Dictionary of International Biography" and "2,000 Notable Women."

In an interview shortly before her death, Dr. Miller recalled that while she was growing up, she felt that "everything had been done, that there was nothing left for me to do. Then I made this discovery, believing that somebody had to set the record straight."

As a result of setting the record straight, she proved beyond a reasonable doubt that Francis Bellamy penned the original pledge, and her work prompted the U.S. Flag Association in 1939 to conclude that the patriotic oath was, in fact, written by Bellamy. The Library of Congress released a report in 1957 concurring with the Flag Association decision.

Mr. Speaker, although Dr. Miller's dream never was realized, we owe her a debt of thanks for restoring patriotism around the country through her work.●

A TRIBUTE TO THE CALVERT COUNTY DEMOCRATIC WOMEN'S CLUB 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to bring to your attention, the inspiring contributions of the Calvert County Democratic Women's Club as they celebrate their 50th anniversary of service to the Democratic Party.

In 1934, at a time when few women shared equal status with their male counterparts, a group of concerned and determined women challenged the myths and stereotypes of the day, forming the Calvert County Democratic Women's Club. The dedication of these ladies can be attested by their accomplishments.

I would like to bring special recognition to the women who have displayed their leadership for this club and have served as president. From 1934, when Mrs. Joseph Lyons was elected as the first president, to the current president, Mrs. Elizabeth Gott, let me share with you the names of the past presidents: Mrs. Robert Meade, Mrs. Claude Turner, Mrs. Willard Ward, Mrs. Earl Hicks, Mrs. Harold Gibson, Mrs. Emma Jane Southard, Mrs. Mary Sullivan, Mrs. Everard Briscoe, Mrs. Oscar Carpenter, Mrs. Carroll King, Miss Mildred Cox, Mrs. Wilhelmina Lyons, Mrs. Patricia Lavato, and Mrs. Barbara Stinnett.

As we reflect upon 50 years of changes in our country's history, from model T's to space shuttles, let us also recognize the integral part this organization has played in shaping our destiny and progress. They had a vision of purpose, dedication to principle, an obligatory sense of duty, and pride in our great United States. Throughout the past 50 years, they have unselfishly devoted time and energy to the preservation of the goals of the Democratic Party. They have reached out into the community to educate and involve the citizens in the electorial process, and today stand proud of their outstanding record of achievement.

The Constitution of the United States gives us the right to freedom, and in return asks that we give our loyalty, participation and interest for the good of our country. The members of the Calvert County Democratic Women's Club, past and present, exemplify this pledge, and I am proud to share this occasion in honoring each of them.●

A.L.T.E.R.

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, the remarks printed below on the subject of congressional tenure are those of Mr. Fred Meeker of Burlington, IA. I am a longtime proponent of limited tenure for Members, and I have introduced legislation to this effect during the current Congress. Although my proposal, House Joint Resolution 189, which would amend the Constitution to set a limit of five House terms and two Senate terms for any one person, differs from Mr. Meeker's proposal that House and Senate Members alike be limited to 12 years of service in each House, I find Mr. Meeker's general argument in favor of limited tenure stimulating and useful and recommend this reading to my colleagues:

A.L.T.E.R.: AMEND LEGISLATIVE TENURE ENABLING RESPONSIVENESS

(By Fred Meeker)

This is a statement advocating a constitutional amendment to limit members of Congress to twelve years service in each house. Political Action Committees (PACs) are expected to spend $120 million on congressional candidates alone in 1984. That amounts to nearly $2 per voter and is a 50% increase over 1982 with no end in sight. The vast majority of this money goes to incumbents. Incumbents also have many other advantages such as name identification; services to constitutents; large, full-time staffs; and free postage. These advantages, and others, combine to create overwhelming preferences for

incumbents. The result is lopsided or even uncontested elections which only contribute to the greed and apathy consuming us. Why bother to vote if the incumbent almost always (about 90% of the time) wins anyway? Also, with few younger models in Congress, the rampant political apathy among our youth should come as no surprise. The key becomes mediocrity. If an incumbent makes few waves, he is virtually assured of remaining in office indefinitely.

A treatment of the symptoms might include public financing of campaigns. However, if public financing means opponents could not outspend their incumbents, it may prove only another incumbent advantage. Another step in the right direction may be four-year terms for representatives. With this, representatives could serve at least a couple of years as statespersons rather than all their time as politicians seeking reelection as is the case with the current two-year terms.

Even the possible improvements of public financing and four-year terms do not sufficiently deal with the problems of reelection concerns, special interest influence, and incumbent advantages. Reform of the seniority system is necessary to insure a more responsive Congress. There are some options. We might elect members of Congress for life. This would eliminate reelection concerns and probably lessen the effects of special interests, but it would remove government even farther from the people. On the other extreme, we might elect members of Congress only for single terms, but this would not allow for much experience or reward for a job well done. Fortunately, there is a third alternative, a middleground between life and single terms. This compromise is supported by 60% of those surveyed in a Gallup Poll. It is a constitutional amendment to limit members of Congress to twelve years service in each house.

Opponents of this limit on legislative tenure will claim that the people's choice should be returned indefinitely. However, representative government evolved to remove the process from the impulses of the masses in the first place. Besides, we now have the technology to allow everyone to vote on every issue. Few would favor such direct democracy, knowing the political views of our neighbors. So the people's choice argument is found wanting.

Others will claim incumbents deserve return for a job well done. This is true to an extent and is why we are not advocating single terms. However, it also ignores the fact that there are many in each constituency who could do the job as well or better than the incumbent. They do not run because the aforementioned incumbent advantages render such a contest virtually an exercise in futility. Then when the incumbent finally dies or retires, a disgraceful number suddenly emerge from the woodwork to take his place.

Still others will argue that a twelve-year limit is too restrictive. With twelve years allowed in each house, an individual could still serve a total of twenty-four years in Congress—a whole generation. Too restrictive?

Historically, the seniority system developed as a result of the post-Civil War one-party South. Prior to that, tradition held that members of Congress serve usually only one or two terms. Indeed, had the Founding Fathers foreseen a time of greater life expectancy or the seniority system they may well have limited legislative tenure at the outset. Our first president, George Washington, established the two-term tradition for the executive branch, and now it is limited by amendment. Thomas Jefferson believed, "Rotation in public office is more reflective of democratic intent." Andrew Jackson wrote, "More is lost by long continuance of men in public office than is to be generally gained by their experience." Harry Truman specifically endorsed the limit saying, "Twelve years of Washington is enough for any man."

The current decline in the average length of service of members of Congress must not be construed as the problem solving itself. A final term is still needed in which members can rise above politics to statespersonship. There would, of course, be a "Grandfather Clause" to allow those elected under the antiquated system to remain as long as their constituents would tolerate it.

There are obstacles to the passage of limited tenure. For example, senior members of Congress are in the best position to effect the change, but will tend to be among those least likely to support it. Also, citizen groups that might otherwise support the amendment will be reluctant due to reliance upon senior members for passage of their pet programs. Furthermore, while the populace recognizes the seniority system as a problem, they regard their own anachronistic member as the exception. Voting against persons of such long standing becomes perceived as almost Un-American. Future citizens who will have come to accept limited tenure as commonplace will surely regard this paradox as curious.

Only a few voters in each constituency making limited tenure their primary consideration will eventually result in the change. It remains to increase support in Congress for the amendment either by conversion or replacement. As Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence, "Whenever government becomes destructive of these ends (life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness) it is the duty of the people to alter . . . that government." A.L.T.E.R.: Amend Legislative Tenure Enabling Responsiveness.●

THE FENDER GUITAR AND UNFAIR FOREIGN COMPETITION

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, this is the story of a U.S. industry which once enjoyed a preeminent position in the world but has recently run up against stiff foreign competition, much of it unfair. It is a case study of the problems and challenges facing the U.S. economy.

The Fender electric guitar has been synonymous with rock n' roll music from its inception. When Buddy Holly first appeared on the Ed Sullivan show in 1957, he played a Fender Stratocaster. The list of artists who play Fender guitars includes Eric Clapton, Jimi Hendrix, Bruce Springsteen, Carl Wilson of the Beach Boys, and Dire Straits.

The Fender guitar was invented in 1948 by a radio repairman in his garage in Fullerton, CA, located in the district I am privileged to represent in the Congress. Leo Fender sold the company to CBS Musical Instruments in 1965.

All of us are aware of the problems facing many domestic industries due to imports. The automobile and steel industries are the most visible, but the challenges are equal or greater in areas such as piano and guitar imports. As recently as 1979, the Fender facility in Fullerton employed 914 people. As of this month, that number is down to 384.

In the case of Fender, there is more to the import problem than just the dragging effect of an overvalued dollar on exports and the boost it gives to imports. The problem is compounded by unfair practices of foreign importers, which in this case includes infringement on trademarks of guitar headshapes and bodies.

Fender has been the best-selling electric guitar in the world for many decades. Copying of the popular product began in the mid-1960's. Since headshapes were not patentable as registered trademarks at the time, no infringement action could be taken. Furthermore, the ability of manufacturers to seek protection through State laws of unfair competition was hampered by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Sears and Compco decisions of 1964.

In the 1970's, as changes in trademark laws permitted coverage for headshapes, Fender filed to register the two major guitar headshapes. When the applications were published, around 50 Japanese companies opposed them. A settlement was reached, however, in which the Japanese acknowledged the validity of the Fender trademarks while CBS agreed not to object to Japanese use of any of five specific headshapes.

The headshape registrations were issued in 1981 and CBS has been trying to enforce them at ports of entry, but more must be done by U.S. customs officials and others even though some shipments have been stopped. While the situation was relatively stable until the end of last year, it has become clear that some Japanese importers plan to expand their U.S. sales through use of electric guitar headshapes not allowed by the settlement, thus infringing on the CBS/Fender trademark.

In a sense, this situation is worse than that facing the automobile industry. In the case of autos, the Japanese are bringing in their own models and capturing market share on that basis. With the Fender electric guitar, the Japanese are bringing in identical copies, both headshape and body, against the American product.

The Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held 5 days of hearings last year

on copyright, patent, and trademark infringement by foreign companies. While these and other legislative activities must go forward, I intend to work with like-minded colleagues to make the appropriate executive branch agencies more aware of the need to crack down on shipments of imports which violate U.S. trademark restrictions.●

REDLINE LOW-INCOME NEIGHBORHOODS FOR MAIL DELIVERY

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, as the House knows, the U.S. Postal Service delivers the mail 6 days a week. They do that for two reasons: One is that you need to deliver the mail 6 days a week in order to provide an acceptable level of service; the other is that the law requires that the mail be delivered 6 days a week. Every now and then we have a commission or some other group of dignitaries recommend that delivery service be reduced—we even had a Governor or two of the Postal Service who seemed a bit wishy-washy on the subject. So a few years ago we settled the matter by simply prohibiting, by law, any reduction in the number of days each week that mail shall be delivered. The requirement is in the law in two places right now, so you would think that would be sufficiently discouraging to all but the most determined enemies of effective postal services.

Alas, such is not the case: The "Consumer Advocate," an employee of the Postal Rate Commission whose statutory obligation is to "represent the interests of the general public" in Postal Rate Commission proceedings, has introduced testimony in the current postal rate case outlining his interpretation of the public's interest and how he will go about "protecting" it. The Consumer Advocate's expert witness is Mr. Leonard Goodman. I thought my colleagues ought to know how Mr. Goodman views the "public interest."

Mr. Goodman first points out that the statutory prohibition against reducing mail delivery service expires on September 30, 1984, and so, in his words, "will not be in effect in the test year now before the Commission." The test year, I might add, is the imaginary year upon which the rate case is presupposed. So, free from Congress clutches, and determined to save the Postal Service uncounted millions of dollars, our public defender, Mr. Goodman, recommends that the Postal Service simply "redline" low-income neighborhoods in the United States and cease to deliver mail every day in those neighborhoods. Where household income is less than $25,000 and mail volume is light, Mr. Goodman says, mail would simply not be delivered as often as in higher income areas. Since these folks receive only a letter or two a day, and are not among the elite who are deluged with credit card offers and mail order catalogs, Mr. Goodman will—again I use his words—"push the deferred deliveries to the rear" and hop on out to the plush neighborhoods to deliver mail every day.

Now do not jump to the conclusion that Mr. Goodman is short on political judgement. Not for a minute. He knows, and is even kind enough to say, that there just might possibly be someone, somewhere who would consider redlining less opulent neighborhoods to be "socially unwise and unfair" and that the Postal Service should proceed "cautiously." Our public defender even goes so far as to suggest that before redlining American families who have incomes below $25,000, Congress should be given an opportunity to appropriate the money to pay the U.S. Postal Service to deliver mail every day in the redlined neighborhoods. I am sure the House is grateful to Mr. Goodman for permitting us an opportunity to play a role, however small, in these matters of public policy.

I have an alternative suggestion. Instead of appropriating money to permit the redlined citizens to get their mail, the House might simply appropriate the Postal Rate Commission's annual operating budget, as we do with Defense, State, Agriculture, and other agencies. Right now, the Commission gets its money from the Postal Service fund without congressional supervision. Having read the Consumer Advocate's ideas on how to "protect" the public interest, I think it might be a better idea, and most certainly in the public interest, to appropriate the Commission's budget annually.●

REPORT ON EDUCATION CONFERENCE

HON. JAMES R. "JIM" OLIN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. OLIN. Mr. Speaker, recently I have been holding education fora in my district in Virginia. These meetings give me the chance to meet with parents, teachers, administrators, and other concerned citizens about education issues. I have been very pleased with the number of people attending these fora. They have been very valuable to me. I hear what the people of my district think about education.

I would like to share a summary of the comments I heard at my most recent education forum in Weyers Cave, Va., with my colleagues here in the House. This summary includes comments saying what is good about education as well as what needs to be changed. I think it is very informative.

JIM OLIN'S EDUCATION FORUM, BLUE RIDGE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, MARCH 31, 1984

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

About 150 parents, teachers, principals, administrators, students and interested citizens from Harrisonburg, Staunton and Augusta, Rockingham, and Highland Counties met at Blue Ridge Community College on a beautiful Saturday morning to discuss educational issues. What is good about our schools and what needs to changed and improved? The following is a summary of the participants' oral and written comments:

What is good about our schools

Everyone has the opportunity to get a free education which is directed to individual needs.

We try to educate all students of diverse backgrounds, regardless of abilities, disabilities and handicaps.

Our schools reflect the good aspects of our society—a mix of people, a force for the transfer of social programs and values.

Our schools provide a good balance of academic subjects and extracurricular activities, opportunity to develop leadership and artistic, musical, and athletic skills.

Schools have been adaptable, have kept pace with technological and social changes.

Vocational-Technical programs are good. So are college preparatory programs, special education, adult education and school libraries.

Headstart and Chapter I have given early help to children who might have later learning problems.

The school lunch program is good.

The drop-out rate has decreased.

There is community and parent support for the schools.

And last, but not least, the majority of our teachers and administrators are hard-working, well-educated, caring and dedicated to providing high quality education to their students.

Some suggestions for change and improvement

Program

Provide more extra help in early years—qualified teacher aides and smaller classes.

Daycare and after school care as part of the school program (in recognition of the high percentage of working mothers.)

More challenging requirements and demands at all levels, especially in verbal and quantitative (math) skills and science.

Fine arts, vocational and physical education must not be neglected.

More help for the average student.

We still need good programs for the emotionally disturbed, learning disabled, physically handicapped and gifted.

A seven period day in high school with a variety of electives is needed.

Less use of visual aids, more field trips.

Minority students should not be shunted into non-academic courses or slow classes.

Increase student awareness of social issues and the business system.

Place less emphasis on competition and more on creativity and individual development.

Emphasize cognitive learning more than memorization, getting good grades and passing tests. Revise the grading system to make

it fairer and a measure of real learning. (Some kids stay out of science and math because it's hard to get good grades.)

Learning should be individualized. There is too much emphasis on "assembly line" education.

One suggestion was that we provide general education for all up to age 14 and then an apprentice system for those who choose it. But do not base a student's future on standardized test scores.

Administration

Better communication among administrators, teachers, parents and students.

Must keep classes smaller, especially in elementary school.

Need for stricter discipline, especially in junior high school.

Need for more and better guidance counsellors, especially at the elementary level.

Need for better health services, school nurses and preventive programs. (Mental and physical health.)

Teachers

Need higher pay. (To attract and hold talented people.)

Should have a greater voice in policy making.

Need a better retirement plan.

Need more authority in the classroom.

Have too much paperwork—give them time to teach.

Should have on-going training, help for the (few) weak teachers.

Need to be trained to motivate students and to make the material more relevant to them.

Need programs for exchange of good teaching ideas—from county to county, state to state.

The tenure system needs revision and a "rational" merit pay system should be examined.

Parents and the Family

Should prepare children for school and teach them to want to learn.

More parent participation is needed—in academic as well as other areas.

Should teach religion at home.

The ten small discussion groups looked at the following questions:

1. What should the federal role be in education?

Views ranged from "Get the federal government out of education" and "Reform should start at the local level", to a proposal that the federal government should support one-third of the cost of education, the state one-third and local government one-third. Some other ideas were that the federal government should:

Provide the moral and intellectual leadership and inspiration and set national goals in education. Education is a national concern, it should be a top priority.

Conduct research on effective teacher methods and student motivation, gather and disseminate the data.

Educators should have more input into federal projects.

The Department of Education should be expanded.

Equalize education spending among different areas of the country and among special groups. A common core of learning could be funded.

Provide leadership in setting up new programs, such as handicapped programs and integration.

Fully fund federally mandated programs.

Recognize the professionalism of teachers and help get teachers' salaries competitive with other professionals. This is crucial if we are to keep and attract good teachers. Some suggestions on how to do this were:

Special federal funding for the training of science and math teachers.

Providing of special tax deductions for teachers without increasing the bureaucracy.

Providing of tax incentives for business and industry participation in teacher training and/or hiring teachers in the summer.

Providing highly competitive scholarship and student loans to prospective teachers, loans to be forgiven if the student enters teaching.

2. Which existing programs should be expanded? Eliminated?

Expand: Headstart; chapters I and II; school lunch; vocational programs; programs for the gifted; programs which help early identification of learning problems; special education "PL 94-192 students are increasing at an alarming rate"; new guidelines need to be established to bring the numbers into line with the funding; and implementation of Title IX programs.

Cut back: Impact aid needs to be re-evaluated and Job training Partnership Act (JTPA) has too much money.

3. Should there be federal standards in education?

Yes, we should have national standardized tests for teachers. No, passing a written test does not make a good teacher.

Student standards vary too much throughout the country. Possibly we need a nation-wide standard to challenge students. But, we need to keep local autonomy and control over curriculum. "There is strength in diversity."

4. How much do we as a nation/community value education? Is there a national commitment to it?

Teachers' pay is way below those working in industry and business.

We reward athletic ability way over academic ability, for example in terms of community interest and scholarships.

Parents don't value education as highly now as they did formerly.

Young people can now get jobs without high school or college diplomas.

With both parents working there is less involvement in school.

5. How do we as a nation/community view our teachers?

There are good and bad teachers. Teachers are human.

Low salaries for teachers reflect low prestige and a low view of teachers in the community.

Teachers are not considered professionals but as caretakers, not producers of a product.

The public doesn't realize how hard teachers work.

6. How can we attract and keep high caliber teachers?

Weed out poor teachers before they get a teaching degee.

Give teachers decent starting salaries. Good students will not be attracted to or stay in teaching if salaries are low. Some teachers' families qualify for food stamps, school lunch and housing subsidies!

Society needs to change its concept and expectations of teachers. Their private life should be their own.

Avoid teacher burn out.

(Also, see question No. 1 proposals.)

7. Are we willing to spend more money at federal, state and/or local levels to increase teachers' salaries?

Yes, people are willing to spend more for good teachers.

Federal and State governments must assist in funding for teachers' salaries. localities cannot afford all that is needed. The real estate tax is inadequate.

Place an assessment, earmarked for education, on the federal income tax on a graduated scale and return it to the local schools on the basis of school population.

Pass the American Defense Education Act. (ADEA)

8. The National Commission on Education pointed out some deficiencies in American education. Do these apply to your school?

It was generally felt that the report was too negative, but there was some agreement:

We need better ways of motivating students. There is a "me-oriented" outlook. Too much T.V., too little self discipline.

Sometimes too much emphasis is placed on extra-curricular activities.

Math and science requirements could be strengthened, but this might result in more drop-outs.

Computer literacy should be promoted with exploratory courses, keyboard classes in summer, tutored programs.

Foreign language study should be encouraged and started earlier. "America is a disgrace compared to other countries."

Do away with social promotion.

Try a flexible school year.

Discipline is not a big problem in this area.

9. Are we willing to spend more money at federal, state and/or local levels to correct the above mentioned weaknesses? Some comments on funding for education:

Education needs more support from all three levels of government. There should be more clear cut definitions of guidelines and responsibilities. All three levels need to work together.

Federal support should be dependable, "Don't jerk us around every two years."

Some federal "strings" are reasonable, but local autonomy should be protected.

Block grants have been good. Per pupil funding is preferable to grant writing, but smaller districts may suffer. There should be a financial floor.

Spend less on the United Nations and foreign aid.

Too much money is being spent (and wasted) for defense, the military and weapons. "How many bombs do we need?"

If the federal government reduced taxes, there would be more local monies available for education. Local money goes further.

10. What can the individual citizen do to muster more community support for our schools?

Encourage more people to get personally involved in the schools. Start a program which brings in parents, computer experts, college teachers, lawyers, businessmen, policemen, musicians, artists and the elderly. Get them into the classrooms.

Ask the media to give more and better publicity to the schools—feature articles, T.V. programs—on academic programs, the library, science projects and other programs as well as music and sports. Perhaps the schools need a public relations person.

Participate in the PTA, visit and speak with teachers or attend school board meetings. Tell your elected local officials how you feel about good education. Contact your state and national representatives.

Elected school boards might improve funding for education. "Keep the taxes down" as the basis for local political campaigns hurts the schools.

In general, work to build pride in your schools—among students, teachers, parents and the whole community.

Thanks again to all of you who attended the forum and those who helped plan it. Special thanks to Blue Ridge Community College for allowing us to use their fine facilities. Education is truly an investment in our country's future.●

FIFTH PRECINCT COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF NEW YORK CITY PRESENTS COP-OF-THE-YEAR AWARDS

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a distinguished and outstanding citizen of New York City, Police Officer John Smith. This dedicated man will receive the Cop-of-the-Year Award to be presented this evening by the Fifth Precinct Community Council of New York City.

This marks the fifth time the Community Council has presented this award. Each month of the year, one police officer is chosen for performing a courageous deed or for displaying remarkable leadership qualities; Officer Smith has been so distinguished once this year and twice in the past. At the end of the year, a committee chooses the Cop-of-the-Year from the pool of 12 candidates.

I commend the Fifth Precinct Community Council for recognizing the achievements of individual members of the precinct and for enhancing the corporate morale of the precinct. By this action it has renewed the spirit of solidarity that permeates an important multiethnic, multiracial community in New York City.

Police Officer Smith, a member of the force for 12 years, the past 9 with the Fifth Precinct, distinguished himself this year by assisting in the apprehension of a gunman. While on patrol with his partner, he observed a gang member who had fired two shots at another person on Catherine Street. After Smith struggled with the assailant, he wrestled the gun from him. The gun still contained five live rounds and two spent shells. Officer Smith clearly demonstrated his ability to take risks and to act decisively.

Officer Smith, who started his police career at the age of 21, has received other awards and citations including seven excellent police duty awards and four merit awards. Recently he was assigned to the Youth Gang Patrol. In addition to his duties as an officer, Smith is the manager of the Fifth Precinct softball team and is a member of the Board of the Fifth Precinct Club.

Smith is a fine example of an individual who makes the community a strong, healthy, and safe environment in which to live. This man is an asset to his community, both as a keeper of the peace and as a leader of outstanding character whose courageous contributions serve as an inspiration to all of us.●

BILLY MITCHELL, A YOUNG HERO

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the extraordinary rescue made by Billy Mitchell, a young man from Daytona Beach, FL. Billy, a 19-year-old college student, was ending a day of golf recently when he noticed confusion near a pond on the green. As he approached the water's edge, he saw a young boy, 16 months old, and a woman floundering in the water.

Without hesitation, Billy Mitchell dove in, golf cleats and all. Swimming approximately 70 yards, and diving underwater several times to find the young boy who had now lapsed below the surface, Billy's efforts were relentless in finding the child and bringing him to shore for assistance.

Billy then swam back out to save the woman who had first attempted to save the child, but lost footing when the pond dropped off to 15 to 20 feet deep. Both the woman and the child are doing fine thanks to the efforts of Billy Mitchell.

This act of heroism is one that deserves to be commended. There was no doubt in Billy's mind that day as to what he needed to do for his fellow man. It was a decision made without question. I salute Billy Mitchell for his valor, as he helps restore the faith we need in our fellow man.●

JUST WHAT THE ELDERLY NEEDED

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, last night the National Broadcasting Corp. aired the movie "A Doctor's Story" here in Washington. While there are many movies and television programs about doctors and hospitals, this movie was unusual and carried a critical message. Simply, the message was that the elderly have unique health problems and need special care. When they receive that special care both the elderly and their families benefit greatly.

Art Carney effectively portrayed an elderly widower named Harry who suffered from a heart problem and the apparent onslaught of senility. In real life, this is a fairly typical situation which would usually result in an elderly person, such as Harry, being placed in a nursing home.

However, Harry's problem was not senility. His problem was a misdiagnosis of his condition. What is normally taken as an irreversible slip into a loss of mental function and independence was in fact a side effect of his heart medication. A vital being was almost lost.

What saved Harry was his own rugged determination and the help of a physician. Just as Harry was no ordinary person, the physician was not your usual physician. The physician, skillfully portrayed by actor Howard Rollins, Jr., had two elements essential to helping an elderly person. He cared deeply and he was trained in the practice of geriatric medicine. It was that combination that saved Harry from an unnecessary placement in a nursing home, saved his family from the loss of a parent and grandparent, and saved everyone the immense cost of nursing home care.

This movie deserves much credit. It sends several clear messages. Physicians should see that what is critical in serving the elderly is the willingness to care deeply and the capability to better diagnose their health problems. Families of the elderly should walk away believing that what may appear to be an inevitable slip into dependency and a nursing home need not be so. The elderly person should gather some hope that their health problems are treatable. Growing old does not always mean losing independence and going to a nursing home.

Finally, we policymakers must insure that this Nation has sufficient numbers of physicians who have training in geriatric medicine and who can provide the care our elderly so desperately need.

As chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging, I extend my deep appreciation to NBC, to the actors, Art Carney and Howard Rollins Jr., to the director, Peter Levin, and to the producers for giving us a high quality film on the elderly. I would hope that the success of this film will encourage other filmmakers and other networks to make similar efforts to make the public aware of what it means to grow old in America.●

COL. GEORGE S. ROBERTS

HON. ALAN B. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I must report the death of a great American, and a

fellow West Virginian who, through an excellent military career, distinguished himself, his State and his Nation.

Retired Col. George S. Roberts came from my hometown of Fairmont, WV, and, in 1941, at a time that represented great threats to the freedom of America, he became the first black man to be accepted for pilot training by the U.S. Army Air Corps. That accomplishment was only the beginning for Colonel Roberts, whose long career should set a fine example for thousands upon thousands of Americans.

He became the first commander of the famed 99th Fighter Squadron and the first black commander of an integrated Air Force unit at Langley Air Force Base.

Colonel Roberts continued his education and became a professor of air science and tactics at Tuskegee Institute before going on to command the Suwan Air Force Base in Korea. For years, Colonel Roberts served at the very core of the effort to protect America. He served as director of ground radar and the air defense warning system worldwide and was in charge of all fighter aircraft in Vietnam.

Colonel Roberts received much recognition for his years of service. He was the holder of many military decorations including the Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and Commendation Medal as well as service medals with battle stars.

But, this dedicated West Virginian was more than a new breed of military commander and hero. He was a warmhearted man with a conscience for social as well as military service. He was the cofounder of the Hipsters—a support organization that assists persons who have had hip surgery, and he founded the Bereavement Society which assists widows and widowers with adjustment problems. He also belonged to a long list of support organizations from the Arthritis Foundation to Industrial and Educational Councils.

Mr. Speaker, Colonel Roberts is representative of his home State. He desire to serve his country and his love of America asked him to face diversity, difficult challenges and sacrifice. He answered that call and not only met those challenges, he excelled in every aspect of service.

I know many of us are aware of the difficulties Colonel Roberts must have faced in his early career as a man who dared to be first. However, I wonder how many of us would have taken on the challenge of breaking down the barriers of prejudice.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of Colonel Roberts' contributions to the social and military history of America. I am proud of his heritage as a fellow West Virginian, and I hope the example this fine man set with his outstanding career and dedication will not go unnoticed today.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will join me in respectfully noting the passing of a great American and a loyal West Virginian.●

TRIBUTE TO MONSIGNOR PETER O'SULLIVAN

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 19, 1984, the parishioners of St. John Baptist DeLaSalle Catholic Church in Granada Hills, CA, the community, and civic leaders will honor Monsignor Peter O'Sullivan on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood.

Peter O'Sullivan was ordained on June 10, 1934 at Cathedral Thurles. Coming to Los Angeles in 1934, he served under three bishops in the diocese and was named a monsignor by Pope Paul VI in May 1978. Monsignor O'Sullivan was assigned to St. John Baptist DeLaSalle on March 2, 1954, and has been its pastor since that date.

Acknowledged as an innovator and community leader in the San Fernando Valley, he is also considered to be one of the pioneers of the church. Active in Kiwanis and in the Granada Hills Chamber of Commerce, Monsignor O'Sullivan was named Granada Hills Citizen of the Year in 1976. He received the Los Angeles Police Department Certificate of Acknowledgment for his support of community safety.

A vital, moving force in his parish and his community, Monsignor O'Sullivan has earned the devotion, love, and admiration of all who have benefited by his untiring, selfless efforts. I ask the Members to join with me in this tribute on this occasion of the 50th anniversary of the ordination of Monsignor Peter O'Sullivan.●

A TRIBUTE TO MR. WILLIAM DOCHTERMAN

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a good friend of mine, Mr. William Dochterman, who has provided my district with 25 years of dedicated service as the executive director of the Sacramento-El Dorado Medical Society. These last 25 years Sacramento has grown from a mid-sized town to the fourth largest city in California. Amid such expansion, Bill has provided organized medicine with the leadership necessary to cope with the community's increasing needs.

Bill interrupted his college education to serve our country in the Army Air Corps from 1943 to 1946. After the war, Bill came west to finish his schooling at the University of California, Berkeley. A few years later he was hired as an assistant executive secretary at Alameda-Contra Costa Medical Association, and it was only 5 more years before he was offered the director position for which he is now being honored.

Bill has been sentient and responsive to the pulse of organized medicine as a whole. In addition to directing the medical society in my district, Bill has served on the board of directors for several associations: among them the Sacramento Regional Hospital Planning Council, the Sacramento County Heart Association, the California Medical Political Action Committee, and the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce. He also chaired the 1968 California Medical Executives Conference.

Bill enriches every community body he touches, whether he is acting as a community adviser to the Junior League of Sacramento, a council board member for the Boy Scouts of America, or a United Way "New Horizons" committee member. Bill has helped to better Sacramento, and continues to do so in many ways, not the least of them being his strong support of medicare, which has proven to be a worthy form of community assistance in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I know you join me in applauding the outstanding contributions Bill has made and continues to provide for the Sacramento community. Congratulations Bill, on reaching this noteworthy milestone.●

I KNOW WHERE THE BEEF REALLY IS!

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the oft-asked question this year is "Where's the beef?" Well, I have news for Clara Peller and everyone else, I know where the beef is. I not only know, but I am willing to tell. The beef is in the national debt. It now stands at $1.488 trillion—if that is not beefy, I would like to know what is.

Can anyone comprehend the meaning of $1.488 trillion? I would like to put it in simpler terms:

The national debt would purchase 4,907 Wendy's hamburgers, at $1.29 apiece, for every single one of our 235,059,000 Americans.

It would purchase 244 Wendy's hamburgers for every person in the world.

For Americans, the per capita debt equals $6,330.32.

The U.S. per capita debt equals $315.12 for every man, woman, and child on Earth.

According to the Census Bureau, February 1984, the average price for a new single-family home is $94,500. The national debt would purchase 15,746,031 new homes; one new home for every 15 Americans.

According to Consumer Reports, April 1984, the average price for a 1984 four-door Cadillac De Ville is $18,125. The national debt could buy 82,096,551 of these cars; One new Cadillac for every three Americans.

The average price for a 1984, four-door Chevolet Chevette hatchback is $5,616—we could purchase 264,957,264 of these—one for every American.

If the national debt remained fixed at its current level, and $1,000 were paid every second, it would take 17,222 days (or 47 years) to pay off the debt. The total debt would finally be paid in the year A.D. 2031. At $100 per second it would take 172,222 days; 471 years; A.D. 2455. At $1 per second it would take 17,222,222 days, 47,184 years; A.D. 49168.

The national debt in $1 bills would:

Cover 5,939.8 square miles, more than the combined area of Connecticut and Rhode Island.

Stack up 100,984.8 miles high, almost half the distance to the Moon.

End-to-end, extend 144,196,969.6 miles, 51.3 million miles past the Sun.

End-to-end, circle the Earth at the equator 5,790 times.

Weigh 1,518,367.3 tons, 340.8 times the weight of the U.S. Capitol dome.

Weighs more than the combined weight of 15 carriers, 2 battleships, 4 dock-landing ships, 9 amphibious assualt ships, 4 fleet oilers, 2 cruisers, and 12 destroyers.

I think these figures help highlight the staggering magnitude of the national debt. And I think we can all agree that any and all proposals to help wipe out the debt ought to be given serious consideration.

Today I am introducing legislation which provides a simple mechanism to encourage voluntary contributions to help reduce the national debt.

In its book on instructions for preparing one's tax forms, the IRS has a notice under the section on "general information" regarding voluntary contributions to reduce the public debt. It states:

> You may make voluntary contributions to reduce the national debt. Subject to the limitations on charitable contributions, you can deduct this contribution on your 1984 tax return. If you wish to contribute, enclose a separate check in your tax return envelope made payable to Bureau of the Public Debt. Please keep this contribution separate from any amount on your tax return.

Although Public Law 87-58, the "Contributions To Reduce the Public Debt Act" has been in effect since 1961, the above notice was only first included in the IRS instruction booklet in 1982. Since 1961, slightly over $7 million has been contributed.

By way of comparison, the checkoff on the tax form allowing individuals to designate $1 toward Presidential campaigns generally raises between $30 million to $40 million per year, and there is presently a $176.3 million balance in this fund.

It can be argued, of course, that the discrepancy in the two funds can be explained by the fact that the contributions toward the national debt are charitable donations which come out of the taxpayer's own pocket, whereas designations toward the Presidential Election Campaign Fund come out of the general revenue—it seems like you are giving away someone else's money, that is: Uncle Sam's. But where does Uncle Sam get his money? You guessed it—from the taxpayer. This money set aside from the general revenue is the taxpayers' money and it is that much less going toward other Government-funded programs.

Another explanation for the discrepancy could be that we have made it so simple for people to designate $1 toward Presidential compaigns because of the visibility of the checkoff notice right on the tax form—rather than having a notice printed in the instruction manual for filling out the form.

I am not suggesting that we have contributions toward the national debt come out of the general revenue—although I do feel this would be a far more worthy cause than funding so many pie-in-the-sky Presidential campaigns. What I am suggesting—and what my bill provides—is that we give this voluntary contribution as much visibility on the tax form, as we give the Presidential election campaign fund. My bill will give taxpayers the opportunity to designate any portion of a tax refund due them toward a special account to help reduce the national debt. If the taxpayer will not be receiving a refund, he can still contribute by sending in a separate check with his tax form. Taxpayers will be able to contribute any amount they wish from $1 on up. I repeat—this money will not come out of the general revenue—it will be a voluntary contribution as the law now allows. We will simply be making it easier for taxpayers to designate overpayments of income tax, or to contribute other amounts, toward the debt.

Do I think this is going to wipe out the national debt? No; but the procedure will give the American taxpayers the opportunity to participate, voluntarily, in a concerted effort that would serve the public interest by focusing on the size and weight of the burden we are saddling present and future generations with. More and more people are becoming aware that this $1.488 trillion debt is indeed beefy, and that it is a millstone around our necks that is dragging us down with the economy and can have a dramatic effect on inflation. I believe public notice about how Americans can contribute $1 or more toward a fund to help pay off the debt deserves as much attention and visibility on the IRS form, as a checkoff allowing taxpayers to designate money to more and more quixotic Presidential candidates, whose races at taxpayers' expense are often no more than exercises in self-promotion.

Let's all try to remember where the real beef is, and do something about it. You could buy a lot of cows for $1.488 trillion.●

EIGHTH ANNUAL "SWEET POTATO AFFAIR"

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the golden sunshine of spring calls to mind that most nutritious of foods—the delicious golden yam. Tomorrow, April 26, we are observing the eighth annual "Sweet Potato Affair," to celebrate the flavor and nutritional value of this excellent vegetable.

Our Nation is enjoying an upsurge of attention to our health and physical condition. We have learned that the kinds and amounts of food we eat can have a definite effect on our well-being.

In fact, the National Academy of Sciences recently came up with a number of suggestions on how our diet can affect our susceptibility to several diseases, including cancer. One of the recommendations was that we eat more fruits and vegetables rich in vitamins A and C.

These new facts make our annual "Yam Day," with its goal of encouraging greater consumption of the Nation's sweet potatoes, even more worthwhile. One sweet potato proudly claims 9,230 units of vitamin A, a greater proportion than almost any other comparable food.

The yam is a natural way to satisfy our sweet tooth without adding sugar, and without gaining weight. A medium baked sweet potato adds only 82 calories to a meal.

Bake them, mash them or—for an occasional treat—serve them candied. Sweet potatoes are especially good with poultry and pork, and do not forget that Southern favorite, sweet potato pie.

Because we have such a plentiful yam harvest, the Government uses large amounts of sweet potatoes in its food programs for the military and for schoolchildren. Since a major concern

of these programs is to provide foods with a high nutritional value and tasty flavor, the Louisiana yam is custom made. Yams have three great characteristics that make them ideal for government feeding programs: They are extremely nutritious, they are very versatile and can be prepared in many different ways, and they have a natural sweet taste that people—especially children—enjoy.

I encourage the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense to continue and increase their purchases of sweet potatoes, and hope that purchasing decisions will be made as early as possible to assist production planning.●

IN REMEMBRANCE OF SGT. FRANCIS WARNER, SR.

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 23, 1984, Sgt. Francis Warner passed away. I would like to share with my colleagues a few words about this man whom so many of us knew.

Sergeant Warner came to work with the Capitol Police in 1968. He worked in the communications division, and also held traffic posts on the House of Representatives detail. This perhaps, is where many of my colleagues had the opportunity to meet him. Sergeant Warner was a man who went out of his way to help others, and will not easily be forgotten. Despite his towering appearance of 6'6", and approximately 300 pounds, Sergeant Warner was a gentle man.

Prior to his job with the Capitol Police, Sergeant Warner worked for 13 years for the District Heights, MD, police force where he began his law enforcement career. A native of Washington, and graduate of St. John's College High School, he served with the Marines during World War II.

Sergeant Warner was a member of the Fraternal Order of Police and the American Legion.

Sergeant Warner was a friend to all who knew him. He was an excellent police officer and will be deeply missed. I offer my sincere condolences to his loved ones as we grieve the loss of our friend, Sgt. Francis Warner, Sr., may he rest in peace.●

THE RETIREMENT OF HOWARD SEELYE

HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, 1984, my district representative, Howard Seelye, will be retiring from my Newport Beach staff.

As a member of the California State Assembly from 1962 to 1976, I was covered by Howard, herein referred to as "Aitch," then the Orange County political writer for the Los Angeles Times. Some have accused me of hiring Aitch in 1977 in an effort to substantially reduce any possibility of negative press within Orange County. Although not true, it does make for good copy.

Aitch has been in the newspaper business all of his adult life as a writer, editor, and publisher; Aitch started his professional journalism career in 1946 with the Whittier News as a reporter. He then went on to become managing editor of the El Centro Post-Press in 1952 and publisher of the Pismo Times in 1956. Then in 1960 he returned to the southland as managing editor of the San Gabriel Valley Daily Tribune and completed his newspaper career as the political reporter for the Orange County edition of the Los Angeles Times from 1966 to 1976.

During his tenure in the newspaper business, Aitch received numerous awards for his editing and writing skills from the California Newspaper Publishers Association and from the Orange County Press Club. Aitch also served as the chairman of the California Editors' Conference (CNPA) in 1959.

Aitch came aboard my congressional staff as the district representative in January 1977. His extensive knowledge of Orange County politics and his superior writing skills have been a tremendous asset to me. He has served me and the people of the 40th Congressional District diligently during the past 7½ years.

Aitch would never forgive me if I did not at one point mention that he was born in Whittier and is a graduate of Whittier College. Aitch married Gloria Walls in 1947 and has two grown children. He and Gloria have been blessed with two granddaughters and a third grandchild is due any day.

If a man can be truly measured by his friends, Aitch is a very tall man. I wish him nothing but success and happiness in his semiretirement. I know I speak for the staff when I say he will be missed. Thanks, Aitch, for everything.●

"YOM HASHOA" NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE OF MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on the last day of Passover, it is traditional for Jews everywhere to recite "Yizkor", or the mourner's Kaddish, the memorial prayer said for the dead. This Hebrew prayer is said in remembrance of all the departed souls from Biblical times to the present, including those who lost their lives during one of the darkest periods in our society's history—the Nazi Holocaust. As a Jew and as an active member of the Jewish community, and as one who personally suffered family losses, I strongly feel that on "Yom Hashoa", Day of Remembrance, by recalling the horror of the Jews and others killed by the Nazis, society can prevent this tragedy from ever happening again.

We know the pain of remembering the Nazi genocide committed against our people—and feel the loss of each life as if it were our own. We share the sorrow of the survivors and of the families of those who were murdered. Hitler's Nazi genocide happened 40 years ago, but for many Jews who survived the camps, the hiding, and the awful waiting, it happened yesterday. Each Passover, a Seder service is conducted to commemorate the freedom of the Jewish people. Ironically, the Jewish people are still not free, not from the memory of this atrocity. The passover service only contains a few of the many stories and traditions that developed about the bondage of the Jews in Egypt and the birth of Israel as a people. However, of the legends and parables that are told, rabbis that are quoted, and interpretations of Biblical events that are elaborated upon, all are recalled in the hope that in remembering the enslavement of the Jews in Egypt the persecution of a people would come to an end.

"Yom Hashoa" will also be observed in my district on April 29, by the Holocaust Survivors Club of South Florida, the Jewish Federation of Greater Fort Lauderdale, and the Jewish Federation of South Broward. Events such as these serve a greater purpose beyond educating the American public of the roles that survivors and their families play in American life. It brings compassion and reality to the present-day situation of Jews worldwide. The endless efforts of the members of the Jewish Federation of Fort Lauderdale and the Jewish Federation of South Broward who have worked to preserve our heritage should be commended. Their programs remind us of lost friends and of the past as we work toward creating a better future.

I recently had the privilege to view the precious legacy, an exhibit of Judaic treasures from Czechoslovakia's persecuted Jewish community during Hitler's reign of terror. As I toured the collection of objects that were used by Jews of pre-World War II Europe in every facet of their religious and family life, I saw not only mere objects, but also symbols of

Jewish tradition that the Nazis almost eradicated. Amassed by the Nazis as a means of documenting their final solution to the Jewish problem, the collection was intended to become a museum of an extinct race. Instead, these remnants of the rich ethnic culture of the Eastern European Jewish community have become a memorial to the lives and works of a people. During Passover, a time of reflection of suffering and freedom, it is critical to remind ourselves of this unique saga in world history. This culture, as the Nazis preserved it, lives no more. This evidence of Jewish life, however, lives through the survivors who came to the United States after the war. This visible expression of the Jewish heritage must be preserved so that succeeding generations can learn and remember.

During the holiday of Passover, Jews remember the exodus from Egypt from where they left their oppressors for freedom. On this day of "Yom Hashoa," the National Day of Remembrance of "Man's Inhumanity to Man," we also remember the exodus of the survivors of Nazi concentration camps to freedom. The oppression of the Jewish people can be traced back to Biblical times. The persecution of the Jewish people, however, has not been restricted to earlier times only. It still goes on, even today. Therefore, we must also dedicate ourselves to these other causes—the plight of Soviet and Ethiopian Jewry, peace in the Middle East, a safe and secure Israel, the cases of unprosecuted Nazi war criminals, and the welfare of fellow Jews in every Jewish community worldwide.

God bless the memory of the Holocaust victims and the survivors.●

EMEK HEBREW ACADEMY PAYS HONOR

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Helen Pollak, past PTA president and longtime supporter of Emek Hebrew Academy, will be honored on Sunday, May 20, 1984.

Helen and her husband, Alex, were previously honored in 1975 by Emek Hebrew Academy and received the Emek Torah Award.

In addition to her devoted service to Emek Hebrew Academy, Helen is also a past president for Save the Child Guild of Mount S'inai Hospital, and has worked in supporting Hadassah, ORT, and B'nai B'rith.

A true humanitarian, Helen's community service includes involvement in Bnei Akiva, Shaarey Zedek Sisterhood, YMCA, and the Girl Scouts of America.

Helen Pollak has given much of her energy to the community, but has always kept her first priority with her family. She is also a grandmother.

Because of her many contributions to the betterment of her community, I ask the Members to join with Emek Hebrew Academy in paying honor to Helen Pollak.●

BUCKLE-UP AMERICA'S CHILDREN

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would provide incentive grants for those States requiring installation of seatbelts in new schoolbuses.

Over the past several years, we have seen a national ground swell of support for increased safety on the highway. Tougher drunk-driving laws and the mandated use of child passenger restraint systems in automobiles are but two examples of society's concern over the growing number of deaths and injuries on the highways each year.

Each year 20 million children ride on schoolbuses. Thousands of children are injured each year in schoolbus-related accidents. There is no question that seatbelts decrease the likelihood of death and injury in all types of vehicles. I believe that we should make our schoolbuses as safe as possible.

The schoolbus design standards enacted in 1977 by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration have certainly created a much safer bus. I have met with manufacturers, contractors, and drivers of schoolbuses. They are genuinely concerned about child safety. Compartmentalization built into buses manufactured after 1977 has been a step forward. But to increase safety we need to keep the child within this compartment during an accident. Seatbelts would help meet this objective.

The idea of seatbelts in schoolbuses is controversial, Mr. Speaker. Past attempts to increase schoolbus safety have been met with opposition. Concerns over student compliance, vandalism, and other issues have been expressed. The use of seatbelts in several New York communities has not shown these concerns to be a problem, however.

Legitimate differences of opinion do exist as to whether the installation of seatbelts on schoolbuses is warranted. I hope all points of view can be carefully examined in congressional hearings.

This legislation would not mandate seatbelts in schoolbuses. Federal funds would be provided, however, to those States enacting seatbelt requirements for new schoolbuses. Funds could be used for educational programs about seatbelt use, and for other types of child safety/schoolbus issues as well. The choice to mandate seatbelts would be left up to the States.

Seatbelts save lives. America's schoolchildren deserve the full measure of protection we as parents and legislators can reasonably provide. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this new initiative.●

JOBS FOR SENIORS

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I heard a message on the radio when I was back in my district recently that I would like to share with my colleagues. The message, a public service announcement by WBBM Radio in Chicago, was directed at senior citizens 55 and older who are interested in part-time or full-time work. A group called Senior Employment Opportunities, a no-fee, nonsectarian placement service sponsored by the National Council of Jewish Women, is on the lookout for seniors who want to work.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the National Council of Jewish Women for their hard work in trying to find jobs for seniors. Whether it be part-time or full-time work, a job can be a rewarding experience for a senior. I hope some seniors in my district will take them up on the offer. It is a safe bet they will.●

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to my colleagues' attention events taking place during the week of April 29 to May 6, 1984. For the events to be remembered are such a significant part of Jewish history, of world history, that they warrant special attention. The week beginning April 29 has been designated by Congress and the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council as our national "Day of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust."

Never before in modern history has an incredible chapter like the Holocaust had such moral significance to the human soul and spirit. Unfortunately, I do not believe that the world has learned from this tragic genocide. Moreover, there are serious challenges to our moral stature as guardians of human rights around the world.

First, one must realize that the horror of all horrors was that the Holocaust was witnessed by many of us who are alive today. Tragically, most were silent. Like so many others who were part of World War II, we saw, only too late, Hitler's atrocities in the death camps. The Holocaust which had a universal impact was the most despicable example of man's inhumanity to man.

Many of us remember. Some of us witnessed and some of us suffered that tragedy. Unfortunately, too few acted and now too many are forgetting. As the Holocaust fades in the memories of so many, those of us who lived through the realization of the horrors of the Holocaust must not relent in our actions. The reason is not only moral. It is also that our generation—the generation of Holocaust witnesses—is fading as well. We are aging, the few living Holocaust survivors are aging, and our Nation is aging. My fear is that with the years that pass between the Holocaust and the future, the next generation—our children and our children's children—will view the Holocaust as just another bland chapter in our history books rather than the single-most moving reminder of the value of human life.

In considering the many human rights violations facing us today, we are immediately reminded of the thousands of Soviet Jews who are refused the right to emigrate—and, in many instances, refused the right to be reunited with their families. We are also reminded that Soviet leaders tried gamely to rationalize their reasons for shooting down a civilian Korean airliner with 269 innocent people aboard. And, the Soviet Union continues to muffle the proud people of Poland who fight for their rights of speech, peaceful assembly, and religion.

Iran is yet another modern day example of the disregard for human rights. Led by ruthless, religious fanatics, Iran's mullahs instruct their followers to execute death missions against our marines in Lebanon, diplomats in embassies abroad, and citizens within their own country. The Ayatollah Khomeini dispatches his nation's children to the front lines to deactiviate land mines in the war with Iraq.

During these days of remembrance, we are also reminded to look to Israel—a nation that regards human life to be most sacred—after 36 years still seeking acceptance from her neighbors so that the peoples of the Middle East can live in peace without fear of terrorism.

Has the world learned the lessons of the Holocaust? One man—Adolf Hitler—was able to stir the innermost evil within many civilized men and women, leading them to perform acts that at the time we could not even comprehend, let alone believe. Are Qadhafi and Khomeini or any other terrorist any different? Is our Nation and the world of nations bowing to international terrorism, allowing the evils of violence to once again prevail over the good of diplomacy?

Fortunately, many people and many nations will not allow evil to overtake good, or violence to overtake peace, or terrorism to overtake diplomacy. Many of us remain committed to the expansion and applications of fundamental human rights. Elie Wiesel, the renowned writer, philosopher, human rights activist, and Holocaust survivor, reminds the world that it must not forget the tragedy of the Holocaust, stating:

> The world has not learned. It did not want to listen. . . . But if we silently drift toward a Holocaust universe, ignoring the testimony of our latest witnesses—the Sakhorovs and Timmermans—our real literary prophets will not be Babel or Camus but will be Adolf Hitler.

Yes, let us not forget and let us not allow the world to forget the tragedies of the past.

The second series of events encompassing the week of May 6-13 come at the end of another Passover season—a holiday dedicated to freedom and justice. Yet, many Jews continue to struggle for freedom this very day in the Soviet Union, in Ethiopia, in Syria, and South America. But, just as Moses led the Jews to freedom in the Promised Land of ancient Israel, modern Israel today provides refuge for any Jew in need. Tragically, there was no Israel for the Jews of the Holocaust. There was no country willing to open its doors to them. Had Israel existed then, there may never have been a Holocaust. In these days of remembrance, the existence of Israel and the ashes of the Holocaust are forever intertwined.

As Israel approaches its 36th anniversary of independence, Americans and others throughout the world recognize and pay tribute to Israel's high regard for its democratic values, morals, and ideals. This 36th Independence Day has a special meaning designating a double chai, symbolic of a rededication in the preservation of human life.

As the Holocaust years fade into the past, the tortured memories linger. They linger in the minds of millions of Jews throughout the world. They linger in the violent chapters of the history of World War II. They are remembered by the families of the 6 million who perished.

The United States too remembers. In 1980 Congress approved the creation of a U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council. The Council is an independent Government agency charged with the creation of a living memorial museum to the victims of the Holocaust to honor their memories in annual Days of Remembrance ceremonies. Plans are simultaneously underway for the establishment of a living memorial museum in New York City.

In these Days of Remembrance from April 29 to May 6, and during Jewish Heritage Week from May 6 to May 13, Solidarity Sunday with Soviet Jewry on May 6 at the United Nations in New York City and Israel's "Double Chai" 36th Independence Day on May 7, the United States will continue to remind the world of the horrors of the persecution and genocide of the Holocaust and the hope in the birth of a new nation.

During the Days of Remembrance, I urge my colleagues, my constituents, and all human kind to reflect, and to remember the lessons of the Holocaust, not only during the week of April 29, but in their everyday lives. Parents should be encouraged to discuss the Holocaust with their children, reminding them of the right of all people to live freely, and in peace regardless of race, color, creed, or religion.

In this age of radical terrorism and nuclear weapons, the whole world could be hostage to another genocide. It is therefore incumbent upon those of us who truly believe in our democratic institutions to speak out for human rights, for equality, and for justice, to oppose oppression and intolerance, and never to be silent again.●

TRIBUTE TO SOL ZITTER

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, every now and then a remarkable individual comes along who, because of his sensitivity, ability, and determination, leaves lasting impression on his community. Sol Zitter is such a person.

On May 5, a happy crowd will gather in Miami Beach, FL, to celebrate Sol's 70th birthday. It will be more than just a birthday party, however. It will be a celebration of decades of achievement and hard work that will have a lasting impact on our community.

Sol Zitter has spent a lifetime as a pioneer fighting for accessible housing and transportation for handicapped and disabled people. Before Sol, the handicapped were treated as second-class citizens compared to the able bodied. People in wheel chairs were isolated on city blocks with curbs they could not negotiate without assistance. Handicapped people who drove were forced to find parking painfully far from their destinations. Our buildings were designed to be accessible and functional to everyone but the disabled. And handicapped people were forced to accept this discrimination be-

cause they did not have the clout to change it.

That's when Sol Zitter went to work.

With persuasion, organization, political power, and common good sense, Sol appealed to peoples' sense of right and fairness. One by one, the barriers came tumbling down. He fought for and won curbs with ramps so people in wheelchairs could cross the streets. He fought for and won parking for the disabled so that handicapped people could drive with new confidence that they could get to their destinations without fear and exhaustion. He created a new awareness in our community of the problems of the handicapped, the wrongness of arbitrarily excluding them from normal daily activity and the benefits to society of their ingenuity, industriousness and commitment.

Sol Zitter brought people together. He founded the Florida Parapalegic Association and is still the executive director. He is one of the founders of the United Coalition of Handicapped Voters, and still serves on its board of directors. He founded the Florida Council of Handicapped Organizations, and is also a member of the Commission for the Advancement of Physically Handicapped people and the Dade Employ the Handicapped Committee. The list of his accomplishments goes on and on.

Mr. Speaker, in his 70 years, Sol Zitter has selflessly devoted his life to others who needed him, and in so doing, he has helped not only handicapped people, but all of us. I am happy to join with his many friends in offering my warmest congratulations, and thanks.●

BISHOP MOORE DENOUNCES CENTRAL AMERICAN POLICY

HON. GERALD B. H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, this year a member of the clergy delivered an Easter message that should give, not comfort, but offense to millions of Christians living in Latin America.

The remarks were made by the Rt. Rev. Paul Moore, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of New York. He denounced President Reagan's policy and lashed out at the violence and terrorism that he claims the United States has inflicted on our neighbors.

Obviously, Bishop Moore has failed to weigh against these claims the terrors, subtle and substantial, that have been experienced by Christians at the hands of the Soviet- and Cuban-backed Sandinista government.

Bishop Moore failed to weigh the extensive censorship of Christian leaders, including the Pope, or the concerted campaigns to infiltrate and undermine legitimate church hierarchies.

Let us ask ourselves what is the ultimate aim of the Marxist Sandinistas? It is not to promote freedom of religion. It is not even to allow freedom of religion. It is to deny the right to worship, and to replace the Judeo-Christian God with the worship of an all-encompassing state.

As leader of the free world, President Reagan is pursuing a course vital to the future of the God-fearing around the globe. The Communists, on the other hand, cannot and will not tolerate religious tolerance.

I plead with Bishop Moore to recognize this simple fact.●

CORINNA KAY CIVIC ASSOCIATION BREAKFAST

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, the Corinna A. Kay Civic Association will hold an awards breakfast, honoring eight outstanding residents of Essex County. The breakfast will also be an opportunity for us to pay tribute to a dear friend and dedicated leader, Corinna A. Kay.

Corinna is the vice president of Newark's Central High School and is currently seeking her second term on the Essex County Board of Chosen Freeholders. She has served her community with a great deal of distinction, and the civic association in her name is a sign of the esteem in which she is held.

Eight individuals will be honored at the breakfast for their community activities. They are: Mr. Herbert Rama, executive president of the Irvington Chamber of Commerce; Earl Williams, city clerk of East Orange; Joe Clark, principal of East Side High School in Paterson and a resident of South Orange; Gladys Hillman Jones, assistant deputy superintendent of academies for the Newark Board of Education; and Marion Shaw, a senior citizen activist. In addition, student awards will be given to Thelma Ramsey, a high school senior from East Orange, and Sharman Curry, a senior at Columbus High School in Maplewood. The Veterans Award will be presented to Frank Corvasce of Irvington, a veterans activist and State hospital chairman for Menlo Park Soldiers.

The keynote speaker will be Mrs. Jewell Jackson McCabe, national president of the coalition—100 Black Women. The master of ceremonies will be Elmer J. Herrman, Jr., of the Corinna Kay Civic Association.

I am certain that this breakfast will be a very special event, and an opportunity for us to honor some of Essex County's outstanding community leaders, as well as Corinna Kay herself.●

REMEMBRANCE OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. ROBERT I. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1984

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to rise in remembrance of the 1.5 million people of Armenian ancestry who were victims of the genocide perpetrated in Turkey between 1915 and 1923. It is essential that we remember these people, both as an acknowledgment to the survivors and as an important lesson to ourselves and future generations.

Genocide is the most terrifying event that has faced the modern world. The attempt to eradicate a people solely because of their ancestry should horrify us all and raise cries of dismay and indignation. But the event becomes more frightening if we choose to forget it occurred. It is important for our children to know that tyranny has existed in the past and that it must be opposed as it arises in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance both for the past and our future, I would like to take this moment to recognize the courage and suffering of the Armenian victims. I sincerely hope that their memory will inspire us to work diligently to protect human rights and to oppose tyranny wherever it occurs.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, April 26, 1984, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 27

9:30 a.m.
Finance
Health Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine how to ensure quality health care to low-income persons.
SD-215

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on S. 2505, to give local communities a right of first refusal when the owner of a professional sports team seeks to relocate that team.
SR-253

APRIL 30

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings to examine the scope and impact of certain occupational diseases.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Acid Precipitation Act of 1980 (set forth in subtitle A of title VII of the Energy Security Act (Public Law 96-294)).
SD-366

Judiciary
To resume hearings on S. 462, to clarify certain provisions of the Hobbs Act relating to Federal jurisdiction over labor extortion matters.
SD-226

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the U.S. Supreme Court, U.S. District Courts/Courts of Appeals, and the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
S-146, Capitol

MAY 1

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.
SD-116

9:30 a.m.
Rules and Administration
Business meeting, to consider pending legislative and administrative business.
SR-301

Special on Aging
To hold hearings on protecting medicare and medicaid patients from sanctioned health practitioners.
SD-628

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the joint weapons program of the Department of Defense.
SD-192

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
SD-124

Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on legislative proposals which authorize funds for those programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee.
SD-406

Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To resume hearings to investigate alleged involvement of organized crime and mismanagement of funds in the Hotel and Restaurant Workers' Union (HEREIU).
SD-342

Judiciary
To continue hearings on S. 462, to clarify certain provisions of the Hobbs Act relating to Federal jurisdiction over labor extortion matters.
SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Public Health Service Act, focusing on title X (family planning).
SD-430

Joint Economic
To hold hearings on foreign trade issues.
SD-562

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for programs of the U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.
SD-138

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Marine Mammal Commission, and the Small Business Administration.
SD-146, Capitol

Judiciary
To hold hearings on S. 2423, to provide financial assistance to State victims of crime programs.
SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.
SD-430

Joint Economic
Monetary and Fiscal Policy Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review policies to reduce the cost of the Federal Government.
SD-562

MAY 2

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Legal Services Corporation.
SD-146, Capitol

Judiciary
Criminal Law Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 804, to reform Federal criminal laws by establishing certain standards and limits for conducting Federal undercover operations and activities.
SD-226

Judiciary
Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on child sexual abuse issues.
SD-628

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SR-328A

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Transportation and certain related agencies.
SD-138

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings on legislative proposals which authorize funds for those programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee.
SD-406

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to review veterans' compensation programs.
SR-418

Joint Economic
Monetary and Fiscal Policy Subcommittee
To continue hearings to review policies to reduce the cost of the Federal Government.
SD-562

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SD-226

MAY 3

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SR-328A

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Defense.
SD-192

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for U.S. Territories.
SD-138

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Transportation and certain related agencies.
SD-124

Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1985 for the Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration.
SD-406

Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on S. 2117, to establish the National Vaccine-Injury Compensation Program as an elective alternative remedy to judicial action for vaccine related injuries.
SD-562

Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Head Start program.
SD-430

MAY 4

9:30 a.m.
Joint Economic
To hold hearings on the employment/unemployment situation for April.
SD-106

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for the impact aid program of the Department of Education.
SD-430

Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the low-energy assistance block grant program.
SD-562

MAY 7

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for certain programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and related agencies.
SD-124

MAY 8

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SR-253

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to discuss certain pornography issues.
SD-226

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for certain programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and related agencies.
SD-124

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-406

Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Public Health Service Act, including title X (family planning), and title XX (Adolescent Family Life Act).
SD-430

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, and the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.
SD-138

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Conservation and Supply Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the revised constitution of American Samoa.
SD-366

MAY 9

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Justice.
S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up a committee resolution to authorize certain construction projects of the Veterans' Administration contained in the administration's budget for fiscal year 1985.
SD-418

MAY 10

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the impact of drugs on crime.
SD-430

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2329, to improve retirement income security under private multiemployer pension plans and to remove unnecessary barriers to employer participation in those plans by modifying the rules relating to employer withdrawal liability, asset sales, and funding.
SD-124

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.
SD-138

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-406

MAY 15

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on child sexual abuse issues.
SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on title IX of the Higher Education Act relating to educational equity.
SD-430

MAY 16

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings on proposals to extend and amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (Superfund).
SD-406

MAY 17

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2329, to improve retirement income security under private multiemployer pension plans and to remove unnecessary barriers to employer participation in those plans by modifying the rules relating to employer withdrawal liability, asset sales, and funding.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold open and closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal

year 1985 for space programs of the Department of Defense.
SD-192

MAY 21

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings to examine the scope and impact of certain occupational diseases.
SD-430

MAY 22

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on alleged corruption by officials of the Boilermaker's Union.
SD-430

MAY 23

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 10, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for women and men.
SD-562

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

11:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Separation of Powers Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1405, proposed Federal Neutrality Act of 1983.
SD-226

JUNE 5

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings to examine the scope and impact of certain occupational diseases.
SD-430

JUNE 6

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the activities of the Inspector General and Medical Inspector of the Veterans' Administration.
SR-418

JUNE 7

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 138, to establish a National Commission on Teacher Education.
SD-430

JUNE 13

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to review the sharing agreement between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense, and to discuss the Veterans' Administration's supply and procurement policy.
SR-418

JUNE 14

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on college athletic programs.
SD-430

JUNE 19

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the civil rights of victims in labor disputes, focusing on existing agencies ability to protect rank and file employees and the general public during labor disputes.
SD-430

JUNE 20

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To continue oversight hearings on the civil rights of victims in labor disputes, focusing on existing agencies ability to protect rank and file employees and the general public during labor disputes.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to markup proposed legislation relating to veterans' compensation.
SR-418

SEPTEMBER 18

11:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to review the legislative priorities of the American Legion.
SR-325

CANCELLATIONS

MAY 1

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Transportation and certain related agencies.
SD-138

Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Public Health Service Act, focusing on title X (family planning).
SD-430