

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE ECONOMY OF THE 1980'S

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, a consensus is growing in the House that solving our country's economic problems will require both immediate relief for those who are suffering from the effects of the administration's misguided policies, and longer term efforts to restore sustained growth and opportunity.

My colleague from New York, Mr. LUNDINE, recently gave a speech to the American Newspaper Publishers Association Convention which lays out the challenges and the potential solutions. He recognizes the need for a multifaceted approach to restoring productivity growth to our economy, and the need for more cooperation among government, business, and labor in addressing the problems of our economy. He also recognizes the need to pay far greater attention to trade issues in this era of international interdependence.

Few of my colleagues have had more firsthand experience with productivity issues than Mr. LUNDINE. As mayor of Jamestown, N.Y., he led a successful effort which transformed a troubled local economy into a much healthier one through labor-management cooperation. Last year he held a remarkable set of hearings on the human factor in innovation and productivity improvements.

I would like to insert Mr. LUNDINE's excellent speech in the RECORD, and to ask my colleagues to read it carefully.

THE ECONOMY IN THE 1980'S: GOVERNMENT, LABOR, BUSINESS, AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(By Representative Stan Lundine)

America is at the dawn of a new age characterized by a revolution in technology which has profound implications for the shape of American life to come. Truly radical changes in our social and personal patterns have already occurred; changes which are as deep and significant as those which took place as we moved from an agricultural society to an industrial one.

These changes do not affect us alone. Our first task is to recognize and come to terms with this. The same rapid technological advancements in communications, transportation, science, and medicine hold great promise for us and our world neighbors. But, if we are to survive and flourish as a nation, all interests in our society—especially labor, management, and government—must work carefully together to define a vision of our role in the new world.

The tasks before us will not be easy. There are no "quick fixes" or simple policy

prescriptions to help us deal with the magnitude of the changes that are occurring all around us. As John Naisbitt stated in his recently released book, *Megatrends*, "There are cities and companies, unions and political parties in this country that are like dinosaurs waiting for the weather to change. The weather is not going to change. The very ground is shifting beneath us. And what is called for is nothing less than all of us reconceptualizing our roles."

OUR ECONOMY

Our economy has been affected by several major influences since 1970 which force a re-examination of the traditional theories, institutions, and practices that have shaped our economic and industrial policies prior to this time.

The first of these influences was the tremendous impact that the oil shocks of the 1970's had on U.S. lifestyles and the interrelationships between nations of the world. The advent of OPEC brought the developed world to its knees and ignited a far-reaching worldwide inflationary spiral. In addition, it caused a redistribution of wealth among nations of the world and injected instability into world trade and finance.

The second major influence, itself accelerated by the energy crisis, has been the trend toward a declining rate of productivity growth for our economy. From 1948 to 1965, U.S. productivity grew at 3.3 percent per year, from 1965 to 1972 at a rate of 2.3 percent per year, and from 1972 to 1977 at a rate of 1.8 percent per year. Since 1977, productivity growth in the United States has ceased. This cessation has been brought about principally by severe structural changes in our economy, changing demographics, and lower levels of capital investment in crucial sectors of our economy. A market "vacuum" has been created, enabling foreign products to penetrate our domestic markets and seriously damaging U.S. preeminence in international trade.

The third major influence has been the rise in economic internationalization and interdependence. In the 1980's, no nation can be an island. Amid a continuing revolution of rising expectations among all people of the world, we learned in the 1970's that the United States was not alone in its desire for increased standards of living. Third World nations organized themselves, challenging our access to cheap natural resources and developing industries able to undersell us by relying on low-skilled, cheap labor. Japan and some nations of Western Europe continued to refine and implement industrial policies which succeeded in capturing markets previously dominated by U.S. producers.

These influences have resulted in a series of unprecedented problems and challenges for our economy. A combination of chronic inflation and sagging economic growth has led the U.S. into the worst economic downturn since the 1930's. This year alone, we are facing a potential federal budget deficit of \$200 billion. Over 12 million Americans are unemployed. The international banking system, led by U.S. banks, is threatened with collapse. And, growing talk of outright and total international trade protectionism portends even darker days ahead.

Current solutions to these problems have not worked very well. Macroeconomic management has not been successful in alleviating the stress of business cycles. The soaring cost of entitlement programs has driven government spending relentlessly upward. The hyper inflation of the late 1970's and early 80's not only swelled public expenditure, but created uncertainty about the future thereby reducing investment and driving interest rates to unbearable levels, drove labor costs up particularly in those sectors with automatic cost of living adjustment features, resulted in increased taxation through "bracket creep," and generally resulted in disillusionment with the liberal economic policies of the last two decades.

Tight monetary controls and supply side tax cuts instituted in the last two years have also proven disappointing. The strict monetary policy merely choked off economic growth and failed to bring interest rates down to tolerable levels. Unrealistic supply side assumptions that business will invest simply because they receive a tax break have been seriously in error; businesses invest when they think they can market a product at a profit or when they are forced to do so to remain competitive.

We need a set of sensible, stable macroeconomic policies to replace these excesses of the past. Our first priority should be to target interest rates at lower levels to encourage economic growth. Any hint of return to strict monetarism by the Federal Reserve must immediately be corrected by the Congress and the Administration.

In order that interest rates and inflation do not resurge, the enormous budget deficits projected for the next several years must be brought under control. Deficits amounting to between 5 and 6 percent of gross national product threaten to absorb all new private savings in the economy. There must be across-the-board budget cuts sharply reducing growth in defense, entitlement spending, and traditional "pork barrel" projects. We must agree to make "cuts with no buts", while targeting current spending to stimulate private sector economic activity. Reform of the Congressional budget and appropriations process is an absolute necessity.

To the extent that tax increases are necessary to reduce budget gaps, they should be phased in only when recovery has occurred and they also should be accompanied by reforms which convince the public that everyone is doing their fair share. I believe we should reform the individual tax code by abolishing virtually all deductions and credits so that a tax is imposed on net income at lower, progressive rates. This will promote equity and simplification, while ending much of our current tax bias as against savings.

Any jobs program which is considered as an immediate measure addressing the severe unemployment problems now preoccupying America must be designed to provide jobs in the private sector. Training, career education, infrastructure improvement financed by indexed government bonds, economic development financing, and housing rehabilitation should be key components.

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

In developing such a sensible economic policy we must never lose sight of the fact that productivity growth is really the engine that drives our standard of living to higher levels. It is important that government, working in collaboration with business, labor and the public, must focus on supply side incentives that really work.

A STRATEGY FOR PRODUCTIVITY GROWTH

Productivity improvement is critical to our economic growth. Instead of relying exclusively on large, across-the-board individual and corporate tax breaks, a new strategy to reverse the dismal productivity growth trends of our economy needs to be developed. Improved productivity will enable more cost-effective production of better quality products. This is a key element to business expansion and thus to expanded employment. Enhanced productivity growth will also provide the long-term key to our fight against inflation. When the cost of labor, raw materials, and processes increase, these higher costs will be translated entirely into higher prices for goods and services unless productivity is improved.

Reversing the current downward trend in productivity will not be easy, but most experts think that major progress toward this goal can be made by: improving the use of human resources, enhancing and targeting capital investment, accelerating technological innovation, and reforming the regulatory process.

Human Resources. My own experience in improving productivity through a better use of human resources came when I was mayor of Jamestown, New York, a small manufacturing town in upstate New York. In many ways, Jamestown in 1972 was a microcosm with all the characteristics of today's troubled economy. Businesses were closing, unemployment was soaring, and the adversarial relationship between government, business, and labor was principal underlying cause for the community's dismal economic performance.

In this crisis atmosphere and through a lot of hard work from many dedicated people, local government, management and labor broke down their adversarial relationship and worked together to turn the local economy around. The labor-management cooperation which took hold in Jamestown and still exists today, has been followed by the creation of over 30 area-wide labor-management committees which are encouraged, in part, by the Labor-Management Cooperation Act of 1978 sponsored by New York Senator Jacob Javits and me.

In addition to labor-management committees in the workplace, employee ownership of firms offers another mechanism which deserves attention and support from the federal government. Studies conducted by the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan have concluded that employee-owned firms are more profitable and more productive than their counterparts. There is a great deal the federal government can do to facilitate more widespread use of this tool for improving productivity.

Quality of worklife projects in firms around the country have also contributed impressively to productivity improvement. In many instances the work innovations that have resulted from these efforts have been remarkable. The General Motors plant at Tarrytown, New York, the Ford plant at Sharonville, Ohio, and Harmon International's Bolivar, Tennessee project are all good examples of this possibility.

One final note about human resources and productivity: The United States is in

the midst of a crisis in education which must be addressed without further delay. Our educational system has not kept pace with the technological revolution taking place around it. An estimated 72 million Americans are functionally illiterate. And, a 1980 report by the National Science Foundation stated that most Americans are moving toward "virtual scientific and technology illiteracy." There is a shortage of qualified math and science teachers in our primary and secondary schools. A problem of obsolete laboratory equipment and a shortage of instructors has reached crisis proportions at the university level.

To resolve these problems in education, and to prepare our young people for the post-industrial society, we must not just throw money at the problems. Government, industry, labor and educational interests must work closely together to establish innovative joint programs to redirect our available resources to specific educational problems. The federal government can help by investing in development of new curriculum for use by our schools and by increasing the numbers and qualifications of our math and science teachers.

Capital Investment. Our manufacturing sector is operating with plants and equipment which, for the most part, are over thirty years old. Small and innovative businesses especially need venture capital to establish themselves and expand. The U.S. needs to provide a financing capability directed toward long-term investment for basic industries and new technologies to surpass foreign competition. One step may be to consider targeted tax breaks for those investments most critical for industrial revitalization.

Technological Innovation and Regulatory Reform. Both these components of a productivity strategy are obviously influenced by leadership from the federal government. Increased funding for research and development, and policies to encourage close linkages between government, universities, and industry for commercial products and processes should be supported. In addition, efforts to deregulate our economy and to remove unnecessary social regulations, such as some anti-trust barriers to research collaboration, must be pursued at the federal level. Actions on these issues should be taken only after collaboration with labor and management and a consensus has been achieved.

Such a consensus can be achieved. A few years ago, steel companies were complaining that environmental regulations were seriously impairing productivity improvement. A committee involving the industry, its unions, and governmental representatives was organized. A key point: environmental advocates were made a part of these meetings. A consensus was reached. When the resulting legislation came to the House, it passed with only twelve dissenting votes.

A NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Most of the observations I have made so far involve domestic policy. But, as I have indicated, the United States has partners—and competitors—in the world market. Our domestic economy faces serious international challenges. The same spirit of cooperation between U.S. government, business, and labor interests that will serve us domestically is needed to meet our challenges in the world arena.

For the long term, we need a coherent industrial strategy based on consensus between government, management, labor, and the public, or "advocacy" sectors of our soci-

ety. I have proposed legislation in Congress to establish a National Industrial Development Board to develop such consensus and cooperation. The Board would bring together, in equal numbers, chief executives of major corporations, presidents of major unions, government officials, and public interest representatives including academics and innovative small businessmen.

The Board's purpose would be to develop a consensual response to key problems of industrial development. When established, it will recommend industrial development priorities for the United States, provide solutions to particular problems of industrial policy referred by Congress or the Executive Branch, and provide credible information on the domestic and international trends affecting our economic wellbeing.

In addition, the Board could address these elements of an industrial strategy:

Targeted research and development funds for commercial purposes.

A plan for restructuring basic industries.

Financing high risk projects and expansion of small businesses.

Encouraging overseas marketing and export promotion for small and medium-size firms.

Revising anti-trust policies to encourage joint research and development projects and business ventures that can improve our international competitiveness.

Reform of cumbersome federal regulations.

Find ways to encourage long-term investment financing for U.S. industry.

The United States is the only industrialized country without a coordinated and integrated industrial policy. We are losing our competitive industrial edge because of it.

Some have advocated a similar consensus building national board but with a broader purpose. Such a focus on the entire economy seems to me to be a serious mistake. When industry (and agriculture) is strong, our economy is strong. A group such as this needs focus; we need to define the mission of the board as precisely as possible. Moreover, keeping excessive politics out of such a broad economic cooperation council would be exceedingly difficult. Congress should leave general economic policy determinations to the structure presently in place. We should concentrate our collaborative efforts on those industries which compete in global markets.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

As we face these other problems over both long and short terms, we are also facing an immediate crisis in international finance and trade. The banking system of the western world is dangerously overexposed. Many nations are finding it very difficult to service debts accumulated during the post-OPEC period. The resources of the International Monetary Fund needs to be bolstered to help deal with this problem. We may even need to consider creation of a new international institution to provide a worldwide economic stimulus to help nations find markets to export their products.

Despite these problems, the U.S. and other nations must resist the temptation to implement widespread trade protectionist measures. Over the long term, we must encourage more international trade, not less. Exports mean jobs for Americans and provide an ability to offset our reliance on certain imported commodities, such as oil. From 1971 to 1981, American exports rose from 6 to 13 percent of the Gross National Product. This fact illustrates how important

exports have become to our national interest.

At the same time, some measures to protect our trade interests will be needed. Minimally, we must question our "free trade" ideologies in a realization that "free trade" and "fair trade" are not necessarily the same thing. Other nations, particularly Japan and France, have been helping themselves to our markets and protecting their own at great disadvantage to U.S. industries, while we have practiced and promoted the gospel of free trade. Some adjustments in these inequities can and must be made.

Health cooperation between U.S. government, labor, and management interests is especially important to our trade position. Labor must realize that we cannot continue to protect inefficient industries or obsolete industrial policies and practices. Management must provide positive incentives for industrial revitalization. Government must support aggressive international bargaining strategies on behalf of our domestic industries. It is especially important that the government begin to use the Federal Reserve more creatively, in order to establish a fair trade climate in which currency and market manipulation by other nations is discouraged.

As I have indicated, a strategy for U.S. economic recovery and health has long-term and short-term components, as well as international implications. An appropriate balance must be maintained in all our actions.

We must collaborate. Government, labor, management, and the public sectors must cooperate for the development of sensible economic policies. Old, outmoded adversarial techniques for problem-solving are out of date, and must be abandoned if we are to survive the complexities of the technological/industrial age.

We must innovate. The policy prescriptions which guided us through the industrial era are no longer valid.

We must participate. Our free press can help in this. The public needs to know the dimensions of the short-term problems and the long-term challenges we face. A real understanding of the reasons for short-term sacrifices and the possibilities for future success is basic to achieving widespread participation in this endeavor.

The stakes are very high. If we fail, we surely will go the way of Great Britain. But, I'm confident that we can succeed. With tough-minded cooperation and consensus between representatives of business, labor, government, and the public, we can dynamically improve our economy for the rest of this century and beyond. ●

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy contest. This year more than 250,000 secondary school students participated in the contest for the five national scholarships which are awarded.

During the past 21 years of sponsorship by the VFW, over 4½ million students have participated and awards to

taling more than \$2½ million have been given to winners at all levels in scholarships, savings bonds, and the like.

I am very proud to announce that the winning speech from the State of Georgia is by Lorre J. Tokash of Jonesboro, which is in my district.

Lorre has received many other honors including the Governor's honors in communications, an achievement award in writing, and first place in a PTA citizenship contest. She is in the National Honor Society, Who's Who Among American High School Students, and is one of America's outstanding names and faces.

So I want to put in the RECORD the Voice of Democracy's winning speech by Lorre Tokash. It can give everyone one of us inspiration.

The text of the speech follows:

1982-83 VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

Youth is America's strength. Although Benjamin Disraeli was born and raised in London, his thoughts were expressed not only about 'his' small section of the world, but concerning America as well when he stated: "Almost everything that is great has been done by youth."

It is true, youth has the energy, the drive, the will, and the enthusiasm to conquer just about any obstacle strewn in his path. Take the pioneers for example. These people were not old, for the old already had a set living pattern and did not wish to alter it. No, these settlers were the youth. The youth who had the courage and determination to change their lifestyles, to leave their families, and to sell their precious belongings in search of a new and better life in America. It was also this same youth who formed towns and cities, and eventually led to America's industrialization. John Smith was only 26 when he sailed to America and established Jamestown, Virginia.

When the wilderness was still young, so were the pioneers who trekked westward to discover the unexplored lands of America. One such pioneer was Johnny Appleseed, the symbol of westward-moving American civilization. At a mere 26 years of age, Johnny Appleseed was canvassing America, planting his seeds wherever his travels took him.

And what about the great name—Benjamin Franklin. This man had much to do with America's growth, yet he was only 16 when he began his first steps toward fame by writing biased columns in his brother's paper. This act prompted the British to jail him for a month, but nothing could stop the steadfast opinion of this youth. He continued to write articles expressing his feelings and at the age of 26 published the first of many Poor Richard's Almanacs.

The youth helped build America's strength not only as pioneers, but also as fighters, with the will to survive—and win!

Youth in this category include George Washington, given his rank of colonel over the Virginia militia at 23, Nathan Hale, who "regretted that he had but one life to give to his country" at the age of 21, the Sons of Liberty, who fought for the freedom they thought they deserved—even though their average age did not exceed 24, and last—but certainly not least, the Common American Revolutionary soldier. A youth who had not even started his life—maybe 25 at the most,

yet it was this youth who fought gallantly and with exuberant enthusiasm so that his country might someday be a better place to live in—not only for himself, but for all future generations to follow.

It is no joke when youth are labled "America's strength." For it is these young men and women who are America's natural resources. Not oil, not gasoline, not coal . . . but youth.

Still today, youth are prominent in our country. The Peace Corps was originally organized by youth, most recruits in their early-twenties. In a time when the world is becoming smaller and smaller, it is the youth in the Peace Corps who are reaching out to lend a hand and relieve the poverty-stricken and the diseased races of the world. They are the moving force reaching out to bring the world closer together . . . and they are America's youth.

Indeed, it is the young who possess the strength, both physically and mentally, to tackle America's problems. It is the young who form the solutions to questions that the old deem impossible to answer—and therefore do not pursue. And it is the young who stick to their guns and fight for justice and an improved country—no, an improved world—to live in. So don't be surprised when youth is considered "America's Strength," after all, in youth-lies the hope for a better tomorrow. ●

OFFSHORE OIL DRILLING MORATORIUM

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I join Congressmen LEON PANETTA and GERRY STUDDS in the introduction of legislation to impose a moratorium on offshore oil and gas leasing in environmentally sensitive areas off the coasts of California and Massachusetts.

In July of 1982, Secretary of the Interior Watt announced approval of his 5-year plan to open nearly 1 billion acres—almost the entire Outer Continental Shelf of the Nation—to leasing for oil and gas development. Secretary Watt's plan does not give full consideration to the coastal environments and economies of the affected areas. Our bill would protect areas that are environmentally and economically sensitive from leasing.

The bill includes tracts adjacent to Santa Monica Bay, which is off the coast of my district.

I represent 50 miles of the Nation's most beautiful and precious coastline from Malibu Beach to Redondo Beach in California. Time after time, we who live and work in the area have succeeded in convincing the Federal Government that leasing these offshore areas for oil and gas exploration is economically and environmentally unsound and not in the public interest. Past Secretaries of the Interior have

deleted these high-risk tracts from past lease sales.

Development of several of the southern California tracts has been strongly opposed by the State of California in a suit against the Department of the Interior. A development moratorium on the tracts named in the State's suit has been supported by the passage of a resolution I authored last year when I served in the California State Assembly.

I support the intent of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1978 that reasonable development of our offshore resources be balanced by environmental and economic protection. Secretary Watt's plan ignores this. In the Santa Monica Bay, the potential economic, environmental, and esthetic damages far outweigh the benefit of the small amount of oil that can be found. The sad memory of the 1969 oilspill and blowout in Santa Barbara is a constant reminder of the devastating impact oilspills have on the environment, wildlife and economy. We in the Los Angeles area do not want to experience the tragedy that our neighbors to the north suffered.

PREFERABLE ENERGY ALTERNATIVES

There is a vast resource in renewable energy and conservation. According to a Government Operations Committee report, through the installation of conservation measures, costing less than \$100 per home, we can reduce our residential energy use by 25 to 30 percent which would save an equivalent of 2 million barrels of oil per day. We must exhaust clean, safe, and efficient energy alternatives before we degrade our precious environment through offshore oil drilling.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

According to California's State Office of Tourism, coastal-related tourism is an \$11 billion a year industry in California. Over half of those revenues come from southern California, where over 60 million people visit Los Angeles County beach each year. The city of Santa Monica alone generates approximately \$100 million annually from recreation and tourism. A major oil spill in the area would be devastating for our local economy.

An oil spill would seriously threaten our commercial fishing. Between 1977-80 over \$100 million in revenue was accrued through fishing in the Ports of San Pedro and Terminal Island alone. Fish such as the Pacific bonita, jack mackerel, anchovies, and the many fish that spend their larval and juvenile stages near the surface of the water would be severely harmed by a spill. Even absent of a spill, fishing would be hurt by subsurface structures and exploration vessels getting in the way of fishing equipment. Valuable kelp grounds along the Malibu coast may also be damaged by oil drilling operations.

The Santa Monica Bay is used by many people for recreational boating activities. Over 100,000 pleasure craft are registered in Los Angeles. An oil spill would have a terrible impact on the boating industry.

ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS

Secretary Watt's plan would seriously endanger the environmental balance in the Santa Monica Bay. An oil spill could destroy the two remaining wetlands in Los Angeles County, Malibu Lagoon, and Ballona Wetlands. These wetlands are a few of the remaining habitats for several endangered species. The Ballona Creek estuary alone is estimated to include 20 percent of the State's nesting ground for the endangered Least Tern.

The Santa Monica Bay has become a popular place for animal viewing. Many people find pleasure in watching the many seabirds and marine mammals. A favorite pastime is whale watching during migration season. We would miss this recreation if these precious animals were harmed.

The Los Angeles area suffers from some of the worst smog episodes in the country. We are struggling to protect public health and to attain ambient air quality standards. The Environmental Protection Agency is threatening to impose a ban on new construction and to withhold highway funding until we achieve these standards. Air quality would be worsened from offshore oil drilling. Onshore industries would be forced to bear a greater cost of control to achieve the increment of reduction needed to offset offshore emissions. Offshore drilling would retard our efforts to clean up our air.

Those of us who have been fighting oil drilling in the Santa Monica Bay for years have grown weary of Secretary Watt's efforts to endanger our coastal resources in an effort to prospect for oil in an area where every study conducted indicates a low probability—perhaps only a few days of oil—that any significant resources exist. It is time that we take action to recognize that these areas are not the places to be drilling for oil and a moratorium should be put in place. I strongly urge all Members of Congress to support this important legislation to assure that Secretary Watt's latest assault on our precious environmental resources does not do further harm to our public health and our local economies.●

THE UNITED NATIONS AND ANTI-SEMITISM

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to

share an article with my colleagues which very thoroughly documents anti-Semitic actions which have been taken by the United Nations. Arnold Forster, a New York attorney, shows how this body has ignored persistent violations of the human rights of Soviet Jewry, devotes nearly half its energies to condemning the State of Israel, and has effectively legitimized anti-Semitism by equating Zionism with racism. I encourage you to take a moment and consider the issues Mr. Forster has so skillfully raised. The article follows:

Late last year, our ambassador to the United Nations, Jeanne J. Kirkpatrick, declared that the "U.N. record on human rights has been perverted" and charged that the international agency had repeatedly remained silent in the face of overwhelming human-rights abuses. To support these accusations, the U.S. delegate pointed to the fact that the U.N. had remained silent in the face of a "shocking resurgence of attacks against Jews in the world" and the denial of civil liberties to hundreds of thousands of Russian Jews.

This was not the first time that Mrs. Kirkpatrick had spoken out against the United Nations. Some months before, she had delivered a scorching attack on the world organization, charging that "the approach taken toward the Arab-Israeli conflict at the United Nations has nothing to do with peace but is quite simply a continuation of the war against Israel by other means."

Why has Mrs. Kirkpatrick been so passionate in her condemnation of the U.N.? One would have thought that as the American representative to the U.N., she would regard it highly and would be as tactful and conciliatory as possible so that her diplomatic counterparts from other lands would accept her in equally friendly fashion.

But our U.S. delegate, one of the best that this country has ever had, knows precisely what she is saying. Mrs. Kirkpatrick, with the obvious backing of President Reagan, has decided that these serious charges must be leveled loud, clearly and repeatedly—in a desperate effort and hope that in doing so, some bystander nations will be persuaded to force the guilty countries to change before they bring down the entire institution upon themselves and everyone else.

It is a sad fact that the very organization that came into existence nearly forty years ago in an effort to make real the dream of worldwide harmony and understanding has now become the international switchboard for the dissemination of organized hatred against Jews in general and against the Jewish state of Israel in particular.

There are two manifestations of this hatred that are currently destroying the moral fabric of the United Nations. The first is evident when the majority of nations ignore the plight of Jews, whose rights or even lives are being trampled on. As the saying goes: "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men remain silent in the face of it."

But the second brand of anti-Jewish prejudice indulged in by these "good men" is of a more vicious and dangerous variety. In my view, it touches the very essence of hatred for Jews: these anti-Semites in the U.N. actively wish to see the state of Israel eliminated as a formal Jewish entity. They are willing and eager to work for this goal tire-

lessly in order to bring Israel to an involuntary, sudden, and violent end. And—make no mistake about it—this anti-Zionism is nothing more or less than the desire to do away with all Jews.

Israel is a Jewish nation—no one would seriously argue that it is not—and it is the heart of the Jewish world. Snuffing out its physical, cultural, religious, ethnic, and national center surely means destroying the very core of international Jewish life. The destruction of the state of Israel is, in short, the ultimate anti-Semitic act—the final act of Hitler's "final solution" to the Jewish problem.

There is, unfortunately, no end of proof that the United Nations is today the world center of anti-Semitism. Israel has become the primary scapegoat, the priority target of the anti-Western gang of countries that holds almost total control over the U.N. Just look at these two facts: in 1980, exactly one half of the resolutions adopted by the Security Council condemned Israel; and, at this writing, there have been nearly 100 resolutions of the same character passed by the General Assembly. No doubt by the time you read this the number will have increased.

The thrust of all this obscene rhetoric is that Israel is a pariah nation with no legitimate right to survive. And for their passive acceptance of this garbage, most Western nations—Mr. Reagan and Mrs. Kirkpatrick aside—stand revealed as having surrendered to an anti-Zionist, anti-Jewish, anti-Israel campaign coordinated by an Arab-Soviet partnership.

When the coalition of communist and Arab nations first turned the mindless platitude that "Zionism is racism" into an official United Nations resolution in 1975, they forged one of the most dangerous weapons in the Arab propaganda arsenal. To accomplish this hateful goal, the Arab-Soviet bloc was ably assisted by assorted Third World countries who themselves have been seduced by promises of massive financial grants, supplies of military arms, and oil.

Acceptance of this U.N. resolution legitimizes anti-Semitism. The idea itself is stupid and senseless. Zionism is a love of Zion (a synonym for Jerusalem), a liberation movement, a quest for freedom and for the right of Jews to live politically as equals among nations. Racism is the antithesis; it argues the inherent superiority of one human species over another.

(Hiding behind the word *Zionist*, it must be pointed out here, instead of candidly saying *Jew* when that is what is actually meant, is a transparent, classic dodge. Interchanging the nomenclature comes as no surprise to students of anti-Semitism, who long ago learned that those who hate Jews tried to give three different words—*Jew*, *Zionist*, *Israeli*—precisely the same meaning. But Zionism, before Israel came into being, meant a belief in the need for the re-establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. Since Israel's creation in 1948, Zionism has naturally taken on an additional meaning: a conviction that the Jewish State has a right to exist in peace and security. Which means, not so incidentally, that one does not have to be Jewish to be a Zionist.)

Not surprisingly, the senseless but evil U.N. formula that Zionism is racism has become a standard tool in the hands of Israel's U.N. enemies. More than a dozen resolutions have since referred approvingly to the definition, and it has been used unceasingly by Arab, Soviet, and Chinese propagandists to justify anti-Semitism and hatred of Israel.

But this canard is only the most successful of a long list of anti-Semitic assertions in the United Nations. Some others are that the Jews are an imaginary people who never existed in fact, do not now exist, never experienced the Holocaust, and—since they are a non-people—are not entitled to the rights accorded genuine nations.

This undisguised hatred is easy to find in the publications of the U.N. special unit that services the Palestinian Committee. It is also to be found in documents of the U.N. Commission for Western Asia, which accepts the PLO as a member state while rejecting Israel. And it can be found in the once hallowed halls of the Security Council, where the late Saudi Arabian ambassador, Jamil Baroody, once declared that the Nazi Holocaust was simply fiction and Anne Frank's diary a transparent forgery. Only the ambassador of the Netherlands, in whose country the tortured girl lived, rose to challenge the lie.

The litany of patent anti-Jewish prejudice echoes without cessation in the U.N.'s beautiful skyscraper headquarters on the banks of Manhattan's East River. It usually begins in whispered conversations, but it bursts forth with ever increasing frequency on the open floor. On Dec. 8, 1980, for example, the Jordanian ambassador, Hazem Nasseibeh, asserted in the General Assembly that the Arab world had long been "held in bondage, plundered" by the Jewish "people's cabal, which controls and manipulates and exploits the rest of humanity by controlling the money and wealth of the world." During the same debate, Ambassador Fallou Kane of Senegal added that news organizations are "dominated by Jews," a fabrication that was already stale when it was repeated by the Nazis more than fifty years ago. This malevolent falsehood was greeted by its listeners with the assent of silence—as is so much of the anti-Jewish bigotry spewed on the U.N. premises.

The hatred for Jews displayed in the U.N. is especially disturbing in light of the many signs that anti-Semitism is on the rise around the world. It is nurtured by the very international body that was created to strengthen understanding among the polyglot peoples of our earth, and the ominous warnings are largely ignored. The animosity foisted upon Europe by Hitler in the 1930s, resulting in the murder of one third of all Jews then living, is being encouraged by U.N. endorsement of anti-Jewish bigotry and strengthened by the prestige that that once honorable organization once boasted of and still, incredibly, retains.

American taxpayers should take a close look at this world body, whose hatred of Americans almost equals its hatred of Jews. Currently we are picking up 25 percent of the U.N.'s operational costs. Perhaps it is time for us to discontinue this largess and let those who have captured and disfigured a noble dream pay the bill for their perversion. ●

PENTAGON'S "SOVIET MILITARY POWER" REPORT

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon has just released its latest version of the booklet entitled "Soviet

Military Power" analyzing Soviet military forces and their armed forces expansion.

The report provides some useful information and insights into the military activities of the U.S.S.R. What is clear from the report is that the Soviet Union has constructed a mighty military machine, a machine that the Soviet Union has been willing to put to use in Afghanistan, Eastern Europe, and elsewhere. The Soviet Union has continued to expand its nuclear forces far beyond any rational military purpose.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon fails to place the report on Soviet activities in its proper context. While focusing on Soviet military expansion, it fails to note areas of Soviet weakness and measurements of military power where the Soviet Union lags far behind the United States and our NATO allies. In fact it is hard to examine the report without concluding that it has been produced shortly before congressional votes on the military budget and on the nuclear freeze in order to influence votes rather than to inform the public debate.

A fair study of the balance of military power between the United States and the Soviet Union shows that in fact the United States enjoys a lead over the Soviet Union in many measures of military power just as the Soviets lead us in other areas. For example, the United States has more nuclear warheads than the Soviet Union, a superior strategic submarine force, a large lead in cruise missile technology, a lead in accuracy of our strategic missiles and many more forward based weapons systems within range of the Soviet Union.

The Library of Congress, in response to a request from Senator CARL LEVIN in November 1982, prepared a chart listing 24 separate measures of military power by which the United States and its allies possess a decided advantage over the Soviet Union and its allies.

I commend this chart to my colleagues, not to indicate that the United States is militarily superior to the Soviet Union but rather that there are many areas of U.S. military advantage just as there are areas of Soviet advantage.

Clearly, now is the best time to freeze the nuclear arms race between the two superpowers. The United States and the Soviet Union are at overall nuclear parity. I therefore urge my colleague to support House Joint Resolution 13, the freeze and reductions resolution sponsored by Chairman ZABLOCKI.

The table follows:

	U.S. position	Soviet position	U.S. advantage
Strategic nuclear forces			
Total warheads and bombs	9,662	7,060	+2,602
Total missile warheads	7,128	6,735	+393
Total MIRVed missiles (land and sea)	1,056	980	+76
Total MIRVed submarine launched ballistic missiles (SLBM)	496	208	+288
Total SLBM warheads	4,976	1,433	+3,543
Total heavy bombers, including Soviet Backfire	316	235	+81
Tanker aircraft (active reserve)	621	50	+571
Conventional forces			
Marine divisions	4	1	+3
Marine manpower	155,000	13,000	+142,000
Strategic airlift aircraft	310	200	+110
Tactical airlift aircraft (active and reserve)	511	400	+111
Utility/cargo helicopters	4,970	2,100	+2,870
Airborne warning/control aircraft (AWACS)	24	9	+15
Carrier based fighter/attack aircraft	720	60	+660
Antisubmarine warfare aircraft aloft	278	150	+128
Aircraft carriers:			
Attack carriers	12	0	+12
VTOL helicopter carriers	12	4	+8
Amphibious ships (less HELO carriers)	49	26	+23
Destroyers	83	69	+14
Aircraft carriers:			
Attack	8	0	+8
HEL0-anti-submarine Warfare	10	3	+7
Destroyers and cruisers	143	74	+69
Frigates and corvettes	204	126	+78
Mine warfare ships	303	216	+87

MUTUAL GUARANTEED BUILD-DOWN—A RATIONAL APPROACH TO ARMS CONTROL

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. LEVITAS, Mr. Speaker, there is a growing concern throughout this country, and Western Europe about the threat posed by the ever-spiraling arms race and the lack of an overall framework to bring about meaningful progress toward arms control. Clearly, there is no sane or rational person who does not wish to achieve the goal of making this world a safer place. Many of those who have joined the nuclear freeze movement have done so out of a legitimate fear of nuclear war, while others have been motivated by a deep sense of frustration that there is no promising solution to halt the arms race, aside from the President's START initiative.

Unfortunately, merely freezing the number of warheads and weapons will not make this world a safer place. Instead, a freeze would leave the United States with a deteriorating bomber force, a highly vulnerable land-based missile system, and no strategic system comparable to the Soviet Union's ICBM force targeted on Western Europe. For these reasons, a bilateral nuclear freeze would leave the Soviets with little or no incentive to continue negotiations to bring about meaningful reductions in nuclear arsenals.

Thus, I am convinced that we need to pursue a different approach to arms control—a fresh approach that will get us off the arms race treadmill. I rise today along with my colleague from Illinois, Mr. PORTER, to offer such a proposal.

The resolution that Mr. PORTER and I are introducing today is identical in language and intent to a proposal introduced in the Senate last month by Senators BILL COHEN of Maine and SAM NUNN of Georgia, and I commend them for developing this innovative approach. This innovative measure proposes that whenever the United States or the Soviet Union adds a new nuclear weapon to its strategic force, two older, less stabilizing weapons must be eliminated. This so-called build-down approach allows us and the Soviets to modernize forces, which will reduce the tendency for a hair trigger attitude. It will enable us to maintain a credible deterrent, while achieving meaningful reductions in the total number of nuclear warheads.

The net reduction in numbers of weapons, accompanied by the deployment of more reliable, survivable systems, would reduce tensions between the two superpowers. Furthermore, a nuclear arms build-down would give both sides less cause for turning to destabilizing strategies that call for hair trigger responses to perceived threats.

Another advantage of the Cohen-Nunn concept is that it is compatible with, and, in fact, complimentary to, our ongoing arms control negotiations with the U.S.S.R. Moreover, unlike the nuclear freeze, the build-down proposal gives our military planners and arms control negotiators some much needed flexibility. The precise elements of the 2-for-1 formula could be crafted to focus exclusively on one type of weapons mix or broadened to encompass a wide range of nuclear armaments.

In general, the build-down concept would include the following components:

For each new nuclear warhead deployed, two older warheads would have to be eliminated.

Both sides would exercise the principle of freedom to mix in determining tradeoffs and force composition.

Useful counting rules and implementation procedures from the SALT agreements could be retained.

Both sides would agree on verification measures, which would insure confidence and compliance.

I would like to congratulate Senators COHEN and NUNN for their leadership in bringing this imaginative proposal before the Congress. Although their resolution has largely escaped media attention, it has already generated an impressive amount of support. President Reagan has expressed his sincere interest in pursuing this particular concept; Under Secretary of

Defense DeLauer has written Senator COHEN a very supportive letter; and Gen. David Jones, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has embraced the resolution in congressional testimony. In addition, I would like to place in the RECORD a statement made by Senator CHARLES PERCY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, an article by former Senator and Secretary of State Edmund Muskie, which praise the Cohen-Nunn proposal.

I urge the House of Representatives to begin immediate consideration of the build-down proposal. Unquestionably, this flexible approach to nuclear arms control can bring about a cessation of fear and hostilities—and a fair mechanism for achieving a safer world.

MUTUAL GUARANTEED BUILD-DOWN OF NUCLEAR FORCES

Mr. PERCY, Mr. President, last month Senators COHEN and NUNN introduced Senate Resolution 57, which calls on the United States and Soviet Union to agree that while START is negotiated, each side will dismantle two nuclear warheads for every new one they deploy. The Cohen-Nunn proposal for a mutual guaranteed build-down of nuclear forces is one of the most innovative and promising arms control proposals to be presented to the Senate in many years. I will invite the two architects of this resolution to testify before the Foreign Relations Committee when we hold hearings later this spring on the United States-Soviet nuclear relationship.

Although Senate Resolution 57 has largely escaped media attention, it has already garnered an impressive degree of support. As Senator COHEN has noted, the President has expressed "his very sincere and serious interest in pursuing this particular concept." Under Secretary of Defense DeLauer has written a very supportive letter advising Senator COHEN that, "the thesis that newer systems should be able to replace older ones on more than a one to one basis is just what I am trying to bring about." And on February 9, Gen. David Jones, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, praised the resolution in congressional testimony, saying it has "the elements of something much more in long term cuts than the current proposals." Senate Resolution 57 now has 15 co-sponsors, including Senators from both sides of the aisle.

There are a number of reasons why the Cohen-Nunn proposal is attracting such wide, bipartisan support. First, as is the case with the nuclear freeze proposal, it benefits from an underlying concept that can be readily grasped and embraced by the general public. But unlike the freeze, which regrettably would sanction each side's keeping every nuclear weapon they already have, the Cohen-Nunn requirement for "giving up two to get one" would immediately start the United States and Soviet Union down the road toward real weapons reductions.

Second, the resolution would permit the United States to proceed with essential strategic and theater nuclear force modernization. These programs are needed to correct military vulnerabilities and provide bargaining leverage in on-going arms control negotiations. If Congress agrees, new nuclear weapons could be deployed, but only if twice

as many existing systems are retired. Under the Cohen-Nunn concept, therefore, vital modernization programs would lead to a more survivable and hence stable nuclear balance with the Soviet Union at far lower levels of weaponry. This should alleviate the fear of many freeze advocates that the Reagan administration's proposed strategic modernization program will prompt an unregulated and destabilizing arms buildup.

Third, most of the procedures, definitions, and counting rules already laboriously negotiated with the Soviets in SALT could be readily applied in implementing the mutual guaranteed build-down proposal. The SALT I interim agreement, which each side still observes, provides a comprehensive blueprint for establishing a new "old-for-new" trade-off regime. For example, the United States continues to retire one older Polaris SLBM launcher for each new Trident SLBM launcher it deploys, and the Soviet Union continues to dismantle Yankee-class SLBM launchers to make room for newer Delta and Typhoon SLBM launchers.

Under the Cohen-Nunn approach, the only difference would be one of degree. In place of the current 1-for-1 exchange, Senate Resolution 57 would require a 2-for-1 trade off. The present SALT I rules for phasing deployments with dismantlements could be maintained, though, and the SALT Standing Consultative Commission (SCC) could be empowered to oversee the implementation of the new agreement.

The Cohen-Nunn proposal could also draw on agreements reached in SALT II and thereby simplify and streamline the difficulties inherent in attaining a new agreement with the Soviet Union. For example, SALT II provides established rules for counting and limiting the number of warheads on ballistic missiles currently deployed or under development. The treaty also contains a number of other prohibitions and limitations, such as a ban on encrypting treaty-related telemetry, which would strengthen enforcement of a mutual guaranteed build-down accord. In this respect, the Cohen-Nunn proposal is fully consistent with President Reagan's pledge that the United States will continue to avoid actions that would undercut the SALT I and II agreements as long as the Soviets demonstrate the same restraint.

Lastly, the Cohen-Nunn concept would, if implemented, fully complement START. By establishing a new interim framework for reciprocal and verifiable reductions, Senate Resolution 57 would promote a climate of restraint and trust that would enhance the prospects for success in START. Furthermore, the concept is entirely compatible with the proposal which our START negotiators have tendered in Geneva.

To illustrate this point, I urge my colleagues to look at three related questions. First, what would the U.S. strategic ballistic missile force most likely look like in 1989 if the Soviets were to accept our START proposal? Second, how many ICBM and SLBM warheads would have to be dismantled under the Cohen-Nunn 2-for-1 rule if the United States deployed new strategic systems to meet this projected inventory? Third, what number and types of existing ICBM and SLBM warheads would the United States have to destroy by 1989—independent of Cohen-Nunn—to meet our START proposal, assuming it were accepted?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three tables which address these questions.

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

TABLE 1.—HYPOTHETICAL U.S. MISSILE FORCE IN 1989 UNDER U.S. START PROPOSAL

Missiles	Number	Warheads	Number
ICBM's:			
MX	100	10 per ICBM ¹	1,000
MMIII	422	3 per ICBM	1,266
Subtotal	522		2,266
SLBM's:			
C-4 on 11 Ohio SSBN's ²	264	8 per SLBM	2,112
C-4 on 4 Lafayette SSBN's ³	64	8 per SLBM	512
Subtotal	328		2,624
Total ICBM's + SLBM's ⁴	850	Total RV's	4,890

¹ All warhead fractionalization figures reflect SALT II counting rules.
² 11 Ohio-class SSBN's correlates to the Trident shipbuilding program through the fiscal year 1984 request.
³ Assumes Trident C-4 backfit will be completed on all 12 programed ships by end of 1982.
⁴ The United States has proposed a ceiling of 850 ICBM's and SLBM's in START and limit of 5,000 ICBM and SLBM warheads, no more than half of which (2,500) can be deployed on ICBM's.

TABLE 2.—ASSOCIATED DISMANTLEMENTS REQUIRED UNDER COHEN/NUNN

	Number
100 MX × 10 RV/ICBM × 2	2,000
216 C-4 × 8 RV/SLBM ²	1,456
Total RV's	5,456

² Ohio-class SSBN's with 48 C-4 and 384 SALT-accountable RV's are already deployed. Dismantlements only associated with 9 new Ohio SSBN's.

TABLE 3.—ASSOCIATED DISMANTLEMENTS REQUIRED UNDER U.S. START PROPOSAL¹

	Number
52 Titan II's × 1 RV/ICBM	52
450 MM II's × 1 RV/ICBM	450
128 MM III's × 3 RV/ICBM	384
112 A-3 × 1 RV/SLBM	112
304 C-3 × 14 RV/SLBM	4,256
128 C-4 × 8 RV/SLBM	1,024
Total	6,278

¹ List includes some systems (Titan II ICBM's which the U.S. plans to retire unilaterally and some systems (Polaris SLBM launchers) which the United States will have to dismantle if it continues to respect SALT I.
² Polaris-class SSBN's remain in the force. Their SLBM launchers are empty but since they have not been dismantled they still must count under SALT rules.
³ This figure reflects SALT-accountable RV's on the 8 Lafayette class Trident-backfit submarines that could not be retained under the force mix portrayed in table 1.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 6, 1983]
BUILD DOWN THE FORCES WE DON'T NEED
 (By Edmund S. Muskie)

Something important is stirring in the Senate. For the first time in memory a serious and far-reaching arms control proposal has originated within the Armed Services Committee. It has already won the warm endorsement of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and many other senators.

Sens. William S. Cohen and Sam Nunn have proposed a "mutual guaranteed build-down of nuclear forces." Under the plan, the United States and the Soviet Union would each pledge to eliminate from its operational forces two nuclear warheads for each newly deployed nuclear warhead.

At first glance, the concept seems suspiciously simple, but closer examination shows that the build-down idea has great promise as a principle that reconciles the objectives of arms control with the impera-

tives of military planning. It is the kind of constructive initiative for which those of us who support a nuclear freeze have been working.

One can understand the concept's merit best by considering how it might actually be put into effect. While the build-down scheme is applicable to all nuclear weapons, it would be sensible to treat tactical battlefield weapons as a separate category. Of most immediate interest would be strategic nuclear forces and long-range theater nuclear systems, the weapons currently being discussed in the Geneva negotiations between the two superpowers. All the latter weapons are essentially strategic, in the sense that they threaten critical targets in the heartlands of the two alliances. Altogether, these long-range systems probably carry 12,000 to 13,000 nuclear warheads on each side. Yet, unless negotiated limits are soon imposed, even these large arsenals may continue to grow.

The build-down rule would prevent any such growth. Force modernization would mean simultaneously greater force reduction. Thus, the plan would challenge both governments to move promptly toward the real reductions they profess to desire—to put or shut up. While the exact pace and composition of such reductions would surely vary between the two sides, the price of new programs anticipated for the next several years could well be cuts of about one-third in operational nuclear warheads on long-range delivery vehicles—a reduction to perhaps 7,000-8,000 warheads on each side. Those numbers are compatible with both President Reagan's START proposal and the Soviet counter-offers.

To verify such reductions, the parties could employ procedures already elaborated in previous strategic arms negotiations. In particular, the so-called "counting rules" negotiated during the 1970s would be invaluable in confirming the numbers of warheads being eliminated. For example, a Soviet SS18 missile would be assumed to have 10 warheads, an American Poseidon missile, 14. Eliminating missiles and aircraft would be necessary to demonstrate removal of warheads from operational service.

In verifying these activities, the Standard Consultative Commission established in 1972 would be indispensable. As the build-down fulfills President Reagan's demands for real reductions, it would also build upon the vital precedents and procedures of prior strategic agreements.

Especially important are the build-down's implications for the American and Soviet military establishments. They would be both liberated and constrained. They would have broad flexibility to choose which new systems to deploy, but they would have to decide whether modernization was worth the price. Presumably, as forces began to shrink, the military incentives would favor emphasizing the most survivable weapons, thereby promoting strategic stability.

One could strengthen those incentives for stability by incorporating some of the ideas that Rep. Albert Gore and others have advanced to phase out the most dangerous weapons, multiple-warhead ICMBs. For example, if a side chose to deploy smaller, single-warhead missiles, it might be allowed to do so at a replacement ratio of two new warheads for three currently deployed warheads. This would still ensure reduction but would favor the less threatening missiles now attracting interest in the President's Commission on Strategic Forces.

Not only is the build-down concept technically and strategically sound; it also is politically appealing. It could go far toward healing the serious breach we have suffered on arms control policy by responding to the fundamental concerns of both those who favor and those who oppose a nuclear freeze. For understandable reasons, freeze proponents have feared that permitting any change in nuclear forces would in fact mean an increase in those forces. Freeze opponents have feared that preventing any change in the forces would undermine stability by perpetuating a structure of increasingly vulnerable and unreliable weapons. Both perspectives are legitimate. The build-down plan offers a unique opportunity to harmonize them. In the interest of stability, some modernization would be permitted, but there would be no modernization without reductions.

More than a decade ago, an overwhelming majority of senators urged the president to head off the deployment of MIRVed missiles by negotiating a ban on flight tests. But we spoke tardily and timidly, and the world grew far more dangerous. Today, with new technologies in prospect and arms negotiations in peril, a vigorous initiative by Congress could not be more timely. The guaranteed build-down could be the organizing principle on which a strong congressional majority could frame advice to the president in terms on which he might be willing to act. It could be the rallying point for a bipartisan coalition linking Congress and the executive in a renewed effort to blend diplomacy and defense. And forging such a coalition remains the key to effective negotiations with the Soviet Union.

YOUTH—AMERICA'S STRENGTH

HON. JAMES R. "JIM" OLIN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. OLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to enter in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Voice of Democracy script that was judged the best written this year in Virginia. It was written by a constituent of mine, Beth Leitch, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Powell M. Leitch, Jr., and a senior at Covington High School. Beth was sponsored by Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 1033 and its ladies auxiliary. Her essay won first place on the local, regional, and State levels, and this week, she has been in Washington for the national judging. At her school, she is active in the Spanish Club, forensics, and the Madrigal Singers. She also is an organizer at her church. Next fall, she plans to attend Hollins College, which is also in the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia. Beth is the first statewide winner post 1033 has had. When you read her script, "Youth—America's Strength," I know you will realize why her parents, Curtis Smith, her sponsor; James Booth, the State adjutant from Staunton, Va.; Bobby R. Walls, State commander; and myself are so proud of her.

The script follows:

YOUTH—AMERICA'S STRENGTH

I can't count the number of times I've been told that I am America's future. As my senior year quickly comes to an end, I begin to realize that one day this country will depend on my generation. I must admit that as I look around at my classmates and friends I have my moments of doubt. Us, leading America? Yes, we will lead America and undoubtedly quite well. Sometimes it seems that all young people think about is getting the car for this weekend or Friday night's date. Yet they do care about other things. Once they're out in the real world and are made aware of more important issues, these feelings can be geared to something more constructive and significant. There are several things that I feel should be stressed in the early years of youth. Family life, religion, education, and patriotism are necessities in creating a basically well-rounded person. I believe that if one has had the opportunity to sample each of these important factors then he will be more capable of making intelligent and constructive choices.

Family life plays an important role in keeping America's youth strong. At a time when divorce rates are soaring, many people are finally realizing the importance of a stable homelife. Even children from divorced homes, suffering from the emotional impact of a broken home, understand the necessity for a solid foundation. Family-life encourages togetherness and shapes morals, both of which are important attributes in later life.

Religion also plays an influential part in the development of America's youth. Regardless of one's denomination, religion gives a foundation consisting of certain ethical humanitarian beliefs, which helps to guide one throughout life. In order to lead a country one must have these strong convictions and a lot of determination.

Education is a critical factor in the development of young minds. Contrary to what some believe, education is not meant to implant opinions in the mind of students. It is meant to give students the resources from which they can form their own opinions and make their own decisions. Having an opinion does one no good unless he can convey his opinion to others in an intelligent and logical manner.

Many opposing views have surfaced over the reinstatement of the draft. People have begun to wonder what's wrong with this generation. Why won't America's young men stand up and fight for their country? What ever happened to good old fashioned patriotism? The fact is that most boys are eager to defend their country but the media's attention naturally surrounds the few protesters. For every young man who refuses to register for the draft there are many times that number who recognize their duty to support their country and do register.

I'm proud to be counted among the millions of young people who are, indeed—America's strength. Today we are the candy strippers, gas attendants, waiters and waitresses, volunteers who aid in charity drives, struggling students of Mathematics and English, and people who fill a host of other jobs. Tomorrow we'll be the lawyers, musicians, doctors, secretaries, soldiers and nurses, just to name a few. No, there's nothing wrong with this generation. We're just as strong as the last one. Just have faith in us so we can gain faith in ourselves. A group of people had faith in themselves in 1776 and that didn't turn out so bad, did it?●

HOW THE MEDIA SHAPES PERCEPTIONS

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, a great many people in the United States get their information about foreign events from the lead story of a television news show or from the front page of a newspaper. To that extent, the media becomes important in the shaping of public opinion, and perhaps even foreign policy.

It becomes, therefore, that much greater a responsibility for the media to exert both factual and contextual accuracy in their reporting. I want to put in the RECORD a column written by Marshall Breger, for the Washington Times, January 13, 1983. He writes about how American news coverage of the recent events in the Middle East have been less than factual and accurate.

The column follows:

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 13, 1983]

THE MEDIA AND THE MIDEAST

(By Marshall Breger)

The historic announcement by Israeli Cabinet Secretary Dan Meridor that Lebanon and Israel are working toward an agreement on political ties and the withdrawal of Israeli troops has given rise to new hope that Israel's controversial actions this summer have restored at least some measure of stability to troubled Lebanon.

That, of course, was at least one of Israel's stated objectives . . . though one would hardly have known this from the news reports coming from Lebanon at the time.

The job of a war correspondent is never an easy one. Logistics are difficult. Censors are everpresent. Warring sides are vying to gain advantage in the propaganda arena. Still, the American people deserve better than they received from many of the reporters who covered the recent events in Lebanon.

War, of course, is hell. War coverage will reflect this. But war coverage also should do more: It should provide perspective; it should put events in their proper historical context; it should enlighten. Instead, what the consumers of American news received during the Lebanon fighting were nightly pictures of a jovial Yasser Arafat posing and posturing, with Israeli jets constantly in the background. The pictures and the words bore little resemblance to the war itself.

As Joshua Muravchik shows in his stunning 56-page study of media reporting in Lebanon, appearing in the Winter 1983 issue of Policy Review, prime-time newscasts of the Lebanon fighting were replete with errors. Casualty figures, always difficult to pin down, seemingly were manufactured out of whole cloth. NBC, for example, claimed that 600,000 people were left homeless in Southern Lebanon, when the entire population of the area was only 500,000.

Were one to rely on the media's interpretation of the invasion, one would think that Israel wages war only on women and children, schools and hospitals. Through use of

what Bill Moyers calls "the lie of the camera," television sought to interpret the PLO as defenseless innocents and the Israelis as savage Spartans bombing without prudence or purpose. Few network reports, for example, noted that the Israelis had warned civilians before an attack to flee to safety—losing the advantage of surprise—to avoid civilian casualties.

The broadcast media were not alone in their errors of omission and commission. Many newspapers, as well, confused their reporting and editorial functions. Perhaps the strangest use of verbal manipulation by the print media occurred during efforts to place in historical context the continual blood feuds that have marked the sad history of Lebanon since the 1970 Palestinian invasion. In seeking to trace the brutal passions that gave rise to the massacre of Palestinian civilians at the Sabra and Chatila refugee camps, few newspapers pointed to the 100,000 Lebanese already killed during the civil war. While the American media correctly pointed to the 1976 Christian massacre of Palestinians at Tel Zaatar, they consistently ignored the PLO massacre of Christians at Damur that same year.

Take time magazine. In its Sept. 27 issue, Time points out that those Palestinians who survived the siege of Tel Zaatar took over Damur, a Christian village on the coastal highway south of Beirut. They then tell us that the Christians were "rudely displaced to make way for the Palestinian refugees." The Washington Post of Oct. 14 tells us that the Christians of Damur were "forced out of the seaside town" by Palestinian guerrillas. Newsweek of Oct. 4 merely relates that Palestinian gunners "retaliated against Christians in Damur."

The facts are undisputed. Damur is a coastal city about 12 miles south of Beirut. During the Lebanese civil war, the Maronite militia took control of the coastal road at Damur, cutting southern Lebanon off from food and fuel supplies. PLO and leftist Lebanese factions responded by storming the town, massacring about 300 Christians. A seashore evacuation to the Christian stronghold of Juniah saved the surviving Christian refugees. Indeed, The New York Times at the time described the Palestinians as having "plundered," "scorched," and "scoured" Damur. Relatives of the slain formed the backbone of the Phalangist Damur regiment which is widely believed to have been involved in the Sabra and Chatila massacres. And so it goes.

The point of this tale is not to shift responsibility for the horrible slaughter that accompanies Lebanese blood feuds. It is to query why the news media find it necessary to romanticize the PLO, even to the extent of distorting reality through incomplete reportage. The transformation of Arafat's terrorist into freedom fighters derives directly from Americans' moralistic approach toward foreign affairs. If we are sympathetic towards the goals of a political organization, we cannot think of it as doing anything bad. Thus, those Americans who hated the Shah of Iran had to treat the Ayatollah as an agrarian reformer.

The myth of a reformist PLO—styled as a Third World liberation movement—presses the media to reject any evidence that the PLO engages in atrocities. More important, many in the media believe it almost indecent for a guerrilla movement to be defeated at arms.

Most Americans get information about foreign affairs from TV news and newspaper front pages. To that extent, the media have

become a direct participant in shaping public opinion, if not foreign policy. Their professional responsibility for both factual and contextual accuracy has become all the greater.

If American reporters covering the events in Lebanon didn't know any better, they should have been replaced by reporters willing to do their homework. The facts about Damur, for example, were readily available. If they did know better—if they were deliberately telling only a part of this tragic and emotional story—it is time for some sober reflection. ●

IMPLEMENTATION OF A U.S. EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President proclaimed an exclusive economic zone for the United States. The concept of an exclusive economic zone (EEZ), as already recognized in international law and reflected in the recently concluded Convention on the Law of the Sea, is a maritime area beyond the territorial sea in which all nations enjoy non-resource-related freedoms of the high seas. Traditional freedoms of the high seas, including, but not limited to, those pertaining to navigation, overflight, marine scientific research, and the laying and maintenance of submarine cables and pipelines, remain both within and beyond the zone.

Throughout the negotiating process for the Law of the Sea Convention, I had hoped that our negotiators would be able to secure agreement on a text which I could wholeheartedly support. In some respects they succeeded, and I applaud their efforts. I know how long and hard Federal officials, private citizens, and Members of Congress labored to achieve a convention which would provide a sound basis for the policies of all nations with an interest in the oceans. It is unfortunate that certain elements of the convention which remain are not compatible with U.S. interests. Because of this, the President decided that the United States would not become a party to the convention. That does not mean, however, that the United States has abandoned its efforts to contribute to the progressive development of international law. The establishment of a U.S. exclusive economic zone which preserves traditional high seas rights of other nations is consistent with that objective.

To complement the President's proclamation, I have cosponsored legislation to implement the establishment of a U.S. exclusive economic zone. That legislation, which was introduced today is intended to: First, clarify the rights and jurisdiction of the United States and the rights and freedoms of

other states within the U.S. EEZ; second, set forth the policy of the United States regarding the development and use of the natural resources of the ocean and its floor beyond the EEZ; and third, conform previously enacted interim law with such rights, jurisdiction and policy.

Within the EEZ, the United States would assert and maintain:

First, sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring, exploiting, conserving, and managing the living resources—other than migratory species of fish—and nonliving resources of the seabed and subsoil and superjacent waters;

Second, sovereign rights for the purpose of carrying out economic exploration and exploitation not covered under paragraph 1, including, but not limited to, the production of energy from the water, currents, and winds; and

Third, jurisdiction with regard to: (a) the establishment and use of artificial islands, (b) other installations and structures having economic purposes, and (c) the protection and preservation of the marine environment.

The proposed legislation would not affect the authorities under which the United States manages billfish, anadromous species, for example, Atlantic and Pacific salmon, or marine mammals, including whales. Nor would it alter the current U.S. disclaimer of jurisdiction over highly migratory species of tuna. With respect to whales, I expect that the United States would continue to apply both domestic law and International Whaling Convention measures in the EEZ absent specific changes in the Marine Mammal Protection Act and/or the Whaling Convention Act.

With respect to general U.S. fishery policy, the legislation would reaffirm the intention of the United States to maximize economic benefits from the oceans and to exercise its discretionary powers in determining the allowable catch, U.S. harvesting capacity, the allocation of surpluses—if any—to other states, and the terms and conditions established in conservation and management regulations.

The legislation also clarified that nothing in the act should be deemed to be a basis for any royalty, fee, tax, or other assessment of revenue for fishing by U.S.-flag vessels for living marine resources over which the United States would exercise sovereign rights. Concern has been raised by representatives of the U.S. fishing industry that establishment of an EEZ will empower the National Marine Fisheries Service to impose some form of economic rent charge upon domestic fishermen. This is not the case. In and of itself, the proposed legislation would not change existing authority. The FCMA does not now allow charg-

ing U.S. fishermen in excess of administrative costs for any permits which may be required. The proposed legislation would not amend this prohibition. The assessment of foreign fishing fees in excess of U.S. costs, which is already permitted under the Fishery Conservation and Management Act (FCMA), would remain an option should it be determined that such fees are in the national interest.

With respect to the conduct of marine scientific research, another matter of concern to those affected by the establishment of an EEZ, the proposed legislation:

First, expresses the position of the United States that marine scientific research is a high seas freedom in the U.S. EEZ and the EEZ's of other states;

Second, calls upon the Secretary of State, notwithstanding the view of the United States as noted above, to submit promptly to foreign officials, when requested by U.S. scientists, requests by U.S. scientists to conduct research off other coastal states which exercise marine science research jurisdiction in a reasonable manner which is not inconsistent with international law; and

Third, calls upon the Secretary of State to initiate negotiations with coastal states for the purpose of obtaining agreements which will facilitate the conduct of marine scientific research.

Should the United States decide that it wishes to impose restrictions on marine scientific research in the U.S. EEZ subsequent to the enactment of the proposed legislation, Congress would need to enact a new statute to specifically establish the legal authority for regulating such research.

The proposed legislation represents the culmination of months of consultations with affected interests. I believe that in its present form it addresses the concerns of a broad spectrum of interests and is a positive contribution to the development of international law. I recognize at the outset, however, that further refinement may be necessary. I expect that opportunities will be provided for constructive debate on each element of the legislation. I look forward to that debate. The legislation also references the need for a careful analysis of its implications for other existing statutes, including but not limited to, statutes relating to protection of the marine environment and immigration and taxing authority. A report from the President to the Congress, with recommendations for changes to existing laws and programs which would be required as a result of the establishment and implementation of the EEZ, is mandated within 18 months after enactment of the proposed legislation. I am convinced that the end result of congressional consideration of the proposed

EEZ legislation and the Presidential report will be a set of statutes which meet our domestic and international responsibilities.●

IMPROVING TAXPAYER COMPLIANCE

HON. NORMAN E. D'AMOURS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. D'AMOURS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the executive summary of an excellent study done by Dr. Donald J. Puglisi on improving taxpayer compliance on interest and dividend income. Dr. Puglisi, a professor of finance at the University of Delaware, decisively concludes that the revenue estimates supplied by the Treasury in support of withholding are misleading, and the Treasury will not lose revenue if withholding is repealed. Dr. Puglisi also demonstrates that full utilization of TEFRA's comprehensive reporting and enforcement system would produce more tax revenue than a withholding system.

Full copies of the Puglisi study are available on request.

[Condensed version—Updated Mar. 5, 1983]

IMPROVING TAXPAYER COMPLIANCE ON INTEREST AND DIVIDEND INCOME

(A study prepared by Dr. Donald J. Puglisi, Professor of Finance, University of Delaware)

The success of our voluntary income reporting and tax payment system depends on our ability to assure the compliance of taxpayers.

Clearly it is as much in the interest of financial institutions as it is of the government to assure that tax cheating is discouraged to the extent possible—and that honest taxpayers are required to pay no more than their fair share.

The only question is—what is the best way to achieve maximum compliance?

In the area of interest and dividend income, obviously the Treasury believes the best way is through withholding on dividend and interest income, as is done in the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (TEFRA), effective generally on July 1, 1983.

However, the evidence in this study demonstrates that:

(1) equal or better compliance could be achieved through better enforcement and the more comprehensive information reporting also required by TEFRA; and, (2) that the burden of meeting TEFRA's 10 percent withholding requirements would fall hardest on honest and diligent taxpayers who now comply fully by declaring their interest and dividend income. (These would include tax compliers who fail to claim exemptions to which they are entitled, the less-sophisticated who do not adjust their W-2s and estimated payments to compensate for withholding, and taxpayers generally who are already over-withheld upon.)

Note that this study does not recommend the repeal of TEFRA. It recommends that all relevant provisions of the Act remain in

force except those imposing a 10% withholding on interest and dividend income.

TREASURY REVENUE ESTIMATES ARE MISLEADING

The revenue estimates supplied by the Treasury Department in support of withholding are misleading. The Treasury will not lose revenue if withholding is repealed. Full utilization of TEFRA's comprehensive reporting and enforcement system would produce more tax revenue than a withholding system.

The Treasury's estimates, which purport to show that withholding would bring in a total of \$22.7 billion in tax revenues over fiscal years 1983 through 1988, are unsatisfactory because:

The Treasury tabulates additional revenue which is actually obtained from the expanded information reporting system also included in TEFRA—revenue that will be realized with or without repeal of the 10 percent withholding provision of the Act.

The Treasury grossly overestimates the benefits of the one-time tax collection speed up.

The Treasury does not take into account the problem of the escape of tax revenues through the exemptions in withholding dictated by administrative and political necessity.

Even so, based on an analysis of the Treasury's own data, it's clear that withholding can be repealed with no adverse impact on Treasury tax receipts. Efficient matching of 1040s with 1099s, and 1099s with 1040s, and followup enforcement with taxpayers who do not file, or who under-report interest and dividend income, will achieve at least as much in tax collections as 10% withholding.

Thus, Congress is not faced with the difficult dilemma of finding alternate revenue sources to replace those lost by the repeal of withholding. The revenue figures can remain substantially unchanged in the budget line items. Only the methods of producing that revenue need be changed to create a more efficient system.

INFORMATION REPORTING IS A SEPARATE ISSUE

The common contention is that withholding repeal would cost \$22.7 billion over this and the next five fiscal years. The Treasury figures for tax revenues break down as follows:

REVENUE IMPACT BY FISCAL YEAR

(In billions of dollars)

	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	Cumulative
Reporting.....	0.1	0.4	0.7	0.9	1.2	1.3	4.6
Speedup.....	0.9	3.0	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	5.1
Compliance.....	0.3	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.8	13.1
Total.....	1.2	5.7	3.4	3.7	4.2	4.5	22.7

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury Office of Tax Analysis, March 1, 1983.

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

On close analysis, each line in this table is open to serious question.

The first line—\$4.6 billion—is the Treasury estimate of the expected gain from the requirement of reporting on interest and dividend sources not previously subject to information returns.

It is very significant that for the first time full information reporting is now required for such formerly exempted investments as Treasury and U.S. Agency obligations, corporate bearer bonds, original issue discount instrument (both Government and corpo-

rate), jumbo certificates of deposit and U.S. Savings Bonds. (Apparently, comparing the above Treasury estimate with those previously available, no adjustment has been made in fiscal year 1983 and fiscal year 1984 for a Treasury rule change announced March 2 which excuses withholding and reporting on original issue discount instruments, including Treasury bills, until January 1, 1984). There are also tougher penalties for falsifying numbers.

But that \$4.6 billion has no connection with the provision for interest and dividend withholding. It simply does not belong in the discussion. Repeal of withholding is a separate, independent issue. It is important to remember, however, that withholding repeal would not sacrifice this \$4.6 billion in Treasury receipts. This is new revenue made possible by the comprehensive reporting coverage provisions of TEFRA.

SPEEDUP BENEFITS GREATLY OVERESTIMATED

The second line—the \$5.1 billion speedup benefits of collecting some of the taxes owed on interest and dividend receipts in an earlier rather than a subsequent fiscal year—has no better foundation. This speedup is really a significant item only once (fiscal 1984), reflecting the predicted acceleration in the first full year of withholding.

Interestingly, the Treasury's March 1 estimates increase the speedup effect over earlier projections. However, serious doubt must be cast upon these latest figures because of rule changes announced March 2. The Treasury's new regulations will permit once-a-year withholding collections on passbook, transaction, money market deposit (MMDA), and Super NOW accounts at banks and savings institutions. These categories now represent approximately \$500 billion in deposits. Since their inception in mid-December, balances in the MMDAs and the Super NOWs have grown to \$300 billion—with continued growth a virtual certainty. No speedup effect will be realized from such interest-earning balances where once-a-year withholding is used.

Even so, the Treasury's estimate does not take adequate account of the offset which individuals may and will make in their wage and salary withholding and, more especially, in their quarterly estimated tax payments.

Taxpayers filing estimated tax are expressly permitted to reduce their payments by the amount of interest and dividends withheld. The vast majority of these taxpayers, representing an even higher percentage of the dollars involved, will elect to make this adjustment.

The Treasury's own 1980 estimates show that taxpayers in full compliance with the law could offset approximately 95% of the revenue speedup by adjusting their estimated payments and withholding forms for wages and salaried income. Even though all taxpayers may not make these adjustments, the Treasury's numbers seem far too high. Some reasonable downward adjustment should be provided to make these figures credible.

The revenue benefit of speedup is greatly exaggerated.

WITHHOLDING WON'T STOP TAX CHEATERS

The third line—\$13.1 billion anticipated from compliance improvement—is the largest component of the Treasury's projections.

All depository institutions and honest citizens favor measures to ensure that everyone pays all taxes legitimately owed to the government. The only disagreements stem from how to eliminate tax cheating in the most efficient manner.

The withholding regulations will not stop many tax cheats from continuing or partially avoiding their full tax liability. The only way to bring these cheaters under withholding would be to permit no exemptions at all. Withholding, as mandated by TEFRA, is not a suitable method for assuring a high level of compliance.

It is poor public policy to be satisfied with the 10 percent receipts from some tax evaders that would be produced by withholding. If additional tax is owed, the tax liability is probably much higher. The goal should be to target all tax evaders and then obtain all tax owed.

IMPROVED REPORTING, MATCHING SYSTEM WILL DO THE JOB

An improved reporting and 1099 matching system will address the compliance problem more completely. Virtually every 1099 should appear on a tax return somewhere. Conversely, for every Form 1099 submitted by a payor of interest and dividends a Form 1040 should be identifiable. With the Treasury's discretionary authority to require computer-readable 1099 reporting, the matching process can be done efficiently by the IRS. Non-filers of 1040s can be traced through information received on 1099s; under-reporting can be discouraged by matching 1099s against 1040s. Taxpayer identification numbers are now required on each account.

Additionally, because cheating in one area of the tax form is likely to have spread to other income sources, an improved matching system to audit tax compliance on interest and dividend income will also target returns which merit examination for other types of non-compliance. Such targeting can be enforced by low-cost, computer-generated tax deficiency notices. This may be sufficient to collect taxes due without incurring high IRS audit costs (or harrasing the vast majority of taxpayers who comply fully and voluntarily by declaring taxes due).

Without proper enforcement, withholding will not produce significant improvement in taxpayer compliance and tax receipts; with proper utilization of the enforcement tools also provided by TEFRA, withholding is unnecessary.

In addition, the imposition of withholding would impose significant added burdens on the private sector. Implementation of withholding will not only fail to produce new revenues for the government but will reduce the tax receipts which would have been generated. Such costs run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

Expansion of the enforcement activities of the IRS is the fairest and most cost-effective way to close the interest and dividend revenue gap. It targets the closing of the revenue gap toward the noncompliers who have created it, rather than unnecessarily penalizing the vast majority of Americans who already comply with the Tax Code.

Withholding on interest and dividend income is both bad public policy and bad economics. A system of comprehensive reporting and effective enforcement would avoid those errors and should be the preferred solution to noncompliance.●

COMPULSORY UNION DUES

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, as the liberal establishment fulminates about the need for so-called campaign finance reform, a group of airline employees has petitioned the U.S. Supreme Court for relief from the most blatant campaign abuse of all—the use of compulsory union dues for partisan, political purposes.

Currently before the Supreme Court is a petition for writ of certiorari in the case of Ellis/Fails against Brotherhood of Railway and Airline Clerks. Because I believe this case can have historic consequences if the Court agrees to the petition, I intend to submit to the Court an amicus brief on behalf of these workers.

As sponsor of H.R. 4351 in the 97th Congress, I sought to eliminate by statute the union hierarchy's unique power to extract money from working people as a condition of employment for political operations those workers may oppose. Thomas Jefferson expressed it best when he said, "to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical."

Unfortunately, many reform-minded individuals with a zest for amending Federal election law have developed a blind spot when it comes to protecting workers from abuse of their constitutional rights of political freedom at the hands of the union hierarchy.

However, this grave injustice has not escaped the attention of the Courts. In *Aboud* against Detroit Board of Education, the Supreme Court stated that workers could not be required as a condition of employment to pay a union official anything other than the direct cost of collective bargaining with his employer. This means no phone banks, partisan get-out-the-vote drives, union socials or any other nonbargaining item is to be paid for with union dues taken as a condition of employment.

The Court held that the Constitution requires:

... That such expenditure be financed from charges, dues or assessments paid by employees who do not object to advancing those ideas and who are not coerced into doing so against their will by the threat of loss of . . . employment.

Yet, despite the High Court's ringing endorsement of the need to protect the first amendment rights of workers, the abuse of union dues for political purposes continues.

For instance, after years of litigation in the Beck case a Federal court in Maryland finally ordered the CWA-union hierarchy to refund 79 percent

of the forced dues taken from a group of telephone company employees and spent for nonbargaining purposes.

The problem stems from the failure of the Court in the Abood case to provide a general mechanism of relief for workers who are forced to fund union political operatives against their will. This lack of direction from the Supreme Court opened the door for the faulty ninth circuit Ellis/Fails decision which allows union officials to establish an internal rebate system to return to the plaintiffs that portion of their forced union dues for political, nonbargaining purposes. In other words, union officials and their friends are allowed to sit as the judge and jury in the case against them.

A unique opportunity exists in the Ellis/Fails case to challenge these unjust rebate systems and establish national criteria for the proper uses of forced union dues. For the sake of the first amendment rights cherished by American working men and women. I hope the Supreme Court will agree to the petition for writ of certiorari. And, I am certain, that should the Court agree to hear this landmark case, many of my colleagues will join with me in expressing to the Court our desire to see first amendment rights protected.●

NATIONAL REMANUFACTURING WEEK

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution to designate the first week of October as National Remanufacturing Week.

In a world of ever-shrinking natural resources and ever higher energy demands, remanufactured products can make an important contribution to our national welfare. Remanufacturing saves energy, helping to lower the demand for imported oil and lessen our dependence on foreign imports. It creates jobs. It preserves our stocks of nonrenewable mineral resources. It helps reduce our solid waste disposal problems. And, it helps keep down inflation by offering consumers quality alternative goods at a price 30 to 50 percent below the cost of a new product.

Remanufacturing—the recycling of our mineral and energy resources—makes sense from an environmental, economic, and sociological standpoint. It is labor intensive—creating new jobs—and energy efficient—saving capital. I invite all my colleagues to join me in recognizing the contribution that remanufacturing can make and helping to spread the word: reuse, do not abuse.●

TIME RUNNING OUT FOR PLO TO RECOGNIZE ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO EXIST

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues attention an excellent column by Jack Anderson on the subject of the PLO's inflexibility in seeking a solution to the Mideast problems. The PLO's intransigence once more seems to be the main obstacle to peace in the Mideast.

MIDEAST BYPASS

(By Jack Anderson)

The Mideast may be in a mess, but the situation isn't hopeless. There is a bold solution that could finally bring peace to the troubled region; freeze the Palestine Liberation Organization out of the peace process and create an atmosphere in which new Palestinian leaders would emerge to negotiate.

No less than the Soviets, of all people have become "impatient with the PLO's inflexibility." So states a secret Defense Intelligence Agency report, which adds: "Moscow says it supports Israel's right to secure borders and believes that the PLO should agree."

The State Department has picked up essentially the same information from the Moscow embassy and other listening posts. The diplomatic back channels indicate that the Kremlin is weary of the PLO's insane goal that Israel must be destroyed.

One secret cable, seen by my associate, Dale Van Atta, cites evidence that the Soviets are "pushing Arafat toward some sort of recognition of Israel's existence." Another, quoting a clandestine source, says the Russians "view Arafat's intransigence as a stumbling block" to their future plans in the Middle East.

Some intelligence reports indicate that Arafat might be willing to recognize Israel under certain circumstances. He is described by the CIA, for example, as the PLO leader "most closely identified with moderate policies."

Arafat's problem, according to a secret State Department report, is "how to extend recognition without causing a disastrous split within the PLO rank and file." The analysis adds: "In order to preserve PLO unity, its leaders feel they must be able to show solid guarantees that recognition of Israel will be followed by rapid and meaningful negotiations."

Put more simply in another State Department report, Arafat believes that "before he could acknowledge Israel's right to exist, he must have something to show his people." Lacking this, he has stuck to his anti-recognition policy. The PLO leaders under him, meanwhile, are confident that time is on their side and that "Israel ultimately will have to deal with the PLO. . . ."

But some U.S. analysts think the PLO can be bypassed. Not all the Arab nations are as virulently anti-Israel as the PLO is. Many would probably welcome the chance to follow Egypt's lead and work out an accommodation with Israel. Indeed, the Palestinians themselves may produce other leaders who already are beginning to realize the PLO's efforts have been counterproductive.

Backroom analysts cannot name any rising new Palestinian leaders who might

bring peace to the West Bank. But they raise some tantalizing "ifs"—if President Reagan will put his personal prestige behind a peaceful solution, if the Israelis will withdraw from Lebanon and show restraint on the West Bank, if Jordan's King Hussein will play a stronger role, then new Palestinian leaders will emerge who are not affiliated with the PLO but who will be acceptable to most Palestinians.●

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to be a cosponsor of H.R. 1199, a bill to recognize and grant a Federal charter to the Catholic War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

The Catholic War Veterans exists as a nonprofit corporation under the laws of the State of New York. Its corporate purposes, which it has fulfilled with honor, dedication, and diligence for many years, cover the spectrum of patriotic activities and reflect a deep love of God and concern for mankind. I note, in particular, its stated purpose to "increase our love, honor, service to God, and to our fellow man without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin."

In my district, Mr. Speaker, there is a particularly outstanding unit of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States. I refer to the Father Albanese Post in Berwick, Pa., of which I have the honor to be a member. The Father Albanese Post conducts community, charitable, and fraternal activities throughout the year. Its membership is extremely active in pursuing the high goals set forth in its corporate charter.

And so, Mr. Speaker, from my knowledge of its activities on a national level and my personal experience with its activities on a post level, I am able to report to this House the granting of a Federal charter to the Catholic War Veterans of the United States, Inc., not only honors them but all of us by recognizing the outstanding work which the Catholic War Veterans have done and continue to do throughout this Nation.●

PLIGHT OF NATALIA MUKOVOZOVA

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the congressional call to conscience for Soviet Jewry and to have the opportunity once again to speak out on the vital

issue of the crisis facing Soviet Jews who wish to emigrate.

I would like to inform my colleagues of the plight of Natalia Mukovozova. In 1978, Natalia, then a leading ballerina in the famed Kirov Ballet Company, applied for an exit visa to join her parents and brother in the United States. She was refused a visa on the grounds that her emigration was not in the state's interest.

In 1979, Natalia lost her position with the Kirov Ballet. Since then, both she and her husband Leonid have been unable to work. This continued harassment has caused Natalia, age 32, and Leonid great financial and emotional strain. The young couple have a 5-year-old daughter, and the stress and aggravation they are forced to endure serve only to strengthen their desire to leave the Soviet Union.

Natalia plans to reapply for an exit visa this spring. As it stands now, the situation does not look very promising for Natalia and the many thousands of other Soviet Jews who are being denied the right to emigrate from the Soviet Union. The number of Jews allowed to leave has fallen dramatically from a 1979 alltime high of over 50,000 to a record low of less than 3,000 in 1982—a decline of 95 percent. This year is even less promising with only 206 individuals granted exit visas in the first 2 months of 1983.

As Members of the U.S. Congress, it is our duty to call upon the Soviet Union to permit Natalia and the many others who share her predicament to emigrate so that they may finally be free from harassment and persecution. Our continued support is essential for these tormented Soviet citizens who are being punished for the crime of wanting to live freely as Jews.●

THE DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1983

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Domestic Volunteer Service Act Amendments of 1983. This legislation, which the administration transmitted to Capitol Hill last week, would reauthorize the domestic volunteer programs administered by the ACTION Agency.

This legislation will enable ACTION to continue its successful work in providing volunteer assistance to both public and private, nonprofit groups working to meet a wide range of human needs arising from the continuing problem of poverty. The primary focus of the legislation is on the Older American volunteer program under which approximately 368,150

volunteers aged 60 and over will serve this year.

Other provisions in this legislation build on the intent of Congress expressed over the past 3 years to phase out certain title I programs. The university year for ACTION programs, which has not been funded since 1981, is deleted from the statute. Also eliminated is the VISTA program. Congress has phased down VISTA appropriations for the past 2 years.

Reauthorized for 2 years in the legislation are the service learning programs and special volunteer programs. The service learning program seeks to link the needs of the poor, the resources of education, and students' interest in community service. ACTION accomplishes this goal by providing information and technical advice to interested schools, community agencies, and national organizations and by funding short-term demonstration grants. Among the special volunteer programs to be reauthorized are voluntary citizen participation and fixed income consumer counseling.

The proposed 2-year reauthorization of the older American volunteer programs would continue these successful programs without substantive legislative change. The older American volunteer programs consist of the retired senior volunteer program (RSVP), senior companions, and foster grandparents. The fiscal year 1984 authorization level for these programs would be the fiscal year 1983 level. For fiscal year 1985, "such sums" are authorized.

One provision in this legislation is of concern to me. Section 9 would grant the Director of ACTION subpoena authority for the purpose of audit and investigation. In the course of considering this legislation, I plan to carefully review this provision and possibly amend it so as to prevent any possibility of abuse of this authority.

For the convenience of all Members, I am attaching a section-by-section analysis of this legislation:

DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1983

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1, the enacting clause, establishes the short title of the bill as "The Domestic Volunteer Service Act Amendments of 1983."

Section 2 deletes part A of title I of the Act, which authorizes the Volunteers in Service to America program (VISTA). This would complete the phase out of the program that was begun in the 1981 Reconciliation Act.

Sections 3 and 4 delete the currently unfunded University Year for ACTION program (UYA) portion of the Service-Learning Program in part B of title I.

Section 5 makes technical amendments to refer to renumbered sections in part B and strikes refer nces to the deleted part A, title I program.

Section 6 makes technical amendments in part C of title I, Special Volunteer Programs, by striking subsections which refer to the deleted part A, title I program and

which allows the ACTION Director to provide services, stipends, and support to direct and operate part-time and full-time Special Volunteer Programs.

Section 7 makes technical amendments to correct references in title IV, Administration, to the deleted portions of part A, title I.

Section 8 clarifies, in Section 418, that "similar benefit" used in conjunction with "unemployed, temporary disability, retirement, public assistance," includes workers' compensation. This will make it clear that volunteers' stipends in title II programs are not wages for purposes of State workers' compensation insurance benefits.

Section 9 provides subpoena authority to the Director for purpose of audit and investigation.

Sections 10, 11, and 12 provide for the authorization of funds for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for programs in title I, parts A, B, and C of title II and for administration under title IV.●

NO MILITARY AID TO EL SALVADOR

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Reagan, in a speech before the National Association of Manufacturers, announced his plans to ask Congress for an additional \$298 million in economic and military aid for Central America—the bulk of these funds earmarked for El Salvador.

While the President was right to emphasize the "sheer human tragedy" of El Salvador, he completely missed the mark by holding out military aid as the solution. To send \$110 million in military aid to a government that has allowed the assassinations of 30,000 of its own citizens is, in my opinion, a human tragedy of the grossest kind.

Our national security interests compel us to stand up for human rights around the world, not to protect repressive political regimes. Such governments ultimately fall, and if the United States continues as the chief apologist and supporter of the Salvadoran Government, our national security interests in Central America will be hurt for years to come.

But that is where the White House is taking us. In virtually the same breath in which he demanded more military aid, the President restated his opposition to negotiations. It is as though the White House feels that there is something immoral about negotiating with the guerrillas. I think there is something immoral about using taxpayer dollars to encourage a brutal regime to prolong a bloody civil war.

The President should open his mind to the wisdom of Pope John Paul II, who has—to say the least—impeccable

anti-Communist credentials and who just completed a tour of Central America. The Pope, after talking with representatives of the Salvadoran Government, called for unconditional negotiations as the way out of this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, without a radical change in policy—negotiations, and an end to human rights violations, I cannot support any military aid to El Salvador. I will work to defeat this aid request. ●

POPE JOHN PAUL II APPEALS FOR HUMAN RIGHTS FOR HAITIANS

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the visit of Pope John Paul II to Haiti. The visit of the pontiff highlighted the dire human rights situation in Haiti and pointed out our Government's moral responsibility to reexamine its deplorable treatment of Haitian refugees who have fled the political repression and social and economic injustice in Haiti.

Within the last year, I have undertaken two factfinding missions to Haiti to assess the human rights and economic conditions tormenting the Haitian nation and its people. I have embarked on a frank dialog with the Government of Haiti and Haitians at all levels in Haiti and abroad to see if there is some way to improve the human rights situation which is so severe that Haitian refugees have risked death on the high seas to reach a sanctuary on our shores.

Shamefully, these refugees fleeing the social injustice and human rights abuses so eloquently spoken of by Pope John Paul II have been treated with hostility, imprisonment and neglect by our Government. I would hope that all of my colleagues would reexamine the situation of the Haitian refugees in our country and will work with the Congressional Black Caucus Task Force on Haitian Refugees which is providing leadership in attempting to redress the atrocious treatment inflicted on these "black boat people."

I enclose for the record three articles that report on the Pope's visit to Haiti:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 10, 1983]

PONTIFF, IN HAITI, PLEADS FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE, RIGHTS
(By Edward Cody)

PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAITI, March 9—Pope John Paul II delivered a strong appeal to the Haitian Catholic Church today to carry the banner of human rights and social justice in this Caribbean island nation notorious for its poverty and political repression.

"Christians have noticed the division, the injustice, the excessive inequality, the degradation of the quality of life, the misery, the hunger, the fear of many people," the Pontiff said in an open-air mass with President Jean-Claude Duvalier looking on.

"They have thought about peasants unable to live from their land, people who pile up without work in the cities, dislocated families, victims of various frustrations," the pope said. "However, they are convinced that there are solutions. The poor of all sorts must hope again.

With his direct language, John Paul plunged into the burning issue of Haiti as he has in various countries throughout the eight-nation Central American and Caribbean tour, of which today's 10-hour stop marked the final chapter.

Here, perhaps more than elsewhere, however, he seemed to encourage the Roman Catholic Church that he heads toward an active role in fighting political abuses and social inequalities connected with Haiti's 25-year Duvalier family rule.

Before the Pope spoke, Duvalier, in his welcoming speech, announced that he was "waiving" his future rights, under an 1860 concordat between Haiti and the Vatican, to designate the country's bishops.

Referring to Pope Paul VI's decision in 1966 to transfer control of the Haitian church from foreign missionaries to an indigenous hierarchy, Duvalier told John Paul:

"At this time in the same spirit in order to complete the symbiosis between church and state and follow the teachings of Vatican II, I intend from now on to waive my concordatory rights and privileges to allow the Vatican to appoint archbishops and bishops. This new step, which will permit the strengthening of the church's economy, will be effective while obviously taking into account the legitimate concerns of a sovereign state."

John Paul, who began the day with a visit to Belize, former British colony in Central America, was returning to Rome tonight.

Referring in his speech here to Haiti's social inequities, the Pontiff declared that "the church retains in this field a prophetic mission inseparable from its religious mission. And it demands the freedom to carry it out; not to accuse, and not only to bring out an awareness of evil, but to contribute in a positive way to improvement, to enlist consciences, particularly the consciences of those who carry responsibility in villages, cities and at the national level, to act according to the gospel and social doctrine of the church."

The Pontiff referred to a symposium last December in which the bishops of Haiti denounced the country's social and political ills in unusually strong language and pledged to work toward improvements. The symposium statement came against a background of reports leaked by the Haitian clergy that Foreign Minister Jean-Robert Estime had warned the country's seven bishops to avoid public stands that could be interpreted against the government.

"I have read the message from last December's symposium," John Paul said. "I have come here to encourage my brothers and sisters in Haiti to carry it out. . . . I have come to encourage this awakening, this leap, this movement of the church for the good of the whole country."

The latest and so far most-noticed stand taken by the Haitian church came in an open letter Jan. 27 demanding, in the name of the pope's impending visit, that an im-

prisoned activist cleric be released. About two weeks later—three weeks before today's visit—the priest was released.

Friends said the Haitian cleric, Gerard Duclerville, reported he was severely and repeatedly beaten during his 42 days behind bars. Although the Pope made no public mention of his case today, the bishops' appeal was considered here to be a watershed in official church action defending political rights. "Today it is Gerard and all those whose name we do not know," said the bishops' letter, ordered read at all masses. "Tomorrow it will be you, we, I, or somebody else. Where a man is humiliated and tortured, it is the whole of humanity that is humiliated and tortured."

Archbishop Wolf Ligonde, head of the Haitian church, joined in signing the letter. The archbishop, a cousin of Duvalier's wife, Michelle, previously had been regarded by some Haitian clergymen as unacceptably reticent on taking a strong position against governmental abuses here.

Foreign observers, including priests, report that political repression has eased since Jean Claude Duvalier took over from his father at age 19 in 1971. His government recently announced formation of a human rights committee, for example, and the U.S. State Department's annual human rights report noted progress in the field.

Many of the dictatorial practices set up over the years by his father, Francois Duvalier, remain in place, however, and a number of dissidents have been arrested or forced into exile.

A per capita income of less than \$300 a year makes Haiti the poorest country in the Americas. Against this background, John Paul issued his appeal for change based on Christian doctrine.

"There is indeed a deep need for justice, better distribution of wealth, more equitable organization of society, more participation, a more disinterested concept of service by all those who have responsibilities," he said.

"There is the legitimate desire by the media and politics for free, respectful expression of the opinions of others and of the common good. There is the need of more open and easier access to wealth and services that cannot remain the privilege of a few."

A smattering of applause arose from the thousands of Haitians gathered in sticky tropical heat as John Paul read his sermon in French during mass at Francois Duvalier International Airport. The 62-year-old pontiff, although draped in layers of white vestments, distributed communion to scores of Haitians in the late afternoon sun without visibly wilting.

Despite his appeal to the Haitian church, the pope reiterated warnings against clerical involvement in ideology or politics during a later address opening the General Assembly of the Latin American bishops' conference, known by its Spanish-language acronym CELAM. While urging the more than 60 Latin American bishops meeting here to uphold the church's social teachings, he underlined principles set forth at an earlier conference in Puebla, Mexico, in January 1979 ordering clergymen to emphasize their evangelical role.

At the same time, he indirectly warned against inroads against the Catholic Church in recent years by fundamentalist Protestant sects spreading in Latin America. These movements, which he said sometimes "lack the true apostolic message," can create ob-

stacles for the Catholic Church and other traditional Protestant churches, he said.

In his sermon at mass, John Paul also cautioned Haitians against the voodoo practices often mixed with Catholicism among the country's Roman Catholic majority. Without directly mentioning voodoo, he urged that Haitians make sure their religious devotion "not be a new form of submission to the elements of the world, a new slavery, as in certain syncretic practices, inspired by fear and anguish in the face of forces that one does not understand."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1983]

POPE, IN HAITI, CONDEMNNS INEQUALITY,
HUNGER, FEAR

(By Marliese Simons)

PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAITI, March 9.—Pope John Paul II flew here today at the end of his eight-day tour of Central America and the Caribbean and condemned what he described as the excessive inequality and misery, hunger and fear suffered by many people in Haiti.

He also demanded liberty for the Roman Catholic Church to carry at a mass at the airport attended by tens of thousands of Haitians and leaders of the Government, headed by President-for-Life Jean-Claude Duvalier, who has ruled the country for 13 years.

The Pope was interrupted by shouts and drumbeats as he said of the situation in Haiti, "There is a legitimate desire in the media and in politics for free expression." Addressing "all those who have power, wealth, culture," he said they should "understand their serious and urgent responsibility with respect to their brothers and sisters."

Apparently speaking of the tens of thousands of Haitians who have fled to the United States, the Pope said that as the first nation to proclaim its independence in Latin America, Haiti "is called up, in a special way, to develop" so that its people "may work without constraint, without having to seek elsewhere—and often in pitiful conditions what they ought to find at home."

Although he has stressed that there is need for social change and respect for human rights in every country he has visited, he seemed to make his message more explicit in this poorest and most crowded nation of the hemisphere. His tour, which began on March 2, included visits to Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Panama, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala and Belize.

His schedule on this final day of his journey seemed to be the most arduous. The 62-year-old Pope rose at 4 A.M. in Guatemala and flew to Belize in a smaller plane than the one he used for the rest of his tour. The size of the airport made the smaller plane necessary.

Two hours later he flew back to Guatemala and boarded his airliner for Port-au-Prince for a visit of several hours before returning to Rome.

Although Haiti shares many of the political and social problems of the region he visited, its black and French cultures is vastly different from the Hispanic and Indian traditions of Central America.

Voodoo, the African spiritism brought here by the West African slaves from whom most Haitians descend, is as much a part of the people's religious beliefs as Catholicism, and while there are 440 Roman Catholic priests, there are believed to be 60,000 houn-gans, or voodoo priests. Many were said to be at the mass celebrated by the Pope.

In his homily, the Pope appeared to allude to frictions between church and state. Calling for an end to injustice, "misery, hunger and fear," he declared, "The Church has a prophetic mission in this field, inseparable from its religious mission, and it demands the right to carry it out."

President Duvalier seemed to make a conciliatory gesture in welcoming the Pope to Haiti. He said he had waived the Concordatory rights, dating from 1966, that authorized the President, rather than the Vatican, to name the country's Catholic Archbishop and to have a voice in the selection of bishops.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 9, 1983]

DEFYING DUVALIER—THE POPE VISITS HAITI
JUST AS CHURCH THERE IS CHALLENGING
REGIME

(By Thomas E. Ricks)

PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAITI.—He is a young Roman Catholic priest ministering in the eastern hills of this, the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere. His parish lies in a dry coffee growing region a half-day's walk from the nearest road passable by bus or car. More-specific identification would endanger him, for he and a few hundred other priests are attempting the forbidden: to change the politics of President-for-life Jean-Claude Duvalier's Haiti.

"I help them to ask questions," the priest says of his work with the peasants. "We are still in discussion. We don't know where we are going."

But one fundamental shift has already occurred: "In the past, they saw the coffee-buyer as a father. Now they have . . . a different attitude."

Traditionally as quiescent as the peasants themselves, the Catholic Church of Haiti has emerged during the past year as the first broad-based group to mount sustained criticism of the quarter-century-old Duvalier regime. "I'm pretty convinced that . . . the church will be a driving force" in Haitian politics in the future, says an officer of one foreign embassy here.

EARLIER MOVEMENT

Resisting the Duvaliers has been tried before. During the Carter administration's public human-rights campaign, a few Port-au-Prince journalists and others spoke out against the regime. That all ended with a wave of arrests and forced exiles in November 1980. The difference between then and now, perhaps, is that when Haitian security forces recently arrested a Catholic activist, the church demanded his release—and won.

In Washington, D.C., a State Department official is skeptical of the church's ability to keep it up. "Many things happen in Haiti and then don't happen again," he says. Others mention that if the church does maintain its criticism, sooner or later the government will try to put an end to the challenge.

The Haitian church and state have been skirmishing for about a year now. The hostilities have lately been suspended as both sides await the visit of Pope John Paul II, who arrives this afternoon. He will be the first pope to set foot in this land of 5.5 million that, nominally at least, is 80% Catholic. The question being asked in Haiti today is, how will John Paul II react to a church that has been setting precedents of its own?

Throughout 1982, priests across Haiti delivered increasingly feisty sermons, featuring, for example, pointed analogies between

a smallpox epidemic in 1882 and an entire society afflicted a century later. In late November, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Religion responded by warning several bishops and about 25 of the most vocal young priests that such talk could lead to arrest and exile.

A KNOCK ON THE DOOR

A month later, the government gave another sort of warning. At 6:50 on the morning of Dec. 28, security forces entered a Port-au-Prince religious meeting and arrested a popular Catholic lay activist; and radio personality named Gerard Duclerville, Church protests began immediately and grew for weeks.

They culminated on Jan. 27, when the six bishops of Haiti issued a pastoral letter of protest with the order that it be read aloud in all the churches and chapels of the country. "The Church of Haiti is living now in a situation of challenge which puts to the test its faith in Jesus, Lord and Liberator," the bishops wrote. "Today, it is Gerard and all those names we do not know. Tomorrow it will be us, you, I, or somebody else. Where a man is humiliated and tortured, it is the whole of humanity who is humiliated and tortured."

Such language hadn't been used so openly in Haiti for 20 years. Even more astonishing was its source, for an 1860 concordate with the Vatican gives the Haitian government veto power over all top church appointments. These are men who have the Duvaliers to thank for their present positions.

The first signature on the letter, moreover, was that of Francois Wolf Ligonde, archbishop of Port-au-Prince—and uncle of Michele Bennett, the wife of President for Life Duvalier.

THE OUTCOME

The letter's one concrete action was the designation of Feb. 9 as a nationwide day of "prayer and sacrifice." On Feb. 7, however, Mr. Duclerville was set free, reportedly severely beaten.

"Has the church won," asks a Port-au-Prince price, echoing the headline on a recent issue of the Haitian weekly *Le Petit Samedi Soir*. "Wait until the pope has left this place," he answers, suggesting that the next few months will make clear whether the church has succeeded in altering Haitian politics.

No one in the Haitian government would speak on the record about such issues. Most requests for interviews were denied; two officials agreed to interviews, but the first, Dr. Bob Nere, the director of political affairs at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Religion, wouldn't comment on internal matters, while the second, Gabriel Ancion, the under secretary at the ministry, changed his mind at the appointed time and declined to talk.

Haiti's national sport seems to be rumor-mongering, and the past week's speculation has focused on what the pope will say during his 10-hour stay. His pronouncements won't determine the outcome of the church-state struggle, but they could set themes that will shape its course.

Will he follow local leads and raise the touchy issue of human rights? Will he speak on the problems of poverty, another sore spot in a land of great extremes in wealth? Or, as many priests fear, has the pontiff's visit been "captured" (as one puts it) by the government, to consist of what the priest from the hills dismisses as "a mass at the airport," meetings with bishops and "no contact with the people?"

If priests are worried, the government is made just as nervous by the possibility that Haiti's transformed church—and its activist young priests—might receive the papal seal of approval.

The voodoo nightmare of the late Francois "Papa Doc" Duvalier's reign is long gone, replaced by the sporadic beatings and arrests inflicted by "Baby Doc's" men. But Haiti remains a troubled land. It hovers near the top of infant-mortality lists and close to the bottom of charts of per capita gross national product. (The World Bank's current figure for Haiti is \$270—less than half that of even Bolivia, the second-poorest nation on this side of the planet.)

MORE NATIVE-BORN PRIESTS

One reason is Haiti's tradition of corrupt and self-indulgent government. To understand this country, suggests one Haitian development specialist, look at the frozen ice treats sold on the streets of Port-au-Prince. They are called *pezay-sust*, or "push-suck," because children consume them by squeezing the bottom while sucking from the top. That is how the Duvalier regime runs Haiti, the development expert says.

An international financial official adds, "They don't have the concept here that the government belongs to the people. It's more that the people belong to the government."

But if the nation has long suffered under the Duvaliers, its priests have only recently begun to call much attention to the situation. When during the mid-1960s, a few clerics attempted mild criticism of the "Papa Doc," he responded by expelling the country's five foreign bishops and exiling a number of Haitian priests.

Ironically, those expulsions, coupled with the decrees of Vatican II, cleared the way for today's clerical activism. Until the mid-1960s, about two-thirds of the Catholic clergymen in Haiti were foreigners, primarily French. Today, more than half—and perhaps two-thirds, nobody seems sure—of the approximately 550 priests are Haitian.

That may seem a small number to affect a nation of over five million. But, as the Haitian government knows, a parish led by one or two priests may have as many as 2,000 committed members of lay groups such as Catholic Action or Catholic Volunteers (Mr. Duclerville's organization). Haitian priests "used to be a minority, feeling secondary to the foreign priests," says one cleric who witnessed the change. "Now all the bishops are Haitians, and so are all the principal priests in the cities."

Most foreign priests fought voodoo, the native folk religion. The new priests are trying to assimilate it into Catholicism. And with Vatican II, "the liturgy went into the vernacular, Creole, which is what 90% of the people speak," says the Rev. Thomas Wenski of the Haitian Catholic Center in Miami. "The drum was brought in, and Haitian songs." These innovations, Father Wenski says, "brought about a renewal of the church."

GRASS ROOTS

With these changes, priests here say, the newly nationalistic church of Haiti gained in confidence and closeness to the people. Many priests feel the church is strongest—perhaps even more influential than the government—in the back country, where once it was remote and weak. "The church has been doing a lot of work at the base, in little groups," says a priest familiar with the peasant education programs. "This is what created the force that obliged the bishops to write that letter."

No matter what the pope says here, most priests agree, the government will not long sit still for such criticism. They predict a move against the church with months or even weeks. Some welcome the confrontation.

"We have an understanding with the other religious orders," says one priest. "If one of us is touched, we will react in solidarity." On the other side of the country, another priest promises that a crackdown would be met with a shutdown of churches, the many church-run schools and even some hospitals. He wonders aloud if the regime could withstand such a challenge.

Secular observers possess somewhat less faith in the unity of the clergy. The same diplomat who is convinced that church activism is here to stay smiles at this strike scenario. "If the church decides to stand together, it'll be the first time since the founding of Haiti," he says.

Priests here reply that this is a time of firsts. "I don't think there's a church anywhere that's more unified than the church in Haiti is now," says a cleric in the north. "It'll be an interesting evolution to watch over the next three or four years. It might even point the way for some other countries."●

PATRIOTISM OF THE DOMESTIC STEEL INDUSTRY

HON. DOUGLAS APPLGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. APPLGATE. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives the commendable efforts of the United Steelworkers of America in helping to do their part in not only aiding the domestic steel industry but also in helping to improve the U.S. economy.

As you know, the USW has approved a package of continued concession that will help this Nation's largest steel companies weather the economic storm they are now enduring. This was not an easy decision for this labor group to make, but one that they believed was necessary in the name of job and industry preservation. These men and women understand the implications involved, and had the courage to rise to the occasion.

This gesture should now serve as great incentive to this Congress to follow their lead and do what we can to aid the steel industry in whatever way possible. This means a thorough investigation into our trade laws to locate these areas in which changes can be made to achieve a truly reciprocal agreement between ourselves and our trading partners. I realize this is not the only problem being faced by the industry, but it is a major one and one that we have control over. I call on the House to take this initiative upon their shoulder and act accordingly.

Again, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I com-

mend the United Steelworkers on both their loyalty to their companies and their patriotism to their country.●

THE REVEREND WILLIAM C. DOBBINS

HON. WILLIAM HILL BONER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the city of Nashville paid their respects recently to a very great and prominent member of the community—the Reverend William C. Dobbins. I would like to join my fellow citizens in their expression of respect to this man—a man whom I am very proud to have called my friend.

Reverend Dobbins, who passed away in late January, will be remembered by his friends and acquaintances for his strong and effective leadership in the fight for civil rights. It was his view that the problems of segregated housing and employment discrimination were intricately and inseparably tied. As long as there is unemployment and underemployment among blacks, he said, then there is no way for blacks to participate in open housing. Armed with that philosophy, Reverend Dobbins became a member of the Nashville Board of Directors of the Opportunities Industrialization Centers, where he helped focus much-deserved attention on the need to train black youth for jobs that would break the cycle of poverty and segregation.

Reverend Dobbins' commitment to freedom and equality led him to serve many other communities in Nashville. Reverend Dobbins' congregation was the community at large. He selflessly gave his time, his talent, and his effort to serving on many boards, including the board of trustees of Meharry Medical College, the board of ordained ministry of the Tennessee Conference of the United Methodist Church, and the board of trustees of Gammon Theological Seminary. He also served as second vice president of the Nashville chapter of the NACCP.

Though Reverend Dobbins was not a native of Nashville, he adopted it and her people as if he was. He came to Nashville in 1968 after distinguished service elsewhere in the South to the United Methodist Church. In Nashville, he became pastor of Clark Memorial, the oldest black church in our city. From its pulpit, Reverend Dobbins preached the ideals and philosophy of life with which he guided his own life.

Reverend Dobbins will be missed by his fellow Nashvillians. But the mark he left on the city, the lives he touched, and the attitudes he changed

will forever be a testament by which he will be remembered.●

EDA DEFERRAL

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 74 which was approved yesterday.

It is not a very difficult task to convince my colleagues that we do not live in an "Alice in Wonderland" world in which all areas of the country share national prosperity equally. I think that any of us can find pockets of poverty in cities and towns or entire States and regions in varying degrees of economic distress. Sadly, once economic decline begins to take effect a downward syndrome begins to set in which is difficult if not impossible to reverse if we rely totally upon macro-economic policies to somehow alleviate the situation.

Community leaders may want to do something on their own for themselves but lack the capacity to make some necessary public investments in a poor city or town. The worker who lost their job from a layoff may never be rehired in the factory or plant where he was employed before the recession. Those jobs are lost forever. And, sometimes the economic distress is sudden and severe when a major employer, perhaps the only one, decides to close its doors and move to another location. EDA has really worked at addressing these problems by providing a small Federal investment in job generating enterprises.

I think that many of us have forgotten the connection between our public capital investments and economic growth. The capacity to expand or attract businesses is constrained by the ability to deliver public services. The money to increase water and sewer capacity makes room available for housing and industry. An access road and an industrial park can provide a place to start a business and bring their goods to market. These are critical linkages to private sector growth development and the all important jobs that result.

EDA has had its failings in the past. I will be the first to admit that, having served as a former Chief Counsel in the agency. Together, with the gentleman from Minnesota, the chairman of the Economic Development Subcommittee, we have done a massive overhaul of the authorizing legislation in H.R. 10, the National Development Investment Act. This is practically the identical bill that passed the House last year. In a truly bipartisan sense, we would like to have this legislation on the books today. I strongly believe

that the House should take this action because a reform bill will be brought to the floor in the near future.●

THE PLIGHT OF SOVIET JEWS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my colleagues' attention to the convocation of the Third Conference on Soviet Jewry in Jerusalem from March 15 to 17. The purpose of these conferences is to call worldwide public attention to the plight of Soviet Jews and to devise an effective strategy to ease that plight.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body is aware of the manner in which the Government of the Soviet Union has persecuted Jews and other minorities. One need not recount the degradations and deprivations suffered by Jews and dissidents in the Soviet Union to elicit an affirmation of their dignity and their human rights.

But the question remains, Mr. Speaker: When will the Congress of the United States take some positive action? Soothing rhetoric is of little consequence to those who are denied the freedom to worship or freedom to emigrate. When will the Members of this body and the Senate finally realize that the Soviets must give up the notion that they can continue to enjoy a profitable relationship with the United States and at the same time deny the most fundamental rights to their own people? It is past time that the Congress recognize the leaders of the Soviet Union for what they are: Tyrants.

Mr. Speaker, I commend, join with, and urge my colleagues to support Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut and Mr. AUCOIN of Oregon in affixing our signatures to House Concurrent Resolution 63 demanding that the Soviet Union comply with international standards of human rights.

At the same time, I urge my colleagues to join me in praying for the success of the Third International Conference on Soviet Jewry.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD a copy of my message to Mr. Theodore Mann, chairman of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1983.

MR. THEODORE R. MANN,
Chairman, National Conference on Soviet Jewry, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. MANN: I would like to extend my best wishes and prayers on the occasion of the Third International Conference on Soviet Jewry to be held in Jerusalem, March 15-17. These conferences and your organization serve as vital beacons of hope for a proud and indomitable people who find

themselves subjugated by a despotic tyranny.

While Jews everywhere empathize with the plight of their Soviet brethren, all men of good will pray that one day Soviet Jews shall be free to worship in their own country and to enjoy the blessings of liberty in their homeland, Israel.

It is only through the concerted efforts of dedicated individuals such as those members of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry that people and governments in the West can be made aware of the perilous situation confronting Jews in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

Please sustain your efforts in this most worthy cause and be assured of our continued support and prayers for your ultimate success.

Warmest Personal Regards,
PHILIP M. CRANE,
Member of Congress.●

STATEMENT ON ADMINISTRATION'S PLAN TO SELL SATELLITES

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, this week has brought us another example of the administration's simplistic and shortsighted approach to public policy—the proposal to transfer weather and remote-sensing satellites to the private sector.

In a society of nearly 230 million Americans, Government does have a role to play, and providing important data about weather and climate is certainly part of that role. But this administration wants to commercialize this critical information.

This proposal to sell off part of the public trust—like Interior Secretary James Watt's proposal to sell off a major part of our public lands—is totally out of step with what the American people want from their Government. Government exists to provide all of the people with vital services, but this proposal would deny many people a vital service.

Private industry cannot possibly serve the same function as a unified national satellite information service providing weather and remote-sensing land information. This service is critical to many citizens, and is also important for our Nation's security and relations with other countries. We all agree on the need to end waste and increase efficiency, but that is not the likely outcome of this proposal at all. Selling off our weather satellites makes no sense—even the administration admits there is not reliable data indicating that this scheme would save taxpayers money. Indeed, it may well result in more cost for many Americans, as well as denying people a legitimate public service.

As a member of the Science and Technology Committee and the Budget Committee, I intend to work to stop this plan, and ask my colleagues to join me.

Additionally, I would like to insert an editorial on this subject from today's Washington Post in the RECORD, and urge my colleagues to read it.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 10, 1983]

SELLING THE WEATHER

The Reagan administration wishes to sell the weather satellites and impose the discipline of the market on the four winds. First, let's consider the administration's proposition on its own terms. Struggling to keep its budget down, it doesn't want to spend more money on weather satellites. But the technology of weather forecasting is advancing rapidly. With more satellite data pouring through the new giant computers, the forecasts might soon be made immensely more precise.

Under the administration's plan, it would sell the present satellites to a private company, or companies, that would then presumably proceed to use private funds to expand the system. The government would pay the private operators roughly what it's spending now for satellite data. The data would continue to go to the Weather Service for dissemination throughout the country and the world. There would be no difference in the weather report that you get on the radio in the morning as you try to decide whether to take an umbrella. But—if the plan worked—there would soon begin to be a flow of much more specific and accurate forecasts available at a price to commercial users willing to pay. As the administration might put the question, why should the general taxpayer provide free service to businesses?

The answer is, of course, that it's not only businesses that have an interest in more accurate forecasting. Storm warnings are an obvious example. If a city were to fall behind in its satellite bills, when would it hear about the next snowstorm? Among the businesses that need better weather information, the most important is farming. It's not only a matter of cheaper food. If a farmer knows exactly how the wind will blow for the next several days, he can afford to use less pesticide when he sprays. With better rain forecasts, he needs less water for irrigation. And that saves money for the federal government itself, since it is the government that provides most of the water. When the administration speaks of the cost of the additional satellites as hundreds of millions of dollars, that is not the net cost. Net cost is less, if better weather data help the economy to operate more efficiently.

The debate over the weather satellites is another example of the truth that cutting the federal budget doesn't always save money. If it simply means shifting costs from public to private budgets, society doesn't necessarily gain. In this instance society would lose by a substantial amount with the restriction on access to forecasts of value to just about everybody. But it's merely a hypothetical case, since Congress seems totally disinclined to pass the legislation.

THE EAST OAKLAND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT CENTER

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to your attention the outstanding work performed by the volunteer staff at the East Oakland Youth Development Center, located in Oakland, Calif.

The East Oakland Youth Development Center is exemplary of the results of hard work and cooperation between the public and private sectors in meeting the social, economic, and educational needs of low-income and minority youth. It was founded under the sponsorship of the Clorox Co., whose corporate headquarters are located in Oakland, Calif. Understanding these needs, Clorox, a youth advisory council and a program advisory committee were formed to assess the specific needs and to plan and implement programs.

Since September 1981, the center's primary focus has been career education and job development. The role of volunteers' assistance in these programs are crucial. Since February 1982, 112 volunteers have been recruited. In a time of increased cuts for social programs, institutions such as the East Oakland Youth Development Center would be forced to shut its doors if it were not for the hard work and dedication of its volunteers.

It is very fitting that the board and staff chose to honor its volunteers by holding a first annual Volunteer Awards Banquet honoring Dr. J. David Bowick, superintendent, Oakland Unified School District. So often do we forget and disregard the work of dedicated persons whose life and commitment is to provide service with no demand for financial remuneration. It is those persons who breathe life and creativity into an organization and continue to keep it relevant and viable.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to call the East Oakland Youth Development Center to my colleagues' attention. Under the leadership of its executive director, James T. Toliver, Jr., it has become a model for youth programs throughout the country. I congratulate the board and staff for having the vision and sensitivity to honor its valued volunteers and to the volunteers. I say thank you for your dedication to our youth.●

PASSIVE SOLAR TAX CREDIT LEGISLATION

HON. WYCHE FOWLER, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, I introduced H.R. 1883, a bill to provide an energy performance based tax credit to builders who incorporate passive solar energy systems in new homes.

Over the last two sessions, this legislation won widespread, bipartisan support within Congress and the private sector. In the 97th Congress, we had 159 cosponsors in the House for an almost identical bill which was incorporated in the Ways and Means tax bill in 1981. The other body approved a similar measure sponsored by Senator HART in December of 1979 by a vote of 82 to 1. Congressman HEFTTEL and myself are joined by 48 other House Members in introducing the passive solar tax credit legislation. Senator HART introduced similar legislation, S. 710, on March 8.

Among the groups which have endorsed the passive solar tax credit for builders are: The National Association of Home Builders, the American Institute of Architects, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National League of Cities, the League of Women Voters, the Sierra Club, the Bricklayers International Union, the Solar Lobby, Environmental Action, the National Concrete Masonry Association, the Passive Solar Products Association, the Friends of the Earth, the Brick Institute of America, the National Wildlife Association, the International Masonry Institute, the Environmental Policy Center, Pittsburgh Plate Glass, the National Woodwork Manufacturers Association, the Solar Energy Industries Association, and the Mason Contractors Association.

Clearly, there is a broad and growing awareness that passive solar energy can make an important contribution toward reducing our Nation's energy problem. As Modesto Maidique, author of the solar energy section of the Harvard Business School's acclaimed report, "Energy Future," wrote to me in September of 1980: "Passive solar design is the most desirable of all the solar technologies and should be strongly encouraged."

A well-designed passive solar energy system can produce energy savings of up to 80 percent of a standard home's conventional heating load. When one multiplies this by the 1.7 million new houses constructed annually, it is obvious that these passive systems represent a tremendous potential for conserving conventional energy resources. A 1979 study prepared for the White House concluded that by the year

2000, passive solar could contribute 1 quad, the energy-equivalent of 180 million barrels of oil per year, of the Nation's energy needs.

But this potential will not be realized as fully or as quickly as is possible, or as the country needs, without positive action by the Federal Government. For many years we have subsidized the production and consumption of fossil fuels through special tax treatment, federally funded research and development, and most recently Federal price controls. Even though these policies have been or are in the process of being revised in light of new circumstances, they have created biases within our economic system against energy conservation or unconventional energy resources.

What we propose in our legislation is to provide a partial offset against these past policies in order to let a promising new technology take root.

The approach we have chosen; namely, a tax credit to the builders of passive homes, grew out of our experience with the Energy Tax Act of 1978. In that legislation the Congress recognized the desirability of assisting the purchase of both active and passive solar energy systems by providing a tax credit to the homeowners who installed such systems. However, as the legislation has been interpreted, it bars credits for passive solar systems which serve a dual function; and, since many of the major passive features, such as specially designed eaves, Trombe walls, and south facing windows, are of necessity structural components as well, current law excludes the vast majority of passive solar energy systems.

When it became apparent that the 1978 Energy Tax Act was not going to provide the intended spur to passive solar, a number of individuals in both the executive and legislative branches began to search for an alternative method to stimulate the adoption of passive solar techniques. What emerged from this effort was the decision to provide the credit to the builder rather than the home buyer and to spell out in detail how the credit would be determined rather than allowing for discretionary determination by the IRS.

Making the credit available to the homebuilder targets the assistance to the key decisionmaker in the building process.

A primary reason why passive systems, which would result in substantial lifecycle cost and energy savings, are not being built in large numbers today is that residential buyers are extremely sensitive to changes in the cost and availability of credit and hence give maximum consideration to the first cost of a home. Builders are certainly aware of this and must give priority to cutting first costs to a minimum.

The \$2,500 maximum credit under my bill would represent a significant offset for the higher initial costs of a passive home and therefore is a substantial incentive for the construction of passive systems.

On September 8, 1980, the Ways and Means Committee conducted a hearing on my legislation and the testimony, from business, labor and administration witnesses, was virtually unanimous in support of the passive solar tax credit proposal.

Former Assistant Treasury Secretary Donald C. Lubick:

We believe that the credit is soundly conceived from a technical standpoint and support its adoption.

Former Assistant Energy Secretary Thomas E. Stelson:

The Administration continues to support this (passive solar tax credit) approach to stimulating rapid and widespread use of an important, basically simple, but widely misunderstood technology . . . Estimated impact of the credit will be over 500,000 (housing) units through 1990 with a savings of 180 million barrels of oil equivalent.

Robert Peterson on behalf of the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB):

NAHB strongly supports the bills before the Committee that would provide a tax credit to builders that construct passive solar homes . . . A tax credit for a builder that incorporates a passive solar design is a needed incentive to spur such construction.

Furthermore, my bill's approach of promoting passive solar homebuilding through a tax credit would address the concern voiced by many in Congress and the private sector about further direct Government involvement in the marketplace by relying on the private sector through tax incentive to spur solar energy and energy conservation efforts.

Finally, to those in this House who are quite properly concerned with preserving the integrity of the Federal Tax Code, I would point out that those of us who support the passive tax credit have no intention of making it a permanent part of our tax system. Rather, we seek a limited, 5-year program followed by a 3-year phaseout in order to insure an orderly return to a subsidy-free environment. Thus, my bill is meant to be a temporary measure designed to give passive solar technology a fair chance in the marketplace by providing a partial financial offset against the various "cheap energy" subsidies that in the past have discouraged energy-efficient building construction.

Despite recent improvements in our energy conservation efforts and the potential for lower imported oil prices, we still are faced with an unacceptably high foreign oil bill and a 25-percent reliance on interruptible overseas sources of supply. A very important goal of our national security policy is decreasing our reliance on such uncertain foreign sources of energy, and my

bill would make passive solar technology much more affordable and take us far down the road toward energy independence. In my opinion, the passive solar tax credit, by utilizing the private sector rather than governmental bureaucracy, represents one of the most cost-effective ways of achieving energy self-sufficiency.

In closing, I would like to stress the importance of moving this legislation this year. For each month that we delay 140,000 new homes, homes that on average will be a part of our housing stock and a consumer of our energy resources for the next 30 years, will be constructed. We must not let this opportunity to improve our energy security for decades to come slip away.

H.R. 1883 is identical to my earlier proposal except that the effective dates have all been pushed back by 2 years and the maximum credit has been raised to \$2,500.

PASSIVE SOLAR TAX CREDIT COSPONSORS

Alabama.—Dickinson.
California.—Chappie, Don Edwards, Fazio, Jerry Lewis, Matsui.
Connecticut.—Ratchford.
Florida.—Fascell, Nelson.
Georgia.—Barnard, Fowler, Gingrich, Hatcher.
Hawaii.—Heftel.
Illinois.—Yates.
Maryland.—Barnes, Mitchell.
Massachusetts.—Boland, Frank, Markey, Mavroules, Studts.
Michigan.—Crockett, Kildee.
Minnesota.—Stangeland.
Montana.—Marlenee, Pat Williams.
Nebraska.—Daub.
New Jersey.—Guarini, Howard, Hughes, Roe.
New Hampshire.—D'Amours.
New York.—Addabbo, Fish, Garcia, Nowak, Scheuer, Solarz.
North Carolina.—Neal.
Ohio.—Seiberling, Stokes, Wylie.
Oregon.—Weaver, Wyden.
Pennsylvania.—Edgar, Foglietta, Goodling, Walgren, Yatron.
Rhode Island.—Schneider.
South Dakota.—Daschle.
Tennessee.—Duncan.
Texas.—Frost, Pickle, Stenholm.
Utah.—Marriott.
Vermont.—Jeffords.
Guam.—Won Pat.
Virgin Islands.—de Lugo.

H.R. 1883

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

SECTION 1. CREDIT FOR PASSIVE SOLAR RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by inserting immediately before section 45 the following new section:

"SEC. 44I. CREDIT FOR PASSIVE SOLAR RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—In the case of a builder of a new residential unit which incorporates a passive solar energy system, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable

year an amount determined under the solar construction credit table prescribed by the Secretary under subsection (d).

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) MAXIMUM DOLLAR AMOUNT PER UNIT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount of the credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not exceed \$2,500 for a residential unit.

"(B) PHASEOUT OF CREDIT AFTER 1988.—In the case of a residential unit completed after December 31, 1988, there shall be substituted for '\$2,500' in subparagraph (A) the amount determined in accordance with the following table:

Units completed in—	The amount is—
1989.....	\$1,875
1990.....	1,250
1991.....	625.

"(2) APPLICATION WITH OTHER CREDITS.—

The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not exceed the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under a section of this subpart having a lower number or letter designation than this section, other than credits allowable by sections 31, 39, and 43.

"(c) DEFINITIONS; SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) BUILDER.—The term 'builder' means a person who is in the trade or business of building residential units and has a proprietary interest in the residential unit built.

"(2) NEW RESIDENTIAL UNIT.—The term 'new residential unit' means any unit—

"(A) which is located in the United States,

"(B) which is designed for use as a residence,

"(C) which is a unit of a building having less than 5 residential units,

"(D) the construction of which is completed after September 30, 1983, and before January 1, 1992, and

"(E) which is ready for occupancy before January 1, 1992.

"(3) PASSIVE SOLAR ENERGY SYSTEM.—The term 'passive solar energy system' means a system—

"(A) which contains—

"(i) a solar collection area,

"(ii) an absorber,

"(iii) a storage mass,

"(iv) a heat distribution method, and

"(v) heat regulation devices, and

"(B) which is installed in a new residential unit after September 30, 1983, and before January 1, 1992.

"(4) SOLAR COLLECTION AREA.—The term 'solar collection area' means an expanse of transparent or translucent material that—

"(A) is located on that side of the structure which faces (within 30 degrees) south, and

"(B) the position of which may be changed from vertical to horizontal in such a manner that the rays of the Sun directly strike an absorber.

"(5) ABSORBER.—The term 'absorber' means a hard surface that—

"(A) is exposed to the rays of the Sun admitted through a solar collection area,

"(B) converts solar radiation into heat, and

"(C) transfers heat to a storage mass.

"(6) STORAGE MASS.—The term 'storage mass' means a dense, heavy material that—

"(A) receives and holds heat from an absorber and later releases the heat to the interior of the structure,

"(B) is of sufficient volume, depth, and thermal energy capacity to store and deliver adequate amounts of solar heat for the structure in which it is incorporated,

"(C) is located so that it is capable of distributing the stored heat directly to the

habitable areas of the structure through a heat distribution method, and

"(D) has an area of directly irradiated material equal to or greater than the solar collection area.

"(7) HEAT DISTRIBUTION METHOD.—The term 'heat distribution method' means—

"(A) the release of radiant heat from a storage mass within the habitable areas of the structure, or

"(B) convective heating from a storage mass, through airflow paths provided by openings or by ducts (with or without the assistance of a fan or pump having a horsepower rating of less than 1 horsepower) in the storage mass, to habitable areas of a structure.

"(8) HEAT REGULATION DEVICE.—The term 'heat regulation device' means—

"(A) shading or venting mechanisms to control the amount of solar heat admitted through solar collection areas; and

"(B) nighttime insulation or its equivalent to control the amount of heat permitted to escape from the interior of a structure.

"(9) JOINT PROPRIETARY INTEREST IN RESIDENTIAL UNIT.—If 2 or more builders have a proprietary interest in a residential unit, the credit allowable under subsection (a) shall be apportioned to each builder on the basis of his ownership interest in the residential unit.

"(10) PROPERTY FINANCED BY SUBSIDIZED ENERGY FINANCING.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of determining the amount of credit with respect to a residential unit, there shall not be taken into account any portion of a passive solar energy system which is financed from subsidized energy financing.

"(B) SUBSIDIZED ENERGY FINANCING.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'subsidized energy financing' has the meaning given such term by section 44(c)(10)(C).

"(11) SWIMMING POOLS EXCLUDED.—The amount of credit under subsection (a) shall be determined without regard to any swimming pool.

"(d) SOLAR CONSTRUCTION CREDIT TABLE.—

"(1) PRESCRIPTION OF TABLE.—After consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary by regulations shall—

"(A) prescribe the solar construction credit table referred to in subsection (a) which meets the requirements set forth in paragraph (2), and

"(B) prescribe a table of insulation factors, based on the amount of insulation in floors, walls, and ceilings and the number of panes of glass in the windows of a structure, for 8 categories of residential units ranging from one having no added insulation to one having the maximum feasible amount of insulation.

"(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR SOLAR CONSTRUCTION CREDIT TABLE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to meet the requirements of this paragraph, the table prescribed by the Secretary—

"(i) shall provide a credit at the rate of \$60 for each 1 million Btu's of annual energy savings per residential unit, and

"(ii) shall set forth different amounts of credit for different ratios of solar collection area to house heating load and for residential units located in different areas of the United States.

"(B) ANNUAL ENERGY SAVINGS PER RESIDENTIAL UNIT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the annual energy saving for a residential unit shall be the amount by which the number of Btu's of nonsolar energy re-

quired to provide heat to a reference house for a calendar year exceeds the number of Btu's of nonsolar energy required to heat a similar house, in the same or a similar location, which uses an incorporated passive solar energy system for a calendar year.

"(C) REFERENCE HOUSE.—For purposes of subparagraph (B), the term 'reference house' means a residential unit with 1,500 square feet of habitable floor space and a heating load of 7.5 Btu's per square foot per degree day.

"(D) HEATING LOAD.—For purposes of subparagraph (C), the term 'heating load' means the product of the number of square feet of habitable floor space of a residential unit multiplied by the appropriate insulation factor, set forth in the table prescribed by the Secretary under paragraph (1)(B), for that unit.

"(e) TERMINATION.—The credit allowable by subsection (a) shall not be allowed with respect to a residential unit the construction of which is completed after December 31, 1991."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting immediately after the item relating to section 44H the following new item:

"Sec. 44I. Credit for passive solar residential construction."

(2) Section 6096(b) of such Code (relating to designation of income tax payments to Presidential Election Campaign Fund) is amended by striking out "and 44H" and inserting "44H, and 44I".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after September 30, 1983.

HOW DOES THE CREDIT WORK?

SIMPLE, TWO-STEP PROCESS

Step 1. Recognition factor form

The builder will complete a simple form which identifies the requisite passive solar components.

Recognition factors: Storage Mass; Solar Collection Areas; Absorber; Heat Distribution; Heat Regulation Method. The five elements must be integrated into any building qualifying for the credit.

Step 2. Determination of amount of tax credit

To determine his tax credit, the builder must know—

1. Closest city to building (from list of 219 cities);

2. Solar collection area (total area of south facing windows), and

3. House heating load (amount of heating energy required by the House).

Factors 2, 3 will be used to determine the passive rating of the house.

To determine the house heating load: The builder multiplies the total floor area of the house by 1 of 8 selected insulation factors derived from the Insulation Factor Table.

The builder then determines the Passive Solar Rating by dividing the area of south glass by the House heating load:

Passive Solar Rating equals the area of south glass divided by the heating load.

The builder enters the Passive Rating at the closest number on the Solar Construction Credit Table and finds the nearest city.

EXAMPLE

House location: Roseville, California.

Nearest location: Sacramento.

Passive collection area: 279 Ft².

House heating load*: 465 Btu/Hr °F.

Passive Rating: 279 divided by 465 equals 0.6.
Tax Credit: \$708.

SOLAR CONSTRUCTION CREDIT EXAMPLE¹ TABLE

(Amounts in dollars)

Location	Passive rating						
	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8
Albuquerque.....	420	800	1,100	1,340	1,480	1,620	1,700
Atlanta.....	250	475	620	820	972	1,080	1,144
Boston.....	374	636	898	1,122	1,309	1,496	1,683
Burlington.....	366	641	916	1,053	1,237	1,328	1,420
Columbus.....	310	557	756	876	955	1,144	1,194
Madison.....	432	778	1,080	1,295	1,512	1,635	1,858
Sacramento.....	231	400	524	616	708	753	801

¹ Illustrative purposes only—actual figures will vary.
Note: Insulation Factor Table unavailable at this time.●

MARLBORO HOUSES' 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to cite the silver anniversary of Brooklyn's Marlboro Houses located in the Bensonhurst part of Brooklyn. Marlboro Houses was completed on January 31, 1958, during the administration of Mayor Robert F. Wagner. The name came from a local real estate development dating back to 1907. Like many other names in the New York area, its derivation comes from Great Britain where a duchy named Marlborough was created for war hero John Churchill, an ancestor of Sir Winston Churchill and Princess Diana.

The development was built by the New York City Housing Authority and is home to 1,765 families. Marlboro Houses consists of 28 buildings, some of which are 16 stories tall. The total cost for construction of the project was \$22.5 million.

The 25-year history of Marlboro has demonstrated the strong sense of community volunteerism that exists there. The Marlboro Residents Association, led by Violet Sabatel, has produced an award-winning newsletter and citations from the housing authority in a variety of sporting and leisure activities. There are many activities available to residents and a tenant patrol composed of volunteers watching out for the safety of their neighbors.

The culmination of the celebration at the Marlboro Houses is a dinner and dance sponsored by the Marlboro Residents Association at the Colonial Mansion in Brooklyn on Friday. Among the speakers will be my colleague in public office, New York Assemblyman Frank J. Barbaro.

I salute the residents of Marlboro Houses on their 25 years of being part of the neighborhoods of Brooklyn.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE CRIME CONTROL AND VICTIMS' COMPENSATION ACT OF 1983

HON. DONALD JOSEPH ALBOSTA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced the Crime Control and Victims' Compensation Act of 1983, H.R. 1869.

This legislation will strengthen the sentencing for certain serious crimes so that career criminals are not perpetually returning to their life of crime and so sentencing fits the crime. H.R. 1869 not only will act as a deterrent to career criminals, but also will provide uniformity so that certain crimes are met with specific sentences. Furthermore, my legislation will address the problem of neglect of victims of crime: Criminals will be required to work with part of their wages going to compensate their victims.

I am sure that all of you are as tired as I am of hearing of criminals who either repeatedly commit crimes or receive light sentences. Such reports erode public confidence in our judicial system. Samples of prison terms indicate that criminals who receive life sentences serve, on the average, only 9 years. Additionally, studies have shown that just 3 years after release from a long-term conviction, 45 percent of those released have again been arrested. Evidently, our present sentencing for crimes is not an effective deterrent. It is time to take action to correct such problems, and I believe that H.R. 1869 provides the necessary steps.

The Crime Control and Victims' Compensation Act would create a Federal mandatory life sentence for three of the most serious classes of offenders. These are: Persons who are convicted of first-degree murder with a firearm; those who are convicted of three felonies while carrying a firearm; and those who are thrice convicted of selling a specified amount of controlled substances.

Furthermore, the bill provides that such persons must work for pay with one-half of their wages going to pay for their keep and the other half going to compensate their victims. A recent poll of my district showed that of those responding, 93 percent favor requiring criminals to pay back victims of crime and to perform public service jobs. In order to finance the construction of any additional facilities which may be needed to provide employment for convicted persons, the Attorney General is authorized to issue bonds.

H.R. 1869 is a criminal justice bill which will provide a greater deterrent to crime, will compensate victims of crime, and will restore public confidence in our judicial system.

A summary and a section-by-section review follow:

CRIME CONTROL AND VICTIMS' COMPENSATION ACT OF 1983—H.R. 1869

SUMMARY

Recent studies have shown that just three years after release from a long-term conviction, 45 percent of those released have again been arrested. Additionally, many of those who supposedly are sentenced to life-term convictions are released many years short of that.

None of us is immune from the effect of serious and repeated offenses on our society. Increased insurance rates, public health expenditures, judicial time and expense, and the general mental and physical well-being of the victims, community and the nation have an impact on us all. To reduce this widespread effect and to restore public confidence in our judicial system by ensuring that criminals will serve a sentence that fits their crime and that career criminals will not constantly be let loose on the public to again commit crimes, I have introduced the Crime Control and Victims' Compensation Act of 1983.

The key elements of my bill are provisions to:

- (1) Sentence 1st degree murderers, those convicted three times of committing a crime while carrying a firearm, and career illegal drug dealers to life imprisonment without parole, and
- (2) Make the guilty persons work to pay for their keep and for victims' compensation.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

Amendments to title 18

Section 101: If someone is convicted of committing a first-degree murder with a firearm and that crime is punishable by life imprisonment under state or Federal law, then that person shall serve a mandatory life sentence in a Federal prison without parole—no longer will the convict receive an early release to be free to commit another murder.

Section 102: If someone is convicted of carrying a firearm while committing each of three felonies, then that person shall be imprisoned for life without parole—career criminals will not continue to be released to continue their life of crime.

Section 103: If someone sells on three or more occasions specified amounts of controlled substances in schedule I or II, then that person shall be imprisoned for life without parole—career drug sellers will not repeatedly be released to continue their sales.

Section 104a: Those who are imprisoned under the terms of this Act will be employed for pay under the Federal Prisons Industries Program with half of the revenue generated from their work covering the costs of their incarceration and the other half going to the victim(s).

After their victims are compensated, the remaining portion of this half of the prisoner's pay would be deposited in a fund to compensate victims who would otherwise not be compensated.

Victims will now receive at least some financial recompense for what they have suffered and will directly benefit from their aggressor's punishment.

Section 104b: In order to finance the construction of any additional facilities which may be needed to provide employment for convicted persons, the Attorney General is authorized to issue bonds.●

THE 1983 VIGIL FOR SOVIET
JEWRY

HON. THOMAS J. TAUKE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Speaker, as a participant in the Congressional Vigil for Soviet Jewry, I would like to take a moment to protest the inhumane treatment and persecution many Jewish citizens are suffering at the hands of the Soviet Government. By bringing their plight before my colleagues and the American people, I hope to let the Soviet Government know that we are observing its disregard for human rights and religious freedom, and that we consider the situation of the Soviet Jews intolerable.

Mistreatment of Soviet Jews is occurring more and more frequently. Soviet media and literature promote anti-Semitism. Teachers of Hebrew, Jewish culture and history are harassed constantly by Government agents. Jewish youths are being denied admission to Soviet universities. Soviet Jews are frequently charged with crimes against the state and sent to labor camps or into internal exile.

Perhaps the most disturbing form of persecution the Soviets are practicing now is the systematic denial of emigration applications from Jews. The number of Jews allowed to leave the U.S.S.R. in 1982 was 2,670—a 95-percent drop from the 51,000 allowed to leave in 1979. Not only are Jewish emigration applications refused, but Jews who have applied to emigrate become targets for even more harassment and abuse from Soviet authorities.

As an example of these abuses, I call to your attention the case of Yevgeny Lein of Leningrad and his family: Wife, Irina, daughter Sasha, 22, and son Alex, 11. Their tragic case is symbolic of many others.

Yevgeny is a mathematician, but now he works as a stoker and makes one-quarter of the salary he made previously. Yevgeny's problems began in 1978 when he and his family applied for permission to emigrate. Permission was denied. Since that time, they have been harassed and threatened by Government agents.

By 1981, the Leins were known as activists in the study of Jewish culture and history. In May that year, they planned a celebration of Israel Independence Day at their home. One hour before guests were to arrive, a police picket took up posts outside the Lein home and demanded that the meeting be canceled.

Four days later a group of Jews met for their weekly history seminar; Yevgeny was among them. The police broke up the gathering. Yevgeny refused to show his identification to the police because they were in plain

clothes and did not show their identification. Yevgeny was charged with offering resistance to authorities.

In August 1981, Yevgeny was tried and found guilty of assaulting a policeman. He was given 2 years deprivation of freedom and he was directed to work in places determined by the authorities.

Yevgeny was exiled to Siberia. His wife Irina joined him. They lived in a log cabin. In winter the temperature reached 50 degrees below zero. In summer the humidity was very high. There was no electricity. Irina wrote that the children could not join them because of the primitive conditions.

In June 1982, Yevgeny was released and flown back to Leningrad. By July he still had found no job and was warned not to meet his friends or seek legal advice from other Jewish activists.

Also in July, Sasha Lein was expelled from the Mining Institute in the middle of her exams. Yevgeny had been warned while in exile that his daughter would be expelled because of her Jewish activities. A previous attempt to expel her had failed because she had already passed her exams.

From July until December, Yevgeny sought work without success. Each time he visited a prospective employer, a telephone call from the KGB ended his hopes for a job. Finally, he found temporary employment as a manual laborer.

The plight of the Lein family is one of many, many such cases. I urge the Soviet Government to stop persecuting the Leins and other Soviet Jews. We in the United States must not turn our backs on such blatant denials of basic human freedoms. I urge my colleagues and the American people to join me in protesting the abuses of the Soviet Government.●

INDIVIDUAL HOUSING
ACCOUNTS LEGISLATION

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, as we are all too well aware, the current recession has adversely impacted the industrial segment of our economy, including the housing and timber industries. Housing starts have increased slightly in the last few months, but unemployment and high interest rates continue to plague these industries. At the beginning of last year, I introduced legislation designed to assist first-time home buyers in purchasing a home, indirectly providing assistance to the housing and timber trades. Today, I am introducing this legislation which I feel is a necessary step for us to take if we are to pre-

serve the American dream of homeownership.

Based on the IRA concept, this bill authorizes the establishment of individual housing accounts, or IHA's. First-time home buyers would be allowed to deposit up to \$5,000 a year, tax deductible, in an IHA. The maximum lifetime deduction allowed for each account is \$20,000. However, a husband and wife may establish separate IHAs permitting each of them to deposit up to \$20,000 over a 10-year period, for a combined total of \$40,000. If the savings were withdrawn and not used for the purchase of a principal residence, the deductions would be revoked and any regular taxes would become due. However, if the taxpayer becomes disabled, the money may be withdrawn without penalty.

As you know, the IRA concept has become very popular as a way to save for retirement. Following the same concept, the administration has proposed the establishment of individual education accounts to allow parents to save for the higher education expenses of their children. However, for those individuals with more immediate goals, such as purchasing a first home, the IHA provides the answer. For too long, we have discouraged savings through excessive taxation. Perhaps with the individual housing accounts, we can help first-time home buyers rediscover this important saving mentality and consequently bolster the assets of our financial institutions which serve as the primary source of home mortgage credit.

While the horizon does look brighter for the housing and timber industries, projected large deficits may tend to hinder the reduction of interest rates and more importantly, economic recovery. Thus, it is crucial that we act immediately to provide the necessary stimulus for these important industries.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation effort and move it along rapidly so that the American dream of homeownership can again become a reality.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) for his continued interest in this legislation and his assistance in moving it forward.●

TRANSIT BETRAYED

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent New York Times editorial that explains how Reagan ignored a promise he made in order to win passage of the gasoline tax last

year when making his budget. Reagan's budget does not divide the proceeds from the 5-cent tax between highways and mass transit, giving localities the power to spend the money as they wish. The editorial reflects my feelings about this breach of commitment by Reagan to the American public.

TRANSIT BETRAYED

Betrayal is not too strong a word for the Reagan Administration's refusal to honor the compromises it struck to win passage of the higher gasoline tax last year. It had agreed to divide the proceeds between highways and mass transit and to allow localities to judge what transit help they need most: new equipment or more operating and maintenance money.

The Administration's budget reneges on that promise and thus poses a threat to all urban transit. To press the principle that local governments should pay their own way, it would bar the use of gas tax proceeds for transit operating costs. However plausible the principle, that is simply astonishing from a President who cheered the lame-duck Congress as it passed his gas tax proposal.

Twenty percent of the tax collections was to go to local governments to spend as they wished, for either capital or operating expenses. An additional \$800 million a year was to be authorized from general tax revenues for operations over four years. But now the Administration budgets only \$275 million in operations subsidies for the coming year.

The consequences for New York would be devastating. The shift would derail the equally hard-won package of help for the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, in return for its promise to avert a fare hike this year. The same fate, or worse, would overtake transit systems in other large cities. And smaller systems would be hard put to find capital projects on which they could justify spending the newly restricted gas tax proceeds.

The last word remains to be spoken. Senator D'Amato of New York and Representative Howard of New Jersey can be expected to fight hard to restore the deal. The legislators who held out for transit operating subsidies were not demanding needless bounties. They were acting on two important principles: that transit's claim on the gas tax and general revenues is no less valid than that of highways, and that localities know best whether to use Federal grants for operations or capital.

NATIONAL CHILDREN AND TELEVISION WEEK

HON. DOUGLAS APPLIGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. APPLIGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to remind the House that next week, March 13, 1983, through March 19, 1983, has been designated by Public Law 97-443 as National Children and Television Week. This law, hopefully, will bring to the attention of the general public the importance and bene-

fits of television as it relates to our most precious resources, our children.

To paraphrase the several clauses of the law as it was passed, television can create an intellectual and emotional environment which can play a decisive role in shaping individual development and perception. Television should be viewed as a tool that can be used to provide children with true pictures of the world and positive models for behavior, and those individuals who make it a point to strive to improve the quality of television programming viewed by children should be commended for their efforts.

I believe it is incumbent upon the general public and legislative bodies on all levels of government to accept the responsibility of providing appropriate and stimulating programming for children and adolescents and this is why I support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this will become a traditional designated week that will continue to demonstrate the overall importance of television in our society, especially as it relates to the developing minds of our young people.

DEXTER BAKER: MINSI TRAILS COUNCIL DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, each year the Minsi Trails Council of the Boy Scouts of America selects from our community an individual who has been a friend of Scouting and who has given unselfishly of himself to the community. This year the Minsi Trails Council has selected, Dexter Baker, as its 1983 recipient. I would like to share with my colleagues in Congress some of the many contributions Dexter Baker has made to make our Lehigh Valley community a better place in which to live.

Dex is no ordinary person. As president and chief operating officer of Air Products & Chemicals, Inc., Dexter has been responsible for the corporation's position as one of the leading "high tech" companies in the United States. Yet, despite his busy schedule at Air Products, Dexter always finds the extra time to help his fellow man.

His effort to serve his community extends, quite literally, right down to the little man: the Boy Scouts of the Lehigh Valley. Dexter has served as a member of the executive board and the executive committee of the Minsi Trails Boy Scouts Council and was recently appointed to the executive advisory council.

Dexter is also responsible for establishing six explorer posts at Air Products which helps to acquaint young

people with careers such as accounting, aviation, data processing, engineering, manufacturing, and secretarial services. His enthusiasm is contagious. Employees at Air Products volunteer their time as Scout leaders to assist the Scouts in learning firsthand about the many careers existing in business. Dexter recognizes that our young people are the foundation of a better tomorrow and he has worked hard to help them along the difficult path of understanding.

Dexter understands the importance of a technically educated America. His knowledge of international business and his belief that America has to succeed now gives the young Scouts a unique dimension of the new technical trends in business. Many of the Scouts who are learning from the Air Product's Explorer Posts will become the leaders and shapers of a better tomorrow and what better role model can there be than Dexter Baker.

In addition to his work with Scouting, Dexter serves as a trustee at his alma mater, Lehigh University, and is a member of several business and engineering societies. Yet as a successful businessman and a highly respected member of our community, Dexter seeks no thanks or special mention for what he does. His reward is the knowledge that he is contributing to society and helping to make our community a better place in which to live. Dexter and his lovely wife Dottie believe in the basic concepts of hard work, family, and community; the concepts that have made our Nation great.

We in the Lehigh Valley are thankful for people like the Dexter Bakers who give so untrillingly of themselves. I applaud the Minsi Trails Council's selection of Dexter Baker as this year's distinguished citizen and join with our community in saluting him and wishing him all the best.

AGAR JAICKS

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, since 1966, some 16 years in all, the San Francisco Democratic County Committee has been chaired by Agar Jaicks who has given tirelessly of himself to forge coalitions among the many political groups in our city who seek to advance the cause of social, racial, and economic justice.

Agar Jaicks is by his own admission a liberal. He was once quoted in the San Francisco Examiner as saying:

Some people change their political posture for the times. The liberal position will return. As the pendulum swings back, we liberals will be able to move forward with it.

Agar Jaicks is a citizen politician. By profession he is a program director for KGO-TV in San Francisco. He and his wife Diana have raised their two children, Lisa and Scott.

It has been my pleasure to know and to cherish the friendship of Agar and Diana Jaicks for all my public life.

Agar Jaicks has served the highest ideals of citizen participation in the political process. He has worked long and hard to make the Democratic Party and the democratic process responsive to the needs of our people.

I wanted to share with my colleagues this brief view of Agar Jaicks, a person who is truly dedicated to government of, by, and for the people. ●

EXTENDED BENEFITS PROGRAM

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to restore State trigger rates for unemployment compensation to their pre-September 25, 1982, levels and to authorize the use of sub-State area triggers at State option for the provision of payment of extended benefits. This provision would recognize the wide diversity in unemployment which can exist in States with dispersed populations.

The extended benefits (EB) program provides unemployment compensation payments to individuals for up to 13 weeks if first, a State's 13-week insured employment rate (IUR) was 20-percent higher—120 percent of the average—than the average IUR in the last 2 years over the same calendar weeks, and second, the State IUR is at least 5 percent. Montana triggered on the EB program as of January 8, 1983. Because the IUR excludes millions of uninsured jobless, the 5-percent trigger is too stringent. Only 25 States now pay EB. The cost of this program is shared 50-50 between the States and the Federal Government. Without the Federal supplemental compensation (FSC) program, workers in the remaining 25 States would have no other benefits.

The other major provisions of my bill authorizes the establishment of sub-State triggers. Sub-State triggers would target more effectively extended benefits and would remove the inequity under the present system by which workers in distressed areas may be ineligible for extended benefits because the overall State unemployment rate is below the State trigger. My bill would use for these areas the economic areas developed by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce. The Bureau has divided the United States into 183 of these

areas. The areas cross State lines in recognition of the economic reality of unemployment, which respects no political boundaries.

The areas proposed in my bill are a starting point for discussion. I could have selected SMSA's, counties, or labor market areas. There may even be better areas. I selected these areas as the basis for my bill because they are existing areas based on standard metropolitan statistical areas, and based upon the actual commuting patterns of workers in the areas. If the House can develop a better means of establishing sub-State areas for the trigger mechanism, I would support those efforts fully. I just want to see the Congress take some step toward authorizing sub-State triggers. In 1975, the House passed such legislation, but the sub-State provision was dropped in conference.

I recognize that increasing the number of units by which benefits can be triggered increases somewhat the administrative difficulties. I would point out to the House and to the bureaucracy that it is a whole lot more difficult to be employed for endless weeks. It will take time to designate the areas and to develop the date compilation procedures. It may take a very long time. I hope the depression will have ended by that point. The concept, however, is sound and worth doing. If we do not act now, the mechanism will not exist when we face another recession.

It has been suggested that the State trigger mechanism does not provide fairness for those who are employed and residing in pockets of extremely high unemployment while the rest of the State is not experiencing the same economic difficulties. Thus, some have suggested that the only fair way to administer the EB program is to use either the sub-State or area triggers.

What might area triggers cost the Federal Government? One analyst at the Department of Labor has estimated that if an area trigger was in effect during the fiscal year 1983, the additional costs could be anywhere from 10 to 50 percent higher—\$360 million to \$1.8 billion more—than the current EB program, which is estimated to cost approximately \$3.6 billion in fiscal year 1983. In contrast, if the national trigger was in effect in fiscal year 1983 it would cost approximately 100 percent more than the current program or approximately \$7.2 billion. The advantages of a sub-State trigger are:

Assuming that the administrative problems could be resolved, an area trigger would cost less than a national trigger.

Individuals from pockets of high unemployment could receive EB even if their State, as a whole, was not experiencing unusually high unemployment. ●

CHANGING EPA'S NON-POLICIES

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, although an important chapter in the life of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was concluded Wednesday, the resignation of Anne M. Burford as Administrator is by itself insufficient to be the concluding chapter.

As the President clearly indicated in his letter to Mrs. Burford acknowledging her resignation, the environmental nonpolicies she pursued at EPA were very much in keeping with his own environmental philosophy.

Unless the President appoints a new administrator with sufficient stature, and a clear mandate to carry out the environmental laws of this Nation, nothing will have changed at EPA and the desire of the American people to live in a safe environment will continue to be thwarted.

Continuing a policy of foot dragging at the EPA will only compound the problems that toxic wastes presently pose. And it is urgency, not further delay, that is needed immediately.

The problems with EPA regarding cleanup of toxic waste sites in my own State of New Jersey demonstrate the need for a complete overhaul of the Agency.

A comprehensive look at these problems was provided last Sunday by Herb Jaffe of the Newark Star-Ledger. I would like to recommend it to those interested in further understanding why the administration must do an about-face on protecting the environment.

The article follows:

(From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Mar. 6, 1983)

U.S. SUPERFUND DELAYS STALL TOXIC CLEANUPS IN JERSEY

(By Herb Jaffe)

Not one cent of U.S. superfund money has been spent on the cleanup of hazardous waste sites in New Jersey because of federal red tape, bureaucratic snags and a cumbersome system of designating feasibility consultants.

Only \$4 million of the \$14,256,000 granted to New Jersey from the \$1.6 billion superfund is being spent, almost all for feasibility studies, none of which have been completed.

Two years and three months since the superfund was established by Congress, to be apportioned over a five-year period, some of the worst toxic waste sites in New Jersey are still awaiting funds from the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which administers superfund.

New Jersey has the highest number of toxic waste sites on EPA's "priority list." In December, the federal agency listed 418 priority cleanup sites, with 65 of them in New Jersey.

But more than half of the feasibility studies at the 12 New Jersey sites for which su-

perfund money has been earmarked have not been started.

State Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) officials say it takes anywhere from six to 12 months to complete a toxic waste site feasibility study. The studies generally cost between \$200,000 and \$500,000 each, according to DEP records.

Under the procedure, once a study is completed it is followed by months and possible years of bureaucratic haggling before actual superfund cleanup money can be made available.

Kin-Buc landfill in Edison was closed by DEP in 1976 after more than 75 million gallons of chemical waste were dumped. The site, bounded by two rivers, was awarded a superfund feasibility study grant in July when EPA Administrator Anne Gorsuch Burford came to Trenton to make the announcement. But the Kin-Buc feasibility study hasn't been started.

The remainder of more than \$10 million of superfund money appropriated for New Jersey is "dedicated for cleanup, but right now the money is just sitting idle because the feasibility studies must first be completed," explained Dr. Marwan Sadat, DEP's superfund coordinator.

In the meantime, the state is circumventing the strings attached to superfund by using its own funds where possible to continue with other cleanups. State resources under the New Jersey Spill Compensation Fund were practically depleted at one point after the \$25 million Chemical Control cleanup.

But in 1981 the voters approved a \$100 million bond issue for toxic waste cleanups, and this, combined with a reorganization of the state's spill fund, has accounted for most of the cleanup money, even though superfund was supposed to have accounted for the major share.

Sadat, who formerly was responsible for water quality in DEP, recently became the state agency's administrator for the Hazardous Sites Mitigation Administration which is responsible for coordinating both superfund grants and the state's Spill Compensation Fund.

"At present, there is no shovel in the ground at any of the 12 superfund sites," Sadat said when asked whether any superfund money has been used for cleanup in New Jersey.

Sadat explained that seven of the 12 feasibility studies are being undertaken by a "zone contractor" appointed by EPA. The other five feasibility studies are being put out to bid by DEP "because the state took the lead on those sites," Sadat said, referring to a complex procedure under which the EPA superfund zone contractor was able to be bypassed.

The same zone contractor is responsible for most other superfund-financed feasibility studies in EPA's Region 2, which also includes New York and Puerto Rico. Of EPA's 418 national priority cleanup sites, 96 are in Region 2.

But the zone contractor, which recently was replaced, is responsible for superfund toxic waste feasibility studies for the entire eastern United States, it was learned. A similar superfund zone contractor is employed to conduct feasibility studies in the western half of the country.

The new contractor for the eastern area, N.U.S. Corp., is a Washington, D.C., corporation with offices in Pittsburgh and Gaithersburg, Md. The western zone contractor is a firm called Chem Hill Two.

"N.U.S. Corp. came aboard at the start of this year and replaced Camp, Dresser and

McKee of Boston, which held the contract for two years," explained EPA Region 2 spokesman Richard Cahill.

"N.U.S. is now the zone contractor for all of our superfund work," he added.

Cahill said the selection and appointment of the zone contractor is made at EPA headquarters in Washington. Camp, Dresser and McKee was appointed in the waning days of the Carter administration, which was when the superfund legislation was enacted.

Feasibility studies must be undertaken to first determine the scope and nature of a cleanup. Asked whether the fact that only one contractor used by EPA for conducting feasibility studies may be responsible for the delay in obtaining additional superfund grants and actually beginning the cleanups, Sadat stated:

"That's just one reason. There are many. There have been delays in completing feasibility studies for various reasons.

"Another reason is the multitude of agencies that must approve the studies after they're completed. Just in DEP that includes such agencies as the division of water resources, the office of regional affairs, the office of science and research, of course our office, and in some cases even the attorney general's office.

"Then there's the bureaucratic network in EPA that must approve the study, all the way from Region 2 in New York to EPA headquarters in Washington. All of this takes time. I could recommend an alternative, but it might not be the one EPA headquarters may choose.

"Right now the whole process must be finalized by EPA in Washington, and I think it's all unnecessarily bureaucratic."

Sadat said that as a result of dissatisfaction over the lack of EPA environmental policy, the attorney general's office filed suit in federal court last summer in behalf of DEP.

He said the suit against EPA was based on the lack of a suitable national contingency plan to deal with superfund cleanups.

"We also questioned the lack of environmental standards and the fact that EPA has issued no suitable guidelines on cleanups. There's no procedures and administration for superfund cleanups," he said.

Deputy Attorney General Mary C. Jacobson, who filed the suit, explained that it "challenges EPA's publication of its national contingency plan. The case is in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals."

Jacobson said the EPA plan "has not sufficiently spelled out the state's role" in cleanups. A similar suit filed by the national Environmental Defense Fund has since been consolidated with the New Jersey suit. However, briefs in the case have been postponed until next month because of EPA's present problems with Congress.

"Basically, we contend that EPA has not lived up to the spirit of the criteria for superfund," Jacobson said, noting that a number of chemical and petroleum industry associations have intervened in the case on the side of EPA.

In citing one example of the problem, Sadat said that while EPA has granted feasibility funds for 12 sites in New Jersey, it has dedicated partial cleanup funds for only five of the sites.

In addition, Sadat said, "we haven't been able to get superfund money to even conduct a feasibility study at Gems landfill."

Gems, located in Camden County, is the 13th worst toxic waste site on EPA's national priority list and the fifth worst in New Jersey.

"I consider Gems one of the highest priority sites in the state. It poses a serious public health problem. But so far we can't get any EPA action because of a legal problem that has arisen within EPA," Sadat said.

"Their concern is what the state's share should be. EPA says we should match 50 percent of the cost."

The reference was to matching funds under the superfund legislation. The state must put up 10 per cent of whatever superfund pays. For example, of the \$14,256,000 which EPA has dedicated for New Jersey, DEP has added 10 per cent to the total.

However, sites owned by municipalities are eligible for only 50 per cent of the cost from superfund. The 60-acre Gems site is owned by Gloucester Township, but it was leased to Gloucester Environmental Management Services (Gems), a commercial disposal firm that dumped its customers' chemical waste on the site for five years.

"While EPA decides what to do, contaminated leachate is coming from the landfill, and there are homes only 70 or 80 yards away. The site has contaminated Holly Run Creek, and the emissions, in our estimation, pose a very serious problem. The odors are quite strong," Sadat stated.

"Our understanding of superfund is that the money should provide immediate relief for cleanup and the removal of health threats, prior to any legal remedies," he pointed out.

All of the 12 sites that have received any superfund grants are on the priority list of 65. But Sadat noted "we have identified about 400 toxic waste sites in New Jersey, and using the superfund identification process there may be another 100 sites."

"On the basis of what we have identified, as compared to other states, we should be entitled to anywhere from \$200 million to \$250 million" of the \$1.6 billion superfund.

Sadat said he could not comment on allegations by investigating congressional committees that EPA has used the timeliness of superfund grants to enhance the positions of Republican candidates.

However, according to the status of the 12 superfund sites in the state, the one closest to the start of cleanup is the 27-acre Bridgeport site in Gloucester County. This is the site where former EPA superfund administrator Rita Lavelle announced just prior to November's congressional election that \$3.2 million was being presented for the feasibility study and preliminary cleanup.

The effort was viewed as a political attempt to discredit Rep. James Florio (D-1st Dist.), in whose district Bridgeport is located. Florio, who heads the House transportation subcommittee, one of the seven that is pressing for EPA cleanup documents, has also been one of the loudest critics of superfund administration. In addition, he is one of the architects of the legislation that created the fund in December 1980.

While the Bridgeport site was one of the last to receive a superfund grant in New Jersey, Sadat said "we expect to begin some form of remedial action at Bridgeport some time next month."

Bridgeport's \$3.2 million includes \$500,000 for the feasibility study by Camp, Dresser and McKee. Even though this firm was replaced by N.U.S. Corp., EPA spokesman Cahill said all feasibility studies begun by Camp, Dresser and McKee will be completed by that firm. Despite the start of limited remedial action, Sadat said the Bridgeport feasibility study is not expected to be completed until the latter part of this year.

Sadat explained that all 12 sites were given their superfund grants between May 12 and Dec. 20, 1982.

The first grant was to Price landfill, outside of Atlantic City, for \$250,000 to conduct the feasibility study. On June 28, an additional \$336,000 was granted by superfund, including DEP matching funds, for a containment system.

Price landfill, which is threatening the water supply of Atlantic City, is the sixth worst site in the country, according to the EPA list, and the second worst in New Jersey. Sadat said the feasibility study is expected to be completed by next month.

On July 7, during a press conference and ceremony in Trenton, Burford presented \$3.4 million, with DEP matching funds, to Gov. Thomas Kean for Kin Buc and Lone Pine landfill.

Lone Pine, the 18th worst site in the country and the sixth worst in New Jersey, was given \$333,000 for a feasibility study that has begun. The remainder was for Kin Buc, where none of the money has been used.

On Sept. 3, superfund money totaling almost \$3.7 million was appropriated for feasibility studies at Goose Farm, Pijak Farm and Spence Farm, all in Plumsted Township, and the Friedman site in Upper Freehold Township. Approximately \$2.6 million of that money is being held aside for later cleanup at Spence Farm.

None of these four feasibility studies has been started.

A cleanup that EPA officials said reached \$11 million was begun at Goose Farm in the summer of 1980, six months before superfund was enacted. The site was supposed to have been decontaminated by February 1982.

But criticism over the quality of the cleanup resulted in the superfund grant of \$210,000 in September for a feasibility study of the groundwater at Goose Farm.

A superfund grant, with DEP matching funds, of more than \$2.1 million on Sept. 23 allowed for a \$500,000 feasibility study at Lipari landfill in Pitman and \$370,000 for a study at the D'Imperio site in Hamilton Township, with the remainder to be held for cleanup. Both feasibility studies are expected to be completed before the end of this year, Sadat said.

Following the Bridgeport grant of \$3.2 million on Oct. 29, four days before the congressional election, EPA's final superfund grant to New Jersey was \$2.6 million on Dec. 20.

The last grant included \$300,000 for a feasibility study at Kryswaty Farm in Hillsborough and \$350,000 for a feasibility study at Syncon Resins in South Kearny, with another \$2 million to be held for Syncon's cleanup. ●

FERDINAND MARCOS: HERO OR FRAUD?

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1983

● Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the dismal record of human rights violations by Philippine dictator Ferdinand Marcos continues to mount. Amnesty International has documented repeated illegal arrests and detention, torture, disappearances, and killings.

Yet the U.S. Government under the Reagan administration continues to develop and strengthen our relations with the Marcos regime. The recent closing of the opposition newspaper, *We Forum*, demonstrates that the lifting of martial law in 1981 was not an act of substance, but a convenient gesture to appease the Reagan administration.

In 1984, the United States must renegotiate its agreements with the Philippines for American-Filipino military bases on the main island of Luzon. As these negotiations begin to get underway, I believe we should re-examine just who and what is this man with whom we are dealing.

Recently, Bonifacio Gillego, a former Philippine military officer now living in exile in the United States, published an article examining Marcos' proud claims that he is "the most decorated man in the Philippines." This article which was published in *We Forum* (and probably a central reason for its banishment) investigates the circumstances surrounding the awarding of these medals.

I would like to take this opportunity to share Mr. Gillego's article with our colleagues, and in doing so, I might ask our colleagues to keep a few questions in mind.

First, how might we and the citizens of our country react should we discover that this supposed friend of the United States is nothing more than a "paper hero"?

Second, in the words of our colleague, Mr. EDGAR of Pennsylvania, are the real national security interests of the United States served by propping up an unpopular dictator?

With these questions in mind, I commend this article to your attention.

THE MARCOS MEDALS: A STUDY IN EXTRAPOLATION

(By Bonifacio H. Gillego)

How many medals did Marcos actually receive for his alleged feats of heroism in World War II? The count has become a numbers game.

Hartzell Spence, in his book, *For Every Tear A Victory, The Story of Ferdinand E. Marcos* (McGraw-Hill, Inc. New York, 1964), credits Marcos with 28 including American awards. More a hagiographer than a biographer, Spence has been the purveyor of embroidered tales about Marcos' life and deeds to the credulous and gullible public, both Philippine and American. It was Spence who recounted the ridiculous story that when General Omar Bradley "saw Ferdinand's six rows of ribbons headed by twenty-two valor medals including the Distinguished Service Cross, the four-star general saluted Marcos."

The story is patently false because in May 1947, the date of the comic book *Bradley-Marcos encounter in the Pentagon*, the Armed Forces of the Philippines could account only for six war medals. Most of the medals of Marcos were conferred on him by the Armed Forces of the Philippines only from 1948 to 1963.

On the occasion of the multi-million extravaganza (the Marcos state visit to the

USA), the Philippine Embassy in Washington, D.C. gave the widest dissemination to propaganda materials glorifying the war exploits of Marcos. A brochure entitled "Friends in War Ferdinand E. Marcos in the Pacific War, 1941-45" tabulates 32 medals. The souvenir program contains among others a picture of Marcos with the inscription at the back that during the Pacific War, Marcos won 33 American and Philippine medals. A more modest claim, however, is made that Marcos delayed the fall of Bataan "by weeks" not three months, as Spence propagandized earlier in his campaign biography of Marcos.

The salvo of paeans to Marcos vaunted war heroism was part of a well-funded drive to influence the powers-that-be in the USA to award Marcos the Congressional Medal of Honor. At this juncture, it may be recalled that it was Spence again who fantasized that upon hearing the exploits of Marcos in Bataan, General Jonathan Wainwright from his headquarters in Corregidor called by phone the 21st Division directing that Marcos be recommended for a Congressional Medal of Honor. Accordingly, Brig. General Mateo Capinpin allegedly made the recommendation but the papers got conveniently lost, hence the explanation why Marcos was robbed of the singular honor of receiving the much coveted American award.

Claiming that the recommendation was "sidetracked," Bataan, purportedly a Philippine magazine published in Washington, D.C., came out with a special edition (20 September 1982) urging the conferment of the Congressional Medal of Honor on Marcos 40 years after the guns of Bataan and Corregidor were silenced!

Unfortunately for the drumbeaters of Marcos, the grant of the Congressional Medal of Honor has prescribed time limitations. The recommendation has to be made within two years after the deed of extraordinary valor above and beyond the call of duty. The actual conferment has to be made within three year after such deed. Only the US Congress can waive the time limitation but apparently the move for a Congressional waiver was laughed off.

There is not a scintilla of evidence in the files of the US Army Center of Military History, the National Records Center of the Archives, the US Army Library in Pentagon, the Library of Congress, etc. that Marcos performed an authentic deed of extraordinary valor deserving the grant of the Congressional Medal of Valor.

The reports of and about the defense of Bataan by the staff of General Douglas MacArthur, General Jonathan Wainwright and General George Parker, Jr. do not show the faintest trace of Marcos singlehanded feat of stemming the tide of Japanese advance in Bataan that delayed its fall by three months. Even the foremost deodorizer of the Marcos dictatorship, Carlos P. Romulo, made no mention of Marcos among the heroes he "walked with."

But the count remains. The statistical projection, whether it be 28, 32, or 33, creates and fosters the impression—as it is deliberately intended to—that Marcos was the most decorated Filipino soldier in World War II. None of the participant nations during the war could produce a hero with as many awards as Marcos not excluding General MacArthur, himself. That is if the count of the Marcos medals is devoid of fraudulence and deception.

What is deliberately concealed in the accounting of the Marcos medals is the date of

issue of each of the awards. If this is one essential detail that is shown, the stark truth stands out. It was not during the war that he was awarded these medals. Marcos managed to have himself awarded these medals by the Armed Forces of the Philippines long after the war was over! Medals that would include such essential details as the General Order number, the date of issue and the issuing headquarters would reveal the following:

Eleven of the 33 awards were given in 1963.

Ten of the 11 awards given in 1963 were given on the same day, 20 December 1963.

Three awards were given in one General Order, also issued on 20 December 1963.

One award was given in 1972.

Eight of the "33 American and Philippine Medals" (President Marcos: A Political Profile, Office of Media Affairs, Republic of the Philippines) are strictly speaking not medals but campaign ribbons which all participants in the defense of Bataan and in the resistance movement are entitled to.

Awards are duplicated for the same action at the same place on the same day.

One is a Special Award given by the Veterans Federation of the Philippines.

All these are included in the count of 33 and foisted upon the unwary public as having been awarded to Marcos during the war. The fact of the matter, to repeat, is that most of the medals claimed had been

acquired long after the end of World War II.

Even as late as 1972, the Armed Forces of the Philippines gave Marcos on his birthday the Philippine Legion of Honor (G.O. 121, GHQ, AFP, 11 September 1972).

On 20 December 1963, almost 20 years after the end of World War II, the AFP awarded Marcos for services in Bataan and in the resistance movement 2 Distinguished Conduct Stars; 2 Distinguished Service Stars; 2 Gold Cross Medals; and 3 Wounded Soldier's Medals.

One General Order alone (No. 155, GHQ, AFP, 20 December 1963) granted Marcos 3 medals for having been allegedly wounded in Bataan on April 5, 1942 and April 7, 1942 and in Kiangang, Mt. Province.

If these awards were truly deserved, why were they not conferred earlier? What prompted the Armed Forces of the Philippines to go on an awarding splurge one day in December 1963? Recollections of top politicians in the know tend to show that President Macapagal allowed the Armed Forces of the Philippines to give Marcos awards on a wholesale basis in the expectation that an amply awarded and appeased Marcos would not contest his (Macapagal's bid) for reelection.

For identical citation as a guerrilla and underground leader, Marcos received 2 Distinguished Service Stars (G.O. 435, HPA, 24 April 1945 and G.O. 152, GHQ, AFP 20 December 1963). For the same action at Pan-

updapan on 5 April 1945 when allegedly Marcos singlehandedly forced the enemy to withdraw after 30 minutes of combat, Marcos received 2 Distinguished Conduct Stars; one on 16 October 1963 (G.O. 124, AFP, GHQ) and another on 20 December 1963 (G.O. 157, GHQ, AFP).

Both Col. Romulo A. Manriquez, Commanding Officer of the 14th Infantry, and Capt. Vicente L. Rivera, Adjutant of the same unit, in their signed testimonies, stated that Marcos had no participation whatsoever in any combat operations during his service with the 14th Infantry. As Commanding Officer of the 14th Infantry, Col. Manriquez never recommended, as there was no basis at all, Marcos for any award. If Marcos as claimed was ever wounded at all, Col. Manriquez quipped, it must be that Marcos was bitten by a leech.

With the wholesale and indiscriminate grant of awards in one day, the duplications, the multiple awards in one General Order, the inclusion of the campaign ribbons, etc. Marcos is truly the most decorated Filipino soldier in World War II by extrapolation.

One wonders how the future will reckon with this man who has so audaciously and unconscionably distorted our military records with unspeakable fakery and imposture when men of the caliber of Col. Romulo A. Manriquez, Col. Narciso Manzano and Capt. Vicente L. Rivera will come out and speak the truth.●