

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MEDAL OF MERIT RECIPIENTS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last weekend I had the privilege of presenting my annual Medal of Merit for Outstanding Youth to 23 young people from throughout the 15th Congressional District. The range of voluntarism, achievement, and commitment of these young people is an outstanding tribute to their families, schools, and communities and I want to call this event to your attention.

I also want to take this opportunity to commend the 17-member citizens volunteer committee, chaired by Mr. Doug Ritter of Canton Township, for their dedication and commitment in the selection of tomorrow's leaders.

The 1983 Medal of merit winners are:

Augusta Township: Felicia J. Chestnut, 17, daughter of James and Mary Chestnut, for volunteering musical entertainment to service clubs and churches, and for serving in a student leadership role on school millage issues.

Belleville: Kimberly Ann Fields, 17, daughter of Dave and Sandy Fields, also a gifted musician-violinist, who has donated free musical recitals to the Kiwanis, Rotary, senior citizens and church groups.

Canton Township: Catherine Kelly Baldrice, 17, daughter of Daniel J. and Katherine A. Baldrice, for planning and preparation assistance to the Canton Public Library; and for a broad range of volunteer work with Health-a-Rama, her neighborhood civic association, class fundraisers, the Canton County Festival, and as a special math and French tutor.

Garden City: Brian Petrucci, 17, son of Eno and Virginia Petrucci, for help with Jaycee projects, the youth athletic association, Little League, and for his involvement with the City Charter ballot issue.

Colleen Elliott, 18, daughter of Carol and Robert Elliott, for donating two summers to assist ninth graders in her high school band, for making Easter bunny visits to shut-ins, and also for her fundraising with the Muscular Dystrophy Telethon.

David V. J. Powierski, 19, son of Casimir and Leola Powierski, for his exceptional work as a leadership trainer in the Boy Scouts, as Assistant Scoutmaster to Troop 765, and as an Eagle Scout.

Huron Township: Cheryl Simpson, 17, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. James Simpson, for her leadership in student government, scholarship and in athletic competition.

Livonia: Caroline Kert, 16, daughter of Harry and Corrine Kert, for distinguished musical accomplishments and for assisting underprivileged families in Detroit and Haiti.

Romulus: James P. Holbrook, 18, son of James E. and Josephine M. Holbrook, for his volunteer renovation of the Oakwoods Metro Park Nature Center (Sky Come Down Trail).

Marlene Carpenter, 17, daughter of George and Kathleen Carpenter, for donating considerable time to the tutoring of fellow students, and for assisting the C.R.O.P. fundraising program in Romulus, which helps needy people throughout the world.

Saline: Susan Tracy Stanbridge, 18, daughter of Cynthia Stanbridge, for her leadership and involvement in student government, the Saline High School FHA Beautification Project, and her volunteer work as a Teen Advisor with the Young People's Bereavement Support Group Committee.

Southgate: Cheryl A. Jones, 18, daughter of Elwyn and Pearl Jones, for working with the local beautification committee, and for her assistance in redrafting the school constitution during the recent merger of the two Southgate high schools.

Lisa Zmijewski, 18, daughter of Robert and Sharon Zmijewski, for scholarship and for Candy Stripper volunteer activities with Wyandotte General Hospital.

Superior Township: Mark D. Yenkel, 20, son of Ray and Marilyn Yenkel, for providing personal leadership and counsel to youth, for numerous hours of work with his community ice hockey rink, and for his work with the Boy Scouts.

Cheryl Rogers, 15, daughter of Edward and Mildred Rogers, for serving as a bilingual tutor for her Mexican-born neighbor, and for acting as an aide at Cheney Elementary School.

Ida Williams, 16, daughter of Karl and Kathleen Williams, for her exceptional work with the Special Olympics and other projects assisting retarded children.

Taylor: Toni Marie Amato, 18, daughter of Carol and John Subeck, for raising \$700 during White Cane Week in conjunction with the Taylor Lions Club, and for her numerous other volunteer activities.

Phillip J. Antrassian, 18, son of Vincent and Mary Antrassian, for fundraising success with the school athletic program, and for his participation in student government.

Van Buren Township: Tami Harkai, 16, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Harkai, for serving as co-chair of the local blood bank drive and for contributing articles to local newspapers about her fellow students and school events.

Wayne: Jacqueline F. Poindexter, 17, daughter of Bennie D. and Lucille W. Poindexter, for several contributions, including the 8-10 hours weekly she donates to the Project Head Start preschool program, and her voluntarism with her church's summer reading program.

Westland: James J. Williams, 18, son of Thomas P. and Mary A. Ward, for numerous contributions over several years in performing musical presentations for the disabled, bereaved and imprisoned, and for donating time as a music tutor.

Ypsilanti: Donna Agnes Porter, 17, daughter of John and Lois Porter, for providing

entertainment and assistance to the elderly, including monthly birthday celebrations, and for involving many of her classmates in visitations for the sick and aged.

Ypsilanti Township: Penny P. Foster, 21, daughter of Lyle and Vera Foster, for outstanding problem-solving as a member of the Eastern Michigan University Student Senate, and for her voluntarism with the Little League.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most rewarding events of every year for me. I am proud to call this year's winners to your attention and am proud to honor them by placing their names in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.●

THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT RESPONDS TO CONGRESSIONAL POLL IN RECORD LARGE NUMBERS

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, each year I mail a congressional questionnaire to the residents of the 18th Congressional District of Michigan in an effort to learn their thinking on important national issues.

Nearly 40,000 individuals replied this year—by far the largest response ever to this program. Significantly, nearly three-quarters of those who replied said they would oppose repeal of the scheduled 10-percent personal income tax cut effective July 1.

As in past years, my questionnaire also was distributed to high schools throughout the area. The replies of the young people who participated were tabulated separately and present an interesting comparison to the views of the adults who replied.

Because of the importance of the issues involved and the unusually large number of replies received, I am including a tabulation of the results at this point in the RECORD.

1983 CONGRESSIONAL POLL RESULTS

[In percent]

	Adults ¹		Students	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you believe further cuts can be made in the defense budget without endangering our national security?	70	28	69	31
2. Should social security benefits be taxed in order to help sustain the system?	21	78	22	78
3. Do you support the President's call for a freeze on Federal spending to help reduce the deficit?	92	6	74	26
4. Would you favor a system of reciprocal tariffs that would treat Japanese and other foreign imports as U.S. exports are treated overseas?	87	12	85	15

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

1983 CONGRESSIONAL POLL RESULTS—Continued

	(In percent)			
	Adults ¹		Students	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
5. Would you favor repeal of legislation permitting the Internal Revenue Service to withhold 10 percent of dividend and interest payments?	77	21	58	42
6. Would you support a federally funded program to retrain unemployed workers in industries where jobs have been permanently lost to foreign competition?	46	51	66	34
7. Do you believe states with the highest unemployment should be given preference in the awarding of Federal contracts and grants?	73	26	82	18
8. Should Congress repeal the scheduled 10-percent personal income tax cut scheduled to take effect this summer?	26	72	41	59

¹ Balance equaling 100 percent undecided.

A BILL TO EXTEND ANTITRUST IMMUNITY TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce a bill in response to the decision of the Supreme Court in *Community Communications Co., Inc. v. City of Boulder*, handed down in January 1982.

The Boulder decision has refocused attention on the relationship between the Federal antitrust laws and local government activities. In the wake of Boulder, many municipal officials fear that the threat of treble damage antitrust liability could inhibit their performance of legitimate governmental functions.

By their very nature, municipal actions often tend to have a major impact on competition, and usually involve discretionary decisions which have exclusionary effects. Over the past 5 years, municipalities have been charged with a number of antitrust violations associated with a wide range of franchising, licensing, zoning, and other regulatory activities.

By way of background, in *Parker v. Brown*, decided in 1943, the Supreme Court upheld a California State agricultural marketing program which had been challenged as a restraint of trade. The Court held that the Sherman Act was never intended by the Congress to apply to State action or official action imposed and directed by a State. The key to the Court's holding was the determination that "nothing in the language of the Sherman Act or its history * * * suggests that its purpose was to restrain a State or its officers or agents from activities directed by its legislature." In the 1975 case of *Goldfarb v. Virginia State Bar*, the Supreme Court stated that "the threshold inquiry in determining if an anticompetitive activity is State action of the type the Sherman Act was not meant to pro-

scribe is whether the activity is required by the State acting as sovereign." In that case, the Court held that the publication and enforcement of a minimum fee schedule by State and local bar associations was not required by State law or the State supreme court, and thus was not State action for the purposes of the Sherman Act.

The Boulder decision held that municipal action, even by a home rule city with complete authority in local matters, is not immune from the antitrust laws unless: First, it constitutes the sovereign action of the State itself or, second, is authorized by a "clearly articulated and affirmatively expressed State policy" of substituting regulation for competition. A general grant of home rule authority does not meet that second standard—"mere neutrality" is not enough, the Court said. The Boulder Court also refused to distinguish proprietary from governmental actions by the municipality. In a somewhat similar case decided 4 years earlier, *City of Lafayette v. Louisiana Power and Light Co.*, the municipality's actions had been proprietary rather than governmental and Justice Burger had suggested in a concurring opinion that governmental action should be immune from antitrust challenge. But the Boulder Court, while acknowledging that the Parker doctrine reflects Congress intention to embody in the Sherman Act the federalist principle of State sovereignty, expressly held that the Federal system "has no place for sovereign cities."

As I said at the outset, municipal officials are concerned that their legitimate exercise of both their proprietary and governmental responsibilities will give rise to treble damage antitrust liability. It is not surprising, therefore, that the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors are advising us that they favor an amendment to the antitrust laws to extend the Parker State action exemption to cities and other political subdivisions of the State. I am advised that the Office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives has forwarded to the Judiciary Committee a number of resolutions adopted by city councils and local bodies requesting a legislative remedy. Many of us have also been hearing from individual municipalities in our districts.

I am convinced myself that this is a problem of sufficient importance to merit the prompt attention of the Judiciary Committees of both the House and the Senate. I understand that Senator THURMOND is having legislation prepared for introduction in the other body. The bill which I am introducing today is my contribution toward getting the legislative process underway in the House of Representatives. My bill provides that a unit of

local government shall be liable under the antitrust laws for any conduct within the authority vested in such unit by any law only to the extent that a State, if such State were authorized by any law to engage in identical conduct, would be liable under the antitrust laws for such identical conduct. This may not be a perfect solution to the problem, but I believe it is a useful start. I invite other Members to join me in this important initiative by cosponsoring this bill.●

TRIBUTE TO AN OUTSTANDING NEWSPAPER PUBLISHER, IRA CAHN

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I raise to call to the attention of my colleagues the achievements and accomplishments of an outstanding newspaper publisher in the Fourth Congressional District of New York, which I have the honor to represent.

I refer to Ira Cahn, publisher of the *Massapequa Post*, a newspaper serving some 8,000 families in the communities of Massapequa and Massapequa Park, and the *Amityville Record* serving the Amityville community. Ira Cahn founded the *Massapequa Post* in 1951. Throughout the more than three decades the newspaper has been published by Ira Cahn, it has been a strong and forceful voice for community betterment.

During those years, I have been a reader of the *Massapequa Post* and have long admired the high standards of journalism which have been established under Ira Cahn's supervision. This is in no small part due to the fact that Ira's lovely and talented wife Barbara, has served as the paper's managing editor during most of the years the *Massapequa Post* has been published. The newspaper has won more than 100 awards of journalistic excellence in every field of journalistic endeavor, and represents the very epitome of responsible community leadership and service.

Ira Cahn, now generally referred to as the dean of Long Island newspaper publishers and editors, has won substantial recognition from his peers. He has served as president of the New York Press Association, and is currently a member of the board of the Long Island Press Association. Always interested in the younger generation, Ira Cahn is an associate professor of community journalism at C. W. Post College in Greenvale, N.Y., and no better instructor in that field can be found.

Mr. Speaker, one would think that with all of these professional duties and responsibilities, Ira Cahn's days

would be fully occupied. But such is far from the truth. Few have devoted as much time to community and civic affairs as has Ira Cahn. For example, he has taken a most active interest in the history of the Massapequa area, and is a founding member of the Massapequa Historical Society. He also served as vice chairman of the bicentennial commission for the town of Oyster Bay.

In truth, Mr. Speaker, Ira Cahn is not only an outstanding newspaper editor and publisher, he is an outstanding citizen of this great Nation of ours. I know that my colleagues here in the House join me in offering our heartiest congratulations and our warmest best wishes to Ira and his lovely wife Barbara. Together, they have forged an exemplary record of community service and leadership which can serve as a most inspiring example for all of us. ●

BIRMINGHAM, MICH., CELEBRATES GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, next week the city of Birmingham, Mich., commences its celebration of the 50th anniversary of its incorporation. It has been my privilege to represent the city and its people throughout my years in the House of Representatives, and I wish to extend my sincerest congratulations and best wishes to them on their golden anniversary.

While the history of Birmingham as a city goes back 50 years, its real history extends back over 157 years when the first settlers built their cabins in the area. These were people who left the comfort, civilization, and confinement of the eastern States to seek opportunity and to build a new and better life for themselves and their families through hard work and true grit out west. These were the same people who eventually built a great nation that straddled a continent.

From this beginning, the history of Birmingham parallels the growth of our Nation. From the few log cabins along an Indian trail, a hard days travel from Detroit, Birmingham grew to become a small town that serviced the many farms in the area. In the 20th century with the improvement of roads and the means of travel, the face of Birmingham changed again to become first a bustling town and then the modern, attractive suburban community it is today.

While Birmingham today is part of the sprawling Detroit metropolitan community, it has been able to retain its own identity and historic charm.

The city today is one of nice homes, excellent schools, friendly people, and a good, responsive local government. It is a community of involved citizens taking an active role in helping each other and the community through a variety of clubs and organizations. It is a mature city that is aware and proud of its past and optimistic about its future.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Birmingham and their civic leaders deserve to be congratulated for their fine work in making Birmingham an excellent place to live. As the city readies itself for its golden anniversary celebration, I wish it continued success and prosperity in the decades to come. ●

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MARCY KAPTUR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS IN THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 9, 1983

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a copy of the statement which I made before the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, on May 9, 1983, during the consideration of the International Monetary Fund quota increase request. My statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MARCY KAPTUR BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS IN THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 9, 1983

Mr. Chairman, I have spent a great deal of time thinking about the request for the IMF quota increase, and before we vote on this issue, I would like to explain my position. This is one of the more difficult votes with which I personally have been faced in my months in Congress. I intend to insert my full statement in the Record.

The extensive hearings involving witnesses on all sides of this issue, which I commend Congressman Neal, Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Trade, Investment and Monetary Policy, for holding, have aided me in my decision on this matter. I thank Congressman Neal and Chairman St Germain for their excellent work and for the excellent work of their staffs. I want to briefly share my ideas with the committee members.

I regrettably will not support the proposal to authorize an increase in the U.S. quota to the IMF. However, I do not want this to be interpreted as a vote against the American role in international development, but rather as a statement of deep concern that international financial institutions presently in place are not properly constituted to result in third world development that touches the masses of poor people in the host countries. No short-term financial band-aid in the form of IMF increases to provide so-called liquidity can begin to address the staggering long-term debt these

nations have amassed as they embarked on development. Amendments being offered by several members to stretch-out repayments, though well-intentioned, are nothing more than attempts to make a "silk purse out of a sow's ear." No matter how hard we try to address the long-term debt issue, the IMF proves to be an inadequate institution.

First, I am disturbed by the fact that at best, the result of the banks and the IMF lending activities, as George Champion formerly from Chase Manhattan Bank stated, has been the creation of a heavy debt with little or no improvement in the living standards of the developing countries' needy people. Loaned funds, either directly or indirectly, should not be used for the expansion of recipient governments, nor for the purchase of military equipment, nor for investment in capital-intensive industries. Rather, loaned funds should aid people and small enterprises, including such entities as agricultural cooperatives, which address the real needs of the poor in developing nations. Unfortunately, it is common knowledge that IMF recommendations to developing nations have often adversely impacted on such development. As the Interreligious Task Force on U.S. Food Policy stated to the Subcommittee on International Trade, "by recommending policies that will restore a foreign exchange balance in the short-run, the IMF undermines the basis for long-term, self-reliant, needs-oriented development."

Essentially, IMF policy is a policy of staying the course. I believe that we must break the pattern of encouraging export-led development strategies for the developing nations. These strategies have resulted in the following scenario: 1) increased borrowing for longer periods of time; 2) massive debts; 3) IMF suggestions that these nations tighten monetary and fiscal policies; and finally 4) heightened political tensions and social unrest in host countries. Governments in developing nations must not have to resort to the repressive economic policies in order to carry out IMF-encouraged financial arrangements.

I believe monetary and fiscal policies cannot be separated from development policies, and so we must work for major changes in global economic development and trade arrangements. Holding a conference, modeled after the original Bretton Woods Conference, that focuses on international fiscal and monetary policy and its relation to development policy, is crucial and timely. Most of our nation's current trade troubles—the falling exports, the disputes over other countries' trading tactics, the alleged decline of American industrial competitiveness—are the result of exchange rates fueling an overpriced dollar, lifted by high interest rates, as well as the problems of cash-rich banks that reacted to Mideast oil price hikes of the 1970s. The abnormally high dollar is doing irreparable harm to our economy—both to the export industries and to producers here that must compete with imports. Moreover, it is devastating to debtor nations. Hence, the North and South must engage in a major dialogue to fundamentally alter current arrangements in the international fiscal and monetary systems, and address their relation to development policy. I will support all efforts to do this.

Finally, I believe that the major banks which loaned this money are entirely responsible for their own actions, and that greater regulation is not the answer. I believe these banks, on their own, should set up larger loan loss reserves. Their painful experience in the international lending

arena should be adequate impetus to do so. Unfortunately, the idea which Senator Dole (in the other body) floated of a progressive excise tax on deposits of commercial banks earmarked to the IMF to bolster its funds, while intellectually appealing, is not politically feasible. A useful albeit a modest proposal at first blush, would be to have the banks pay for the regulatory agency exams evaluating and commenting on their country risk, similar to a user fee. Under the current system, the U.S. government pays for the exams which the agencies perform on U.S. banks with significant foreign lending activities. The cost is not insignificant, and is borne equally by the U.S. taxpayers. We should see to it that the large banks which land abroad and benefit from the IMF, pay the Treasury the examination fee.

In conclusion, I oppose the request for the IMF quota increase for several reasons. First, I do not believe that the IMF lending activities address the problems faced by the poor in third world nations. Export-led development policies, encouraged by the IMF, have undermined the basis for long-term, needs-oriented development. Second, I believe that a worldwide conference is necessary to assess and alter international fiscal, monetary and development policies. I will support efforts to aid developing countries, not by increasing the IMF quota, but rather by pushing for a worldwide conference to work for major changes in global economic development and trade arrangements. Finally, I believe that the banks must be responsible for their own errors, and that the U.S. taxpayers should not be forced to pay for the mistakes of the large banks.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you again for allowing me this time today to share my deeply-held views.●

BUSINESS PERSON OF THE YEAR

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am sharing with my colleagues a success story of Mr. R. Dale Moretz, the owner of a small business in Jackson, Mich. Mr. Moretz accomplished the impossible of keeping a small business alive and employees on its payroll during the most severe recession in the history of Michigan. For this accomplishment, Mr. Moretz was named Michigan Small Business Person of the Year by the U.S. Small Business Administration.

Mr. Moretz, coowner of the Mid-American Products Corp., accomplished this impossible task by using wise management practices and by attracting U.S. defense contracts. According to Mr. Moretz, the defense contracts gave his company a higher priority in securing raw materials that were in short supply during the 1972 Arab oil embargo.

I offer my congratulations to Mr. Moretz and urge my colleagues to read of his accomplishment as outlined in the following news article printed in the Jackson Citizen Patriot.

(The article follows:)

BUSINESS PERSON OF THE YEAR

CO-OWNER OF JACKSON FIRM USED DEFENSE CONTRACTS TO KEEP WHEELS TURNING

(By Dan Spickler)

R. Dale Moretz of Jackson, named Michigan Small Business Person of the Year, showed how to keep a fledgling business alive during a recession.

When the going got tough after his company formed in 1972, particularly because of the Arab oil embargo, Moretz went after defense contracts. That made the firm a high priority for obtaining petroleum-based materials.

Moretz, co-owner of Mid-American Products Inc., 1603 Wildwood, was named the state's Small Business Person of the Year by the U.S. Small Business Administration.

"The selection is an honor, but I was really most proud when I was nominated, because you are nominated by your peers," Moretz said. Advisory councils made up of small business owners in each state made nominations to the SBA, and one winner was selected in each state. Moretz was given the award for Michigan.

Moretz has been active in the Greater Jackson Chamber of Commerce Small Business Council and has testified before state and congressional representatives about pending legislation. He is also a director of the Independent Business Association, a statewide group representing 2,000 small employers.

He has served on the White House Conference on Small Business and the Michigan Conference on Small Business.

The Jackson man will receive the award at a luncheon Monday, May 9, in Lansing as part of National Small Business Week, May 8-14.

Moretz, 41, of 1123 Woodbridge, was honored for his demonstration "that a small entrepreneur, with a good product and the application of sound management principles, can be successful even under the most trying circumstances," said Raymond L. Harshman, Michigan director of the SBA.

Mid-American Products, founded in 1972, started with a handful of employees and has grown to a diversified thermoplastic molding firm with 44 workers and annual sales approaching \$2 million. It makes parts for aerospace, automotive, electronic and home appliance firms and numerous other applications.

Harshman said Mid-American demonstrated resourcefulness when, shortly after beginning business, it faced trouble with the oil embargo and the subsequent recession.

Moretz said the company survived by securing U.S. defense contracts, which grew to account for 40 percent of its sales volume.

"Now it's more like 25 percent," he said. The defense contracts gave Mid-American higher priority in securing polymer raw materials that were in short supply due to the oil embargo.

Moretz is one of three owners of Mid-American. He grew up in North Carolina and graduated from the University of North Carolina in 1967.

Although he came to Michigan and to Jackson to start the plastics firm, Moretz said the state's business climate is still negative due to increased taxation and higher than average employee costs.

"I see the national economy improving, so naturally Michigan's economy will improve, but we're still in a very negative climate," he said.

As for Mid-American Products, however, Moretz said he expects his firm to continue to grow.

"I think the whole future of Michigan really depends on small business people," he said. "We make up the most employment in the state."

SBA defines a small business as one that employs fewer than 500 employees. Such firms represent 98 percent of the 13.3 million firms in the country. Small businesses account for half of the country's total employment, about 50 million people. Nine out of 10 of these small firms employ fewer than 10 people.

Of the roughly 2,500 businesses in Jackson County, 1,800 of them employ fewer than 10 people, according to the U.S. Department of Commerce study of Jackson issued in 1979.

James Barrett, president of Michigan Chamber of Commerce, recently reported that between 1960 and 1976, 79 percent of all new jobs created in the state were by firms classified as small businesses.

A recent SBA report concludes that small businesses retain employees to a greater extent than larger firms and that the recession was not as damaging to smaller firms because of better cost controls.

Despite record bankruptcies of 65,807 in 1982, a 38 percent increase over the previous year, entrepreneurs are breaking into the business world at a record pace. Incorporation of new businesses totaled about 560,000 in 1982, double that of a decade ago, SBA officials said.●

A "SALUTE" TO THE WORCESTER, MASS., DISTRICT MEDICAL SOCIETY AND UNITED WAY

HON. JOSEPH D. EARLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, last April 15, the district medical society in my home city of Worcester, Mass., initiated a program to give free medical care "as long as there's a need" to "recession-distressed patients" and their families who are now without health insurance. Dr. John P. Howe III, president of the district society, announced that more than 450 physicians have agreed to participate in this activity which will be conducted in cosponsorship with the United Way. I would like to express my wholehearted personal endorsement of this noble gesture and extend my congratulations and appreciation to everyone connected with it.

The loss of health insurance benefits, through no fault of their own, is one of the major tragedies being visited upon unemployed workers and their family members in every region of the country. Many authorities believe that widespread unemployment will continue to plague the Nation over an extended period and will affect several million Americans. The records around the country reveal that because they cannot pay, and because of pride, embarrassment, discourage-

ment, and other reasons, a very great number of afflicted individuals tend to avoid seeking needed medical treatment until an illness reaches an emergency, and sometimes an irreversible, stage.

The tremendous mental strain, physical harm, and declining morale being experienced by these distressed families is easy to imagine. No one understands the undermining potentialities and actualities of accelerating health deterioration in such a situation better than the doctors of medicine. But understanding and even good intentions are one thing; taking effective action is another. Such action requires organization, scheduling, the giving up of substantial compensation and family recreation time and unselfish cooperation between and among individuals and units. But above all else, it requires the actual application of genuine concern for a fellow human being and genuine compassion for the bad fortune of a neighbor.

Of course, Federal and State Governments and legislatures are trying to find ways and means to provide necessary health care to unemployed workers and their families. Unfortunately, these well meant efforts are too often regarded as being procedurally complex, lacking in the human touch and too long delayed for corrective impact upon a home crisis.

Mr. Speaker, some noted sociology writers have been emphasizing, over the past decade, their fears about a dangerously increasing withdrawal, among Americans, of any personal interest in the well-being of their neighbors residing in the same streets, in the same housing area, in the same community. The abstraction from a neighbor's difficulties; the wish "not to get involved"; the lack of response even in an obvious crisis, is becoming more and more the rule among Americans rather than the exception. This abstraction fosters a cool indifference to a neighbor's plight, which can lead to bias, which can lead to hostility, which can result in violence and much additional evil. It is a dread disease that can grow to epidemic proportions. It can sabotage the foundation unity of citizen effort which is essential to the reasonable accomplishment of community objectives for common progress and improvement in the quality of local life.

Beyond their immense contribution of free medical care for unfortunate fellow citizens, the members of the Worcester District Medical Society and the United Way have made an equally, if not more, important contribution to the revival and strengthening of our traditional neighborly spirit in our area. Such a revival can serve to restore trust and confidence and a high morale and a more general feeling of well-being and unity throughout a community. It can regenerate a true

concern and compassion for a neighbor in distress which the Bible encourages us all to do second only to the primary directive to love God. The neighborly action of so many of our Worcester doctors could lead to the cure of more than just physical ills. It could inspire the spreading of greater good will among people in all neighborhoods everywhere which is the foundation of better understanding in a more peaceful country and world.

That is why I hope the generous gesture of our Worcester District Medical Society will be highly contagious and speedily imitated throughout the country.

That is why I will fully support this splendid program to "help thy neighbor."

That is why I believe the members of our district medical society and their associates merit a united "salute" from their fellow Americans.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to include an editorial about the district medical society's program that appeared in the April 19, 1983, issue of the Worcester, Mass., Evening Gazette. The article follows:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette, Apr. 19, 1983]

RESPONDING TO CRISIS

The Worcester District Medical Society deserves praise for its program to help the jobless maintain adequate levels of medical care.

Some 450 physician members of the society have agreed to take part in a program designed for those who have lost health benefits because they have been out of work for an extended period. Doctors will see and treat patients who are referred through the First Call-United Way hotline.

In Worcester, as across the nation, doctors are finding that people who normally are covered by employers' health plans are being forced to forgo medical care when their coverage vanishes with a layoff notice or benefits run out. The program is planned to help out-of-work people and their families who do not immediately qualify for other aid programs. Similar programs have been set up in Michigan and other states where the jobless rate has been high, the American Medical Association says.

Worcester area hospitals, the city health department and the area pharmaceutical associations have been asked to lend their resources to the project as well. The program should be a boon to those in need. ●

CONSTRUCTION DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY PAYBACKS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine recently held an oversight hearing on the controversial issue of the payback of construction differential subsidies, which is presently the subject of a Department of Transportation rulemak-

ing. The proposed rule would permit tank vessels—that have been constructed with subsidies and that can only operate in our foreign trade—to operate in our domestic trade upon repayment of the unamortized subsidies that are owed plus interest.

After hearing extensive arguments both in favor of and against the proposed rule, I and the great majority of the Members present at the hearing concluded that issuance of the rule would not be in the Nation's best interest. We, therefore, transmitted our views to the Secretary of Transportation to be considered during the rule-making process.

Recently, several major newspapers have published editorials favoring issuance of the proposed rule. Those editorials appear to have been written by people not familiar with all of the facts of this controversy. For that reason I was pleased to see in the New York Times a response to that paper's editorial on the subject. In my opinion, it accurately and forcefully points out that adoption of the proposed rule will cost the Government money, will reduce our defense capabilities, and will result in a loss of jobs. I would like to share this response with my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 27, 1983]

PROTECT UNSUBSIDIZED TANKERS

(By Richard T. du Moulin)

(The writer is vice president of Ogden Marine, Inc.)

By endorsing the Department of Transportation proposal to permit subsidized tankers to return to domestic service (editorial April 14), you condemn the unsubsidized domestic tanker industry so important to this nation's movement of oil and to national defense. Let me review some facts.

Of the 10 million tons of unsubsidized tankers in our domestic trade, over 1.6 million tons are now at anchor—unemployed. Thousands of sailors are on the beach. Shipowners are having difficulty paying their mortgages, and shipyards are not receiving any orders for new ships. This is the true picture of the domestic, unsubsidized market.

Private and publicly owned shipping companies, many based in New York, have invested \$5 billion in the past 10 years, without subsidy and without guarantee of profit. They are not oversubsidized—they are not subsidized at all. They are not over-regulated—they operate in a free domestic market protected only from foreign-flag ships.

Because of the depressed market, 1 to 2 million tons of old tankers will soon be scrapped. This is unfortunate since most are in good condition, and of the "handy size" preferred by the Navy for military support. The British used 34 such vessels to support their 10,000-man Falklands force. We would need hundreds to support our Rapid Deployment Force. By the way, most of these old tankers are faster than modern tankers, having extra-horsepower engines.

The Transportation Department is now proposing 2 to 4 million tons of U.S. tankers, built with Government subsidy to compete abroad, be allowed to repay that subsidy and return to the unsubsidized domestic

trade. This was never intended in the Merchant Marine Acts of 1936 and 1970, and would force out of service 40 to 60 modern unsubsidized tankers—a quarter of our fleet.

This payback of an estimated \$200 million of subsidy is not what it seems. First, it's tax-deductible! Second, the Government loses tax revenue from owners and their crews who go out of business or are unemployed. Third, many owners will be forced into bankruptcy, leaving the Government with up to \$1.5 billion of guaranteed debt. In the end, the Government and the taxpayers lose. Upon close examination, subsidy payback provides windfalls to only a few shipowners and is destructive and unfair to all other shipowners, shipyards, merchant seamen and the national defense.

I hope the Department of Transportation and the White House realize this and withdraw their proposal.●

ANOTHER REASON TO DENY ROMANIA MFN STATUS

HON. MARK D. SILJANDER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan has set a June 30 date for the loss of Romania's most-favored-nation trading status. Each spring a sort of unofficial bargaining process begins when the Communist country's trading status comes up for review. MFN is used as a tool to encourage socialist countries to adopt more acceptable emigration and human rights policies. It waives trade restrictions with Soviet bloc countries with which we do not have a bilateral trade agreement if they show some steps toward improvement in those areas.

The President imposed the deadline on MFN because of a new education tax implemented by the Romanian Government in November. The tax makes emigration practically impossible by requiring that anyone desiring to emigrate repay the Government for all secondary and postsecondary education received. The tax is usually inflated and must be paid in Western currency. The catch is that no Romanian citizen is permitted to possess such currency. Romanians pay income taxes that are supposed to cover education costs, but if they wish to emigrate they must pay again.

Another crackdown of concern to those interested in human rights in Romania is the Government's increased vigor at enforcing an old typewriter registration law. Hand-written documents can be easily traced, so the typewriter is a vital tool for the human rights and religious rights movements in Romania. The law is being enforced with new enthusiasm mainly to keep Romanian pastors from duplicating religious documents.

Most recently, Ioan Teodosiu was released from a Romanian prison after a Christian organization in Pennsylva-

nia paid his education tax. Mr. Teodosiu has traveled to the United States to tell Americans about what is happening to the Christians who live in Romania.

Everyone knows that human rights are violated in Communist countries every day, so it really is not surprising that the press took little interest in Ioan Teodosiu's story. The press usually finds it more newsworthy to report on human rights violations in countries friendly to the United States. However, Teodosiu is thankful because many individual Congressmen and Senators took an interest in his human rights and he is now in America.

Teodosiu was imprisoned in Romania for his role as a spokesman for the Romanian Christian Committee for the Defense of Human Rights, a group that is not sanctioned by the Romanian Government and, therefore, has no legal right to exist. At a press conference on April 15, he described some of the conditions in the Bucharest prison where he was held. According to Teodosiu, prisoners were kept in a cell 7 feet long and 3 feet wide, where no light could get in. He left his cell only for interrogations during his entire 3-month stay. The interrogations are a story in themselves.

During one session, Teodosiu was questioned for 60 consecutive hours. He was not permitted to eat, drink, or sleep, and was strapped into a special chair with an apparatus that forced his eyes open the entire time. While lights flashed on and off, he was told to confess that he was working with the CIA. If he confessed, his sentence would be less than 20 years in prison; if he refused, his sentence would be more than 20 years, or execution.

Prisoners were not permitted to sit down in their cells between 5 a.m. and 10 p.m. They received only a piece of bread and hot water—called tea—for breakfast, a bowl of hot water with some beans or grains of rice for lunch, and a cup of hot water in the evening. To keep warm, Teodosiu would turn on a current of cold water in his cell that served as a shower. The cold water was warmer than the surrounding air.

Teodosiu was released on March 9, and recently came to America. At the press conference, he thanked the Senators and Congressmen who were willing to call and write the Romanian Embassy on his behalf, because without their intervention he said he would now be the victim of an executioner's gun. However, Teodosiu is just one success story in a long history of Communist persecution in Romania. He said he went to sleep each night in prison listening to the screams of other prisoners. His story may not be all that newsworthy to the American press, but it must be told over and over again by others who care if anything

is ever going to be done to silence the rest of those screams.

It is of interest to note that the Romanian Government is the most pro-Western, least pro-Soviet in the Warsaw Pact.

The following is the text of an interview with the Washington Times published on Monday entitled, "Romania Reportedly Destroying Christianity." I urge all my colleagues to read this so that they will once again remind themselves of what is going on in the largest prison in the world, Eastern Europe.

The article follows:

ROMANIA REPORTEDLY DESTROYING CHRISTIANITY

(Ioan Teodosiu, former leader of Romanian Christian Committee for Human Rights, on persecution of Christians in Romania.)

Romania is a Warsaw Pact nation which has suppressed its citizens nearly as severely as the Soviet Union. Recently, a tax was passed on emigration requiring repayment to the state of all funds for education. The payment is required in hard currency, which is unavailable to Romanians. Therefore, the tax had to be paid by relatives or governments abroad.

Ioan (John) Teodosiu, 29, former leader of the Romanian Christian Committee for Human Rights, was one of the best sources of information for Helsinki Commission reporting on persecution of Christians and other human rights violations. In December 1981, Teodosiu was arrested and charged with high treason, espionage and cooperating with the CIA. Due to pressure from the West, he was released only hours before his trial was due to go on in March 1982.

Finally, one year later, Teodosiu was permitted to emigrate with his wife and 9-month-old child after paying \$7,400 to the government which was provided by a Christian organization, East Watch International of Erwinna, Pa.

Teodosiu responded to questions asked by Washington Times correspondent Stephen Goldstein.

Q. How are Romanian Christians persecuted by the government?

A. Christians are an impediment to communism. Romania wants to destroy Christianity. They try to use the official leaders of the church against the members. They try to control seminaries, also.

The persecution takes two aspects. First, they control the church and its activities. Second, they control individuals within the church. If they can't use a person or a church, the government sets out to destroy the individual or church.

The party newspaper, Scinteia, has a weekly column attacking religion and the dissidents. Since many Romanians hear the truth about the dissidents on Radio Free Europe, the regime wants to present its side. They even printed an interview allegedly with my wife and me although they never spoke to us.

They say that religious freedom exists according to the constitution but in reality, it does not. They believe that Christianity destroys communism by leading to an influx of Western ideas.

Q. How did the Romanian Christian Committee for Human Rights get started and what are its activities?

A. Hans Stuckelberger of Christian Solidarity International began a contact group

in Romania in 1978. They got a spokesman, Pavel Nicolescu, a pastor in Bucharest, but he had to leave in 1979.

After that, Radu Capusan and myself and more than a dozen others have centered our work in the town of Cloch. Capusan was forced to leave the country in December 1980, and I took over the leadership of the committee.

Our main activity is gathering information about the persecution of Christians and other dissidents. We have given information to Radio Free Europe and the Helsinki Commission although we are not affiliated with either of these organizations.

Although there are many nationalities, German, Hungarian and Romanian, in my country, as dissidents they are all imprisoned together.

Since I left the country in March, the membership is growing and working underground. I would say that the situation for dissidents is worse now than a few years ago.

Q. What were the circumstances of your arrest and detention?

A. In June 1981, my brother was killed by the communists in what they said was an accident. After that, I became more active with the committee and sent human rights information to the West which the Securitate (Romanian secret police) knew about. On December 16, I was arrested and charged with high treason, espionage, and cooperating with the CIA. Actually, it was for providing the information on human rights abuses of the regime.

Q. How were you interrogated and what kind of treatment did you receive in prison?

A. I was taken by the secret police for a continuous 60-hour interrogation without food or water. I was kept in a dark room, placed on a special seat where I couldn't move. An apparatus kept my eyes open to prevent me from sleeping. The light became alternately very bright, then very dark.

During this time, a voice on tape repeatedly told me to confess I was a member of the CIA, and other crimes I was accused of.

Afterwards, I was put in a small dark cell in which I could take only two or three steps. From 5 a.m. to 10 p.m., I was made to stand or walk in my cell. No exercise or fresh air or work was given to political or Christian dissidents. The winter was very cold and there was no heat. I took a cold shower to get warm! Our food for the whole day was two cups of hot water, 5 ounces of bread, and a bowl of rice soup.

I was beaten very strongly as part of the program for dissidents. The worst part of my confinement, that caused me the most pain, was hearing people screaming for help at night.

Q. Was your family threatened?

A. My five brothers and my wife went to the secret police and to the prison and contacted the West to try to find out what had happened to me. My brothers were threatened with prison and the secret police began following my wife and mother-in-law. Their houses were searched, and Bibles and tape-recorders were confiscated.

When I was released, I was told not to say anything about what happened or my relatives would "have problems". My whole family, especially my brother David, have been active Christians.

Q. Is the emigration tax applied fairly?

A. After I paid the tax, I met several other emigrants who did not have to pay it. When I asked the secret police why I had to pay while others did not, they said they couldn't give me an answer that would satisfy me.

I know of four or five people who had to pay to leave the country, but I was the first to pay. Many intellectuals want to leave but can't afford the \$20,000 or more it would cost them to pay for their professional degrees.

Q. Is psychiatric treatment used on religious and political dissidents as it is in the Soviet Union?

A. Yes. One case is that of Filip Iulius who claimed to represent Polish Solidarity in Romania and spent eight years in prison.

When his wife came to visit him, she said he was drugged. She couldn't recognize him in his changed state. He didn't want to eat.

He, along with other political and Christian dissidents, was put in the prison hospital and administered drug "therapy."

Paulina Dragu and her family were trying to emigrate. She was told to quit her job so she could receive a passport. She did, but didn't receive her passport. She went on a hunger strike and was put in prison as a parasite. She had a heart attack and was then put in the psychiatric ward.

These are just representative examples of the psychiatric treatment of dissidents in Romania.

Q. What is the current status of the church in Romania?

A. There is a revival going on, and there are many open churches. The church is growing, especially Medias in Transylvania.

After hearing communist ideology for many years, people want another source of truth and love.

The secret police and government are strongly anti-religion. They conduct house searches, Nazi style. They tamper with the cars of religious believers to make the drivers sick from the exhaust fumes coming into the car.

The secret police are buying new technology from the West to use against dissidents. Every pastor must report to the secret police once a week on Monday, any visitors or unusual events that happened in his church.

There are no baptisms allowed of children under 18.

Q. What has become of the Orthodox priest, Father Gheorghe Calciu?

A. He is one of 10,000 Orthodox priests who are not recognized by the government. He was influential with young priests and seminarians. He has spent 16 years in prison.

I was imprisoned with a man who shared a cell with Calciu. Some other "criminals" were instructed to kill Calciu to get reduced sentences, but they refused.

Q. What is the Helsinki Commission doing in Romania?

A. No one is commissioned in Romania. I contacted the American Embassy and Christian organizations. Some of the groups we worked with were: Student Struggle for Soviet (and East European) Jewry. The Committee for Human Rights in Romania; the North American Coalition for Human Rights in Romania.

But it is hard to get into Romania or get information because of the tension there. There are many informers—perhaps every third person—.

Q. Are there economic problems in Romania and what is being done about it?

A. Of course, there are economic problems as in all communist regimes. But there is nothing organized like in Poland.

One man, Nicolae Litoiu, 20 years old, wrote on the walls of a factory: "We want milk and bread". Ten thousand workers were called in to compare their handwriting to that on the wall.

Litoiu was accused of being a terrorist and received 25 years in prison for this act. ●

HEALTH PLANNING BLOCK GRANT ACT OF 1983

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to your attention to H.R. 2935, the Health Planning Block Grant Act of 1983, which I introduced this past Monday, May 9, 1983. I am pleased to note that two of our colleagues from the minority side have joined me as initial cosponsors of this legislation. I am pleased that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MADIGAN) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROY-HILL) saw fit to join in this effort.

Members should note that H.R. 2935 is precisely the same bill which passed this House last September 24 by a recorded vote of 302 to 14. For the purpose of refreshing our memories, H.R. 6173—as amended by H.R. 7040 on the House floor—was a bipartisan compromise to deal with the national health planning program in a rational and reasoned manner. This compromise was drafted and fully supported by both the chairman of the Health and Environment Subcommittee, Mr. WAXMAN; the chairman of the full Committee on Energy and Commerce, Mr. DINGELL; Mr. MADIGAN; Mr. BROY-HILL; and me.

I am concerned that rapid increases in health care costs continue to bring significant increases in Federal outlays for our health care entitlement programs. Over the last decade, Federal Medicare and Medicaid outlays for hospital services alone have risen some 17 percent per year. Many economists believe that excessive investment in hospital construction and equipment is a major cause of the growth in hospital costs. In response to this, the Congress some 9 years ago enacted the Health Planning and Resources Development Act of 1984, Public Law 93-641.

This legislation created a system of State and local health planning agencies. It also required States to enact certificate of need legislation requiring State approval of hospital investment in new facilities, equipment, and services.

This health planning program came up for reauthorization last year. During 1982, our subcommittee held a series of hearings and received testimony from many varied witnesses.

As a result of the testimony presented in these hearings and subsequent discussions with key individuals, I was convinced that outright repeal of the health planning system without provision for some interim program, al-

though an ideologically desirable goal, was not feasible for the short term. Despite the fact that I have sponsored repeal legislation in both the 97th and 98th Congresses, I publicly acknowledge that some planning function may be necessary to help restrain health care costs growth in the immediate future.

Last year in our committee, we considered three varying approaches to the health planning question. My bill to outrightly repeal the planning system was not favorably considered. Mr. MADIGAN had a bill which would have created a block grant mechanism providing for an optional program of State certificate of need review. At the same time, our subcommittee chairman had his own bill which would have reauthorized and extended authorities for the existing title XV of the Public Health Service Act.

From these three quite distinct approaches to planning our committee was able to draft a balanced bill. As of last fall, the five sponsors of this bill believed this approach best addressed our immediate needs for a modest regulatory program.

As I stated above, the bill I have introduced this week is precisely the same bill passed by the House last September. The only alteration I made was to move the 2 authorized years back so that fiscal years 1984-85 are covered, rather than 1983-84 as in the original. Otherwise, I made no change in the House-passed bill.

H.R. 2935 would authorize grants to participating States to assist in the operation of certificate of need programs. These programs would be designed so that participating States would use State health plans as the decisionmaking basis for certificate of need review.

This bill also provides for discretionary grants for local health planning agencies. States could choose whether or not to use Federal funds to assist in the operation of local health planning agencies.

Further, the bill provides for a flexible transition period during which activities under the existing title XV of the Public Health Service Act and the new activities under this bill would be coordinated.

Finally, the bill contains a "sunset" provision under which this new section of title XIX would automatically be repealed following the end of the third fiscal year after enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this quick summary will assist Members of the House in their initial considerations of the health planning issue. I believe that we have given this program serious and considered attention. While I still retain some reluctance about continuing the health planning system, I believe that some Federal action is necessary to help restrain capital cost expenditures and their contribution to

health care cost inflation. I urge your support for this bill, and hope that the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee will reconsider his position and become a cosponsor.

At this point in the RECORD I include a section-by-section analysis of H.R. 2935.

H.R. 2935—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 1. Short title: "Health Planning Block Grant Act of 1982."

SEC. 2. Repeal of Title XV: Provides mechanism by which repeal of Title XV takes place on a State-by-State basis. Under the mechanism set forth in this Section, repeal will take place no more than 315 days after the date of enactment. During this period, on a State-by-State basis, funds appropriated under the new bill will be available for conforming actions under Title XV.

SEC. 3. Revision of State Certificate of Need Programs: Provides a flexible mechanism through which participating States are given varying periods of time to conform their Certificate of Need laws (to a maximum of nine months).

SEC. 4. Transition: Provides for an orderly transition period during which activities not inconsistent with the new Part D of Title XIX shall be allowed. Requires termination of Title XV requirements inconsistent with policies found in H.R. 2935. Repeals PHS Act grant cutoff required for States not conforming with Title XV CON program. Also provides for transfer of funds and equipment from existing HSAs to new Regional Health Planning Agencies should the particular State decide to participate in Subpart 3.

SEC. 5. Block Grants for Health Planning: PART D—HEALTH PLANNING BLOCK GRANTS

SUBPART 1—GRANTS TO STATES

SEC. 1941. Authorization of Appropriations: For payments under allotments, \$432 million authorized for fiscal year 1984, \$33.6 million authorized for fiscal year 1985.

SEC. 1942. Allotments: Provides for allotments to States on a population ratio basis.

SEC. 1943. Payments under Allotments: Provides for mechanism for payment of funds to participating States.

SEC. 1944. Use of Allotments. Allotments shall be used to develop and administer Certificate of Need program, and to develop a State Health Plan.

SEC. 1945. Application; Report on Intended Expenditures: Provides application mechanism for participating States. Also provides for report on intended expenditures and public comment period on such a report.

SEC. 1946. Reports and Audits: Provides for public reports and audits of State activities no less often than very two years.

SEC. 1947. Nondiscrimination: Provides for standard block grant nondiscrimination provisions as found elsewhere in Title XIX of the Public Health Service Act.

SUBPART 2—CERTIFICATE OF NEED PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 1951. Program Requirements: CON program to cover major medical equipment, institutional health services, and capital expenditures. Also provides for exemption of HMOs consistent with the existing exemption in Title XV. Also provides that States shall specify maximum amounts obligated under CONs, and for periodic review of such CONs.

SEC. 1952. Criteria for Review: CON decisions are to be based on State Health Plan for the State, and decisions on applications for CONs shall be based on the application's

consistency with the State Health Plan. Provides for expedited application, review and approval process, including automatic approval on the meeting of certain conditions.

SEC. 1953. Procedural Requirements: Provides for hearings, administrative review and judicial review of administrative decisions.

SEC. 1954. State Health Plan: Describes coverage of the State Health Plan, requirements for the data on which it is based, and pre-issuance hearings.

SEC. 1955. Definitions: Mandatory Federal thresholds of \$5 million for capital expenditures and equipment and \$1 million for services are set. Provision is made for reduction of those thresholds to \$1 million and \$500,000 respectively. Definitions of these terms are provided.

SUBPART 3—GRANTS FOR REGIONAL HEALTH PLANNING AGENCIES

SEC. 1961. Grants: Sets up system of optional Regional Health Planning Agencies (RHPAs) within States which choose to participate. Provides for RHPA 15 percent match of Federal funds. Authorizations of \$32 million for fiscal year 1984 and \$33.6 million for fiscal year 1985 are made.

SEC. 1962. Designation of Health Planning areas: Provides mechanism for Governors to designate areas in which RHPAs will operate.

SEC. 1963. Designation and Organization of RHPAs: Sets out requirements for RHPAs, including composition of governing board.

SEC. 1964. Functions of RHPAs: States that the functions of each agency will be to assist the designated State agency in developing the State Health Plan, and to encourage support for the State Health Plan. Specifies that RHPAs shall not exercise decision-making authority in the CON process.

SUBPART 4—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER FOR HEALTH PLANNING

SEC. 1971. Secretary to designate a single center for technical assistance to State and regional health planning bodies. Provides that funds from sections 1941 and 1961 (not to exceed \$1.5 million) may be spent in each fiscal year to support this program.

SEC. 6. Termination of Amendment: Provides that at the end of the third complete successive fiscal year following enactment of this Act, Part D of Title XIX is repealed.

SEC. 7. Effective Date: Amendments made by section 4(a)(1), 5 and 6(a) take effect on the date of enactment of this Act or October 1, 1982, whichever occurs later.●

ENCOURAGING, OVERLOOKED SIGNALS OF A NEW APPROACH TO DISARMAMENT

HON. JOEL PRITCHARD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks the House has been focused on the most serious issue of our time, the threat of nuclear war. A nuclear freeze, arms control, arms reduction—these are serious and complicated issues. One of the most articulate and clearest of thinkers in this area is George Weigel, the scholar-in-

residence, for the World Without War Council in Seattle, Wash. Mr. Weigel has been of great assistance to me in understanding the many issues involved and in developing a constructive approach to move us closer to peace. For the benefit of all my colleagues, I would like to share Mr. Weigel's thoughts as they appeared in the April 27, 1983, issue of the Weekly, a Seattle newspaper.

ENCOURAGING, OVERLOOKED SIGNALS OF A
NEW APPROACH TO DISARMAMENT

(By George Weigel)

For some years now, it has been clear that beneath the surface of the nuclear-strategy debate there was profound dissatisfaction with the prevailing orthodoxies, and what they meant for both arms control and weapons modernization. The nervousness and frustration have been evident only in a paragraph or two in Kissinger's or Brzezinski's memoirs, in between the number-crunching in the foreign-policy journals, in off-the-record conversations with both strategists and politicians. But they have been growing over time, fueled by both the failures of arms control and the unsatisfactory products (the B-1, the MX missile) of the force-modernization process. What was really needed was not more sophisticated hardware analysis; what was needed was a basic reorientation of the whole debate, leading to a new framework that pointed a way out of, rather than further into, the nuclear peril.

That reorientation may now be underway. The evidence is the Report of the President's Commission on Strategic Forces (the Scowcroft Commission) and, several weeks earlier, an extraordinary set of speeches by President Reagan about the possibility of developing defensive weapons. The Scowcroft Commission report addresses short- and medium-term strategic and military problems, while the Reagan proposals suggest a long-term realignment of the security relationship between the superpowers. Taken together, these two sets of ideas are quite suggestive of where the nuclear debate really lies, and may be going in the future.

The Scowcroft Commission was originally born out of bureaucratic and political embarrassment. Two presidents had failed to find a home for the country's new ICBM, the MX, in which billions of dollars had been invested over the past decade. Both presidents Carter and Reagan agreed that there was a serious problem in the theoretical vulnerability of land-based American missiles to a preemptive Soviet attack (a possibility because of the Soviets' combination of heavy missiles with multiple, independently targetable warheads). Both presidents tried to find a way to base the MX that would give them the missile in quantity (Carter wanted 200, Reagan 100), and in a "survivable" basing mode.

The quest for MX survivability soon became quixotic, even farcical. Short of digging up Nevada and Utah, there just wasn't any place to put the thing that, in and of itself, guaranteed the MX wouldn't be simply a bigger sitting duck than the Minuteman III missiles it was to replace. After a half-hearted attempt at selling Congress on a "Densepack" scheme that even two of the five Joint Chiefs of Staff found ludicrous, President Reagan turned to what has increasingly become the way real business is done in the federal government: a blue-

ribbon presidential commission, in this case chaired by former National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft, with such luminaries as Henry Kissinger, Harold Brown, Alexander Haig, James Schlesinger, Donald Rumsfeld, John McCone, and Lloyd Cutler each having a formal say in the commission's deliberations and report.

That report was released on April 6. Most of the media and congressional attention since then has been focused on its weapons-procurement recommendations: that the US shift, over the next decade, away from MIRVed missiles to a land-based deterrent composed of small, single-warhead ICBMs; and that, as an interim step and an arms-control bargaining chip, 100 MX missiles be placed in super-hardened Minuteman silos throughout the Midwest. What can get lost in all the attention paid to MX and "Midgetman," though, is the commission's impressive rethinking of the doctrinal bases on which both US arms control and nuclear-force modernization should take place.

The commission report includes several important new doctrinal departures:

1. The commission argues that the twin great threats of our time—the threat of nuclear war and the threat of totalitarianism—must be addressed concurrently, rather than as independent variables (the typical approach of both the core of the nuclear-freeze movement and the "dismantle the Soviet Empire" types on the Right).

2. The commission also argues that, in considering these necessarily linked threats, the real problem is war itself, not nuclear weapons. "There can be no doubt that the very scope of the possible tragedy of modern nuclear war, and the increased destruction made possible even by modern non-nuclear technology, have changed the nature of war itself. This is not only because massive conventional war with modern weapons would be horrendously destructive . . . but also because conventional war between the world's major power blocs is the most likely way for nuclear war to develop. . . . Simply put, it is war itself that must concern us, not nuclear war alone."

3. The key standard that, in the commission's judgment, should guide our strategic policy toward the Soviet Union is stability: a situation in which neither side could reasonably fear a crippling first strike from its adversary. What needs to be maintained, the commission argues, is deterrent stability that will set the baseline from which deep arms reductions can be negotiated. That stability has been unravelling for the past decade, because of certain kinds of force modernizations (primarily high-accuracy MIRVs) and because of arms-control approaches that have made MIRVing more, rather than less, desirable (for example, counting "launchers" rather than warheads in SALT I and II).

4. Re-establishing strategic stability means getting our arms-reduction proposals and our force modernizations into sync with each other. "Our arms-control proposals and our strategic-arms programs should . . . be integrated and be mutually reinforcing," according to the commission. "They should work together to permit us, and encourage the Soviets, to move in directions that reduce or eliminate the advantage of aggression and also reduce the risk of war by accident or miscalculation . . . the commission believes that other objectives should be subordinated to the overall goal of permitting the United States to move—over time—toward more stable strategic deployments, and giving the strong incentive to the Sovi-

ets to do the same." The commission, composed of former senior government officials, in effect recognized that the US had been working at cross-purposes with itself over the past decade, with neither arms control nor force modernization contributing to stability or reductions. One result of this disjunction was the MX missile; another was the MIRVing of Soviet heavy missiles. Getting our military policy and our disarmament policy into tandem is, no doubt, a formidable bureaucratic and political task; but the commission's public confession of past failures suggests that at least some senior strategists may just be willing to take on that job right now, given the multiple messes into which a disjointed policy has led us.

It is out of this deterrence/stability/disarmament framework that the commission proposed the development of Midgetman, coupled with a new START negotiating formula whose chief aim would be to get Soviet agreement on de-MIRVing. It is less clear how the MX fits into the commission's new doctrinal scheme, and one suspects that the commissioners did not really expect the controversial missile-without-a-home to survive the congressional appropriations process. The key question, of course, is whether congressional rejection of the MX deployment plan can be turned into a wedge for getting Soviet agreement at START on a sharp reduction in their own SS-18 and SS-19 forces (perhaps by maintaining MX research, development, and flight-testing while holding off on deployment).

The Scowcroft Commission, in sum, imaginatively addresses on side of the current nuclear-doctrine dilemma: how we get offensive nuclear weapons back under the kinds of controls that would lead to deterrent stability, and thus set the stage for serious reductions. President Reagan's speeches on defensive systems last month suggest the other side of the new doctrinal puzzle.

Like the Scowcroft Commission, Reagan's proposals have been grilled at the hardware level, with editorial cartoonists having a Darth Vader field day about "Star Wars" and all the rest. Without denying at all that there are serious technological problems with a spacebased defensive system in this century, however, it seems a shame that the doctrinal roots of the Reagan proposals aren't getting the attention they deserve. For what the president was saying, remarkably, was that there is no good way out of the nuclear peril without a fundamental alteration in the security relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. One dimension of this alteration has to do with the possibility of moving from offensive to defensive weapons; the other, even more stunning, suggestion is that such defensive systems should be developed in concert with the Soviet Union. Had a President Mondale suggested the latter, two things would have happened within a week: nomination by some Democrats in Congress for a Nobel Peace Prize, and introduction by some congressional Republicans of an impeachment resolution. Yet in all the Star Wars blather, there has been virtually no public comment or discussion on the president's tacit admission that there is literally no way we can solve our own security problems without concurrently solving the security problems of our principal adversary.

The Reagan suggestions fit neatly into the redesigned offensive package proposed by the Scowcroft Commission. For the paradox of arms reductions, of the sort envisioned by the commission after de-MIRVing, is that

the superpowers could reach a point of low-level nuclear capability (say, 100 to 200 missiles on each side) where the dangers of first-strike in a crisis could reemerge, because of the temptation to preemptive military action that would not end the planet at the same time. What is obviously needed in the long haul, therefore, is a mix of offensive and defensive systems, so that no new windows of vulnerability, real or imagined, open up during the disarmament process. Maintaining stability during arms reductions, in other words, means having effective shields as well as less lethal swords. No one knows, at the moment, just what those shields would be: technological, political, or a combination of the two. But there seems to be little doubt that the president identified the crucial flip side of the arms-control coin.

So some serious intellectual progress has been made. But does it mean anything at the policy level? Several flies in the ointment are immediately apparent.

There is no present guarantee that agreement within the United States on pursuing the twin paths suggested by the Scowcroft commission and the president would automatically lead to agreement with the Soviet Union. Soviet intransigence at Geneva, on both START and the intermediate-range nuclear force negotiations, is at high tide. Zero-option, the most reasonable arms-reduction proposal, has been flatly rejected. So has a common level of intermediate-range forces in Europe. The Soviets are clearly counting on anti-American-employment sentiment in the NATO countries to win the day for them. Meanwhile, Gromyko and Arbatov continue to make highly volatile suggestions about Soviet missile emplacements in the Western Hemisphere. In short, agreement within our own house is only half the problem; we still lack the means, through negotiations or initiative pressures, to get a deal with the USSR. And if Andropov's hold on the reins is as unsteady as some have recently speculated, matters could only get worse as the demands of the Soviet military gain further currency in the Kremlin infighting.

There is also no guarantee that the kind of calm, steady, deliberate policy suggested by the Scowcroft Commission can get started, much less last, in the Congress. The House of Representatives, in particular, seems incapable of dealing with these issues on anything beyond the most surface of levels. Nor has the congressional leadership made up its mind to seek a set of bipartisan agreements on arms control and force modernization that would do for our strategic policy what was done for Social Security. Meanwhile, members of both parties' extreme wings see these issues as grist for the partisan mill—hardly a situation in which carefully calibrated decisions can take place.

Congress, though, is just a mirror of the continued divisions within the country. Lack of confidence in the administration's foreign policy is one part of the problem; lack of agreement on the nature of the Soviet threat is another. At the end of its report, the Scowcroft Commission made what amounts to a religious plea for consensus: "The commission unanimously believes that a new consensus—requiring a spirit of compromise by all of us—is essential if we are to move toward greater stability and toward reducing the risk of war. If we can begin to see ourselves, in dealing with these issues, not as political partisans or as crusaders for one specific solution to a part of this complex set of problems, but rather as citizens

of a great nation with the humbling obligation to persevere in the long-run task of preserving both peace and liberty for the world, a common perspective may finally be found." For which, as Lincoln would have said, fondly do we hope, and fervently do we pray.

But the odds seem awfully long just now. The core elements of the nuclear-freeze movement are unbudging in their resistance to anything but a "freeze now" policy. The New Right is already convinced that Reagan has been captured by the Eastern establishment wing of the Republican Party. The neoconservatives, whom one might expect to have been interested in the kind of intellectual reordering of the debate that has been quietly taking place, look askance at any Reagan move that hint at something beyond attempts to dismantle the USSR. Meanwhile, we are embarked on another presidential campaign, an 18-month cycle in which issue-crudification is at its very worst.

So the recasting of the nuclear debate comes down, finally, from hardware through doctrine to civics. We know there is no good way out through more number-crunching. We know that our doctrine has led us astray, and the outlines of a better set of doctrinal principles are in sight. But the great question that remains is whether our society can get enough agreement within itself so that the polity can act. That particular window of vulnerability remains very widely open just now. ●

AN OIL IMPORT TAX WOULD BE TIMELY

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, at first glance the seemingly incurable affliction known as OPEC would appear to be on the verge of being eradicated. The magic of the marketplace is finally catching up to the market manipulators of the Middle East. But before the euphoria of the cartel's demise begins to spread we must quickly prescribe a large dose of preventative medicine if we are to insure the recovery of the industrialized world.

Now is the time to levy a tax on imported crude oil. This fee would be both painless and flexible by being subject to adjustment in lieu of any market-related change in the price of crude. Furthermore, no new legislation is needed. The President has the power to impose such a fee under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

The price of oil would be higher with a fee than without, but only temporarily. Through the following market responses, future price increases would be severely curtailed.

First, OPEC would lose its market leverage and would eventually pay for the import fee through lower prices. When faced with the choice of cutting production or price the feuding fiefdoms have had difficulty controlling their productive appetites.

Second, the fee could be used to encourage non-OPEC production of oil. A large part of OPEC's current dilemma is attributable to the huge growth in non-OPEC sources of production. The President, using his discretionary authority, could waive the fee on imports from secure neighborhood sources such as Mexico and Venezuela. The short-term benefits to those debt-ridden countries' shaky treasuries would be substantial, while the long-term goodwill engendered by such an act would help soothe strained United States-Latin relations.

Third, a fee would help to sustain domestic oil, natural gas, and coal production, while helping to maintain our great gains in conservation. The events of the past decade have shown that oil's great elasticity deems conservation a continued must.

The middle of a devastating recession, it can be argued, is not the time to raise taxes. Nevertheless, the overwhelming benefits from a diminished dependence on foreign oil and a widespread reduction in price outweigh all other considerations. Among the benefits are:

First, economic recovery in the industrialized world. Lower inflation, lower interest rates, lower balance of payment deficits, together with a shift of payments from oil to productivity increasing investment and consumption of durable goods will lead to higher employment and growth in the economies of the West.

Second, poorer nations would be granted a reprieve. Burdened by extortionary oil import payments, the half-starved, lesser developed nations of the world would be able to free vital foreign exchange earnings for desperately needed investment, consumption, and debt service—at a much lower interest rate.

Third, the Soviet Union would suffer a severe setback. Soviet energy exports account for almost 80 percent of its hard currency earnings which are needed to buy Western grain and technology. According to Wharton Economics, for every \$1 a barrel decline in OPEC crude the Soviets lose \$750 million a year in earnings. With domestic oil production virtually stagnant, the Kremlin would be forced to place an even tighter squeeze in its shaky Eastern bloc allies, demanding that shipments be paid for in hard currency instead of rubles. More importantly, any reduction in hard currency earnings makes it more difficult for Moscow to continue its massive arms buildup without placing unbearable strains on its people.

Fourth, lower prices increase our security. Together with the added wind-fall taxes from domestic producers on the difference between world and U.S. prices, the billions in oil import fees could be used to pay for filling the de-

pleted strategic petroleum reserves and for the Rapid Deployment Force, created to protect the Persian Gulf.

Above all, we must avoid the temptation to bask in the glory of the current glut and trust it will continue. Most experts believe the current situation to be only temporary. Worldwide economic growth together with the never-ending military conflicts plaguing the Middle East would easily place OPEC in the driver's seat once again.

Time and time again we have foolishly failed to protect ourselves from the whims of outside forces. The time to act is now, for if we do not, we will become a nation destined only to react to crises rather than a people courageous enough to prevent them. ●

KIKK-FM RADIO HONORED BY ACADEMY OF COUNTRY MUSIC

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, the Academy of Country Music has honored Houston's own KIKK-FM as Country Radio Station of the Year, a long overdue honor for one of the finest music stations anywhere.

KIKK's staff of 66 present fine music, news and sports, 24 hours a day. Their FM station was rated No. 1 in the Houston Arbitron cumulative ratings last winter; in any given week, nearly 600,000 Houstonians tune in to KIKK.

KIKK is owned by Viacom International. Its vice president and general manager is Mr. Nick Trigony. May they continue their tradition of public service and enjoyment to the people of Houston. ●

INTERNATIONAL REGULATION AND SUPERVISION

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs reported favorably, by a rollcall vote of 27 to 14, H.R. 2957 which combines in one bill provisions relating to the Export-Import Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the multilateral development banks. Of special significance is the fact that the committee has recommended the strengthening of supervision of U.S. bank international lending and by its adoption of title II entitled "International Economic Recovery," has commenced the process of improving the effectiveness and consistency of the regulation and supervision of all international banking activi-

ties. This title is a concise version of House Joint Resolution 208, cosponsored by 28 committee members, concerning which I addressed the House on March 17 and made the subject of my March 22 letter to the President in connection with the upcoming Williamsburg economic summit.

The complexity of international regulation and supervision is well illustrated by a recent editorial appearing in the *Financial Times* of London, England. The editorial referred to together with my response follows:

[From the *Financial Times*, Apr. 19, 1983]

SNUB FOR U.S. REGULATORS

With the international banking system still in fragile condition there is bound to be some disquiet at the sight of Congress slugging it out with the U.S. bank regulatory authorities over the form of future curbs on foreign lending by American banks.

By Western European Standards the package of measures for tighter supervision and control put forward recently by the heads of the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Comptroller of the Currency looked anything but tame. In addition to tougher monitoring of country risk and increased disclosure, the proposed guidelines covered new rules for accounting for fees on loans and a systematic approach to providing against questionable foreign loans—all this within the context of closer co-operation with foreign central banks and the International Monetary Fund.

Yet the Senate Banking Committee had little hesitation last week in dispatching the regulators unceremoniously with instructions to turn their guidelines into legislative form. When the House Committee on banking, finance and urban affairs conducts its hearings this week, hawkish noises can also be expected.

INCAUTIOUS

A big increase in the IMF authorization is widely felt in the U.S. to amount to a bail out for the banks, whose incautious lending to Mexico, Brazil, Argentina and others helped precipitate the problems to which the IMF is addressing itself. Few politicians are keen to be seen to rescue the banks—never a popular cause in the U.S.—without extracting an appropriate price.

Congressmen can scarcely be blamed for treating the regulators with something less than total respect. Much of the present malaise in banking stems from the growth of the Eurocredit market, which has resulted in excessive dollar lending by non-American banks, and the growth of the inter-bank market, which created the dangerous illusion among bankers during the period of petrodollar recycling that the maturity of loans could be lengthened at will.

The central bankers did not respond to these structural changes in the system with the natural conservatism and concern on which they pride themselves; and they cannot escape a share of the blame for the deflationary impulses that financial fear has now imposed on the world economy.

That said, there is indeed something worrying about a much increased role for Congress in banking supervision. The bankers may not have shown much prescience in sovereign lending; but there is no reason to believe that politicians are likely to be any better at making qualitative judgments about country risk. There is good reason,

though, to be concerned about anything that threatens to curb the increase in the flow of resources to developing countries. Rigid statutory limits on country lending could well have that effect.

DISCRETION

Statutory ceilings on country lending might reduce the flexibility which is essential in trade financing. However, they would probably not have provided total protection against problems on the scale that the banking system now faces: some bad debts are inevitable. Moreover, the fixing of specific limits could well be accompanied by the political friction in relation to individual countries.

On balance, the case for leaving judgments about credit in the hands of bankers is more persuasive, even if past history appears to lend it only modest support. But it remains to be seen how much discretion any future legislation would concede to the American regulatory authorities. Ideally, statutory measures should add strength to the arm of the regulators in preventing a repeat of the present problem and imposing a more realistic approach among the banks to both provisions and disclosure.

They should also be seen within a wider framework. The problems of the world banking system have already led to increased co-operation between central banks over supervision, and indeed between private bankers who have set up the Institute of International Finance in Washington to identify potential liquidity problems. It would be unfortunate if Congress were to embark on legislation that reduced the capacity of American regulators to respond flexibly to the demands of international co-operation.

[Response letter]

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE
AND URBAN AFFAIRS,

Washington, D.C., May 10, 1983.

EDITOR,
Financial Times, Bracken House,
London, England.

DEAR SIR: I could not help but raise an eyebrow at the concluding remarks in your April 19, 1983 editorial, "Snub for U.S. Bank Regulators". You said, "The problems of the world banking system have already led to increased cooperation between central banks over supervision." Though I have not seen evidence to this effect, I hope your observation is accurate. You went on to say, "It would be unfortunate if Congress were to embark on legislation that reduced the capacity of American regulators to respond flexibly to the demands of international co-operation." If cooperation, flexible or otherwise, substantially characterized the relationship among the world's bank regulators, I could fully share your concern about U.S. legislative actions. What concerns me, however, and should concern you too, is the apparent confusion among our bank authorities and what that reveals about the past and portends for the future.

I personally place a very high priority on the need for international supervisory cooperation. However, regarding how successful national authorities have been in the past in this respect, I concur with the finding of the Treasury and Civil Service Committee of the British House of Commons: "... in view of the evidence that banks unduly relaxed their traditional standards of prudence in their international risk lending without

being brought into line by the official supervisory authorities, we are not wholly satisfied with present arrangements for bank supervision." (Committee Report, March 15, 1983, p. xli)

The coordinating group for the banking authorities of the Group of Ten Nations and Switzerland, the Basle Committee on Banking Regulations and Supervision Practices, is often cited as a model of international cooperation. I find it difficult to understand such praise. The Committee meets in secret and its deliberations are confidential. Moreover, what little is known of the Committee's decisions suggests something quite different from a unified international perspective.

The Basle Committee is most often praised for the "Concordat of 1975". However, even regarding this the Committee's most significant action, there appears to be substantial disagreement. The Federal Reserve implied one interpretation of the "Concordat" in its 1980 request for comments on proposed reporting requirements to implement the 1978 International Banking Act. Regarding the Federal Reserve's interpretation, the Bank of England commented:

"In their present form these proposed requirements seem to us to imply an approach to supervision which runs counter to a basic principle agreed to by the Governors of the G-10 Countries and Switzerland in 1975—namely that the primary responsibility for supervising banks incorporated in a particular country rests with the central bank or other regulatory authorities of that country."

Regarding that same interpretation, the Deutsche Bundesbank commented:

"But the principles of the 'Concordat' endorsed by the Central Bank Governors of the G-10 Countries and Switzerland in 1975 should be applied, according to which the primary responsibility for supervising banks with establishments abroad rests with the supervisory authorities of the country in which the parent bank has its registered office."

And, the Swiss National Bank wrote: "According to the principles worked out by the Committee and approved by the Governors in 1975, primary responsibility for the supervision of a foreign branch, subsidiary or agency, doubtlessly lies with the host authority."

Thus, we have four central banks and four different interpretations of a principle upon which agreement had purportedly been reached five years earlier! Clearly, and I trust you agree, supervisory cooperation is in need of improvement. Please rest assured that if the U.S. Congress legislates in this area, it will do so to encourage cooperation and not to hamstring it.

Sincerely,

FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,
Chairman. ●

COACH PAUL WOMACK'S RETIREMENT

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, 1983, the Redlands Terrier Benchwarmers are sponsoring a testimonial dinner in honor of

Coach Paul Womack's retirement as head coach of Redlands High School. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize and commend Coach Womack for his years of dedicated service in guiding and instructing our children.

Coach Paul Womack began his career as an assistant coach at Redlands High School in 1957 and later became the head coach in 1964. He will be leaving behind an impressive record that few to follow will be able to match. To his credit he has 125 winning games, 10 Citrus Belt League championships, 14 C.I.F. playoff games, 3 trips to the C.I.F. semifinals, and even a championship game.

Paul Womack has coached in over 250 high school football games and was named Shrine Bowl Coach in 1974. Over 3,000 young men have learned to play football under the supervision of this man and 96 have received college scholarships. He has dedicated his life to our youth and I believe he deserves our gratitude and thanks. He has taken our children, disciplined their minds and developed their bodies, and made them into men.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in commending to my colleagues Coach Paul Womack for his years of unselfish service. I believe he has taught us all the meaning of the words "leadership" and "dedication" and because of him, Redlands High School is a better educational institution. ●

THE TIME TO ACT IS NOW

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday May 11, 1983

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, as the debate and discussion continue on the issue of natural gas decontrol, I am disheartened to hear many of my colleagues advocating recontrol of gas prices. I fear such price recontrol will only lead to future supply shortages for the years ahead and will discourage further exploration and production of domestic natural gas reserves.

Although we are currently experiencing a surplus in the natural gas marketplace, this phenomenon is only temporary. Unless we act to restore some semblance of rationale to the gas market, we will be faced with even greater shortages than experienced in the seventies. With the current glut of gas in the market, there is no better time for us in Congress to act on this crucial issue. During this period of slack demand and excess supply, the time is now to provide economic balance and equilibrium to the gas market.

The only meaningful method of achieving a rational market is complete and total decontrol of all gas. Consumers of natural gas can no longer bear the economic burden associated with the 20-plus pricing categories of natural gas. These economic distortions have caused the premature development of high cost gas reserves as well as the continued flow of expensive imported gas from countries such as Canada and Algeria.

Economic theory dictates that the most efficient use of any resource is the orderly development of least costly reserves first. In other words, let us develop the less expensive gas first and then move to steadily produce and develop more expensive gas when the market demands this gas and when the market can absorb the cost of this gas, free from any Government-imposed subsidy. And so, the choice is ours to make. One which for many may be politically difficult but should be undertaken nonetheless on the premise that we are acting in the best interest of our country. Continued Government-controlled and dictated prices of natural gas has not ever been and will not ever be in the best interest of our Nation. We must strive to provide economic equity and balance to the natural gas market.

Toward this end, I bring to the attention of my colleagues three recent editorials, all of which advocate the decontrol of old gas. The New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, and the Washington Times all perceive the wisdom of moving toward a free market for natural gas. I commend these articles to my colleagues and urge their close consideration.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

The articles follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 21, 1983]

THE PRICE OF PRINCIPLE

Let's say you're a poor person who drives a car, or let's say you're a rich person, a congressman, who feels sorry for a poor person who drives a car. Under either of these circumstances, which would you rather have—gasoline priced at \$1.30 a gallon or at \$1.05 a gallon?

There are two answers. The poor person, of course, wants the cheap gasoline because he knows a bargain when he sees it. But the congressman might very well have preferred the \$1.30 pump price because he has principles. Now we know all of you out there—rich and poor—are saying, "You've gotta be kidding! What kind of principle is that?"

It's the famous principle of energy-price control, of course. The energy-price control principle holds that . . . aw, why don't we just skip it. All you have to know is that in January 1981, President Reagan lifted the remaining price controls on oil, the price went up for a while, producers sold off their inventories and then the price of gasoline went south. The congressfolk with the courage of their price-control principles had predicted \$2 gasoline. It must have killed them to see those Camaros roaring into gas stations to chow down on cheap unleaded.

Yesterday brought yet more bad news for the principled price controllers of Congress. The Senate Energy Committee voted 10-8 to reject a proposal to keep a price lid on what is known as "old" natural gas. This vote is the first step in what will be a long fight over natural gas deregulation.

The principled price-control people say deregulation will blow the lid off prices. The other side, the people who brought you cheaper gasoline prices, say this:

That so-called "old" natural gas is what drillers found before 1977. In 1978, Jimmy Carter, the most principled energy-price controller since the discovery of fire, got Congress to pass the Natural Gas Policy Act, a legal jungle fixing prices on 17 categories of gas. There was no way producers could make money drilling for cheap gas, so they stopped looking. Then they sat on the cheap old gas they already had and ran straight for their larger profit opportunities—purchasing and selling expensive "deep" gas, LNG or imported gas whose prices weren't so well disciplined.

The result of that: higher gas prices. The result of that: Factories switched to cheaper, decontrolled oil. The result of that: Homeowners' gas prices rose even more because fewer factories were sharing overhead costs. The result of that: Principled congressmen said, "We'll never decontrol natural gas!" a motion now seconded by a good many gas producers who have learned to love the price control route to easy money.

But we think consumers would like decontrol better. Producers would sell their inventories, then they'd drill out our huge amounts of relatively cheap gas reserve, the industry would slug it out for markets based on price and the poor would know a good deal when they saw it.

The system is known as the free market. It, too, is a principle.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 26, 1983]

OLD GAS CAN'T SAVE CONSUMERS

Many who favor a free market for natural gas nonetheless gag on decontrolling the "old" gas that was discovered before 1977. Their view may wreck President Reagan's plan for deregulation on its first test in the Senate Energy Committee this week.

The hesitations are understandable. Decontrol of old gas is not necessary to gain some economic benefits from decontrolling newer gas. But there are good political reasons and solid economic ones for leaving the Administration plan intact.

First the easy argument: Dropping old gas from the decontrol bill would probably allow the owners of old gas to kill any deregulation this year.

There is now widespread agreement that the system created by the Natural Gas Policy Act in 1978 has allowed prices to skyrocket without creating efficient incentives to find more gas. But there is no consensus on what to do next.

The Reagan plan amounts to a clever compromise. It would eventually decontrol all prices, creating a single gas market and generating incentives to develop the best sources. But the transition to decontrol would still be restrained to make sure that pipelines got adequate supplies and that gas prices stayed competitive with coal and oil. If old gas is jettisoned from the compromise, its producers will probably block any legislation.

Now the harder part of the argument: From consumers' perspective, the decontrol of old gas would be, at worst, irrelevant. The

price of gas at the burner will never again be markedly lower than that of competitive fuels. But without any legislation, it could actually be higher.

Under the present system, old natural gas—about half the total being sold—is under permanent controls; newer gas is being decontrolled in stages. The hope was that this would hold down consumer prices by providing a market mixture of old and new gas. In fact, this protection for old gas only encouraged pipelines to bid up the price of the relatively small supply of totally decontrolled gas from deep wells.

Remembering the shortages of the mid-70's, pipelines paying as little as 28 cents per 1,000 cubic feet for old gas sought to assure their supplies by contracting to pay \$8 or \$9 for deregulated gas. Thus nearly all the benefits of keeping old gas cheap have gone to producers of expensive newer gas. The system also perversely destroyed incentives to develop gas at intermediate prices from shallow wells. Locked into contracts at \$8, pipelines can't switch to supplies available for \$4.

There is a narrow logic for decontrolling all new gas without lifting controls on old gas: it would yield some production efficiencies without much effect on the price to consumers at the end of the pipeline. But conversely, the decontrol of all gas would not further harm consumers, would add efficiencies and would advance the political prospects of the entire package. It would provide a windfall for owners of old gas, but at the expense of the owners of now-decontrolled gas, not consumers.

It sounds complicated, and it is, but consumer interests are not now at risk. Legislators choosing sides should know they are choosing only among producers.

[From the Washington Times]

A NATURAL (GAS) CLIFF-HANGER

Uh-oh. The hopes and dreams of millions of consumers may be dashed if a Senate committee does what some members threaten. This would be to emasculate the Administration's natural gas regulatory reform bill. The way they'd do it is to remove the provision that would decontrol the price of "old" gas.

The hopes and dreams we're talking about are for plentiful supplies, far into the future, of this cleanest-burning, most efficient of fuels. But you can't get there from here if you keep pricing the stuff below what people are willing to produce it for. Yet, perversely, federal regulation of natural gas now does just that.

If the Republican-controlled Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources drops old-gas decontrol from the bill, imagine what kind of snowball-in-you-know-where chance there will be of getting it restored in the Democrat-dominated House.

What we'd end up with is a sham, a largely pointless tinkering with the byzantine, self-defeating, regulatory structure the Carterites left us with in 1978. That's when, in "reforming" regulation already on the books, they defined "old gas" as what was in wells developed before 1977, which they declared forever subject to federal price ceilings.

New gas—i.e., from post-1977 wells—was allowed to rise in price gradually toward the equivalent world-oil price. This recognized the economic fact of life—that people won't spend truckloads of money searching for new gas if the government insists on artificially holding the price below that of competing fuels such as petroleum.

But if the Carter decontrol of new gas is scheduled for completion in 1986, why worry about old gas? After all, producers have already incurred the costs of developing the pre-1977 wells. Why will they need any extra incentive to produce gas from them, since they're already getting, under regulation, a price that equals cost plus a reasonable profit, adjusted for inflation?

Two reasons. The first you hear a lot about. It's common sense. What would you do if you have old gas that you can get only a government-set profit on and the possibility of developing and selling new gas, on which you're permitted a bigger profit? You'd concentrate on selling gas from new wells, which is just what producers are doing. Thus, the ceilings on old gas, meant both to insure below-market prices for the stuff and to keep producers from making "windfall" profits on the old gas, actually distort the market, inducing the greater production of new, higher priced gas.

The second reason price ceilings on old gas, in tampering with natural market forces, defeat everybody's purposes, goes beyond common sense—to a knowledge of the physics of gas production. Nothing mind-bendingly complicated, mind you; but simply this:

As you produce gas from most wells, the pressure put there by nature declines. As the pressure declines, so does the rate at which you can produce the gas. Finally, you reach a point where the cost of producing any further gas will equal the price you can sell it for—and unless you got your head screwed on wrong, you abandon the well.

If the market—or the Government—lets you get a higher price for the gas, you can afford to keep the well operating, even though it's yielding you less gas per day. That is, even though it's costing you more to produce gas from it.

What's this mean to consumers and to U.S. supplies of natural gas? A study released only last month finds that about 52 trillion cubic feet of natural gas could be added to our nation's reserves of "old" gas if Congress will only take its foot off the price.

Since we use about 17 trillion cubic feet of natural gas a year, ripping the price lid off old gas now would add about four years' worth of supplies to our reserves. This doesn't include the untold gobs of new gas that total decontrol will yield down the road as producers finally are liberated from investment and profit restraints.

The payoff to consumers is not only more natural gas available to them, and more of that produced by Americans in America, but lower energy prices in general. More natural gas "made in America" means comparatively less demand for oil, since the two fuels are interchangeable for many purposes. This will exert a perfectly lovely downward pressure on world oil prices. In other words, it's really the same as producing more oil at home every time foreign producers cut their oil production in order to try to prop up oil prices.

Decontrol of "old" natural gas in the United States is the worst thing that could happen to the foreign oil cartel. Don't you love it?●

JUSTICE ASSISTANCE ACT OF
1983

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House approved H.R. 2175, the Justice Assistance Act of 1983, which I was pleased to support. This bill would establish an Office of Justice Assistance to administer a modest program of grants for anticrime and criminal justice programs.

Eighty percent of the \$170 million authorized for this purpose would go to the States on a formula basis requiring a 50-percent State match. The funds could be used only for a number of specified purposes which have proven effective in fighting crime. These include programs aimed at arson and career criminals, programs to relieve prison overcrowding, and programs designed for juvenile offenders. I am particularly pleased that one of the specific program categories for which the Federal funds may be used is community and police anticrime activities.

Neighborhood watch and town watch programs are local volunteer citizen efforts to reduce crime. The number of these organizations is growing steadily and the declining statistics on street crime suggest that they are having an impact. When functioning in cooperation with local law enforcement authorities, neighborhood and town watch programs are proving to be a valuable community asset. Yet they have little in the way of funding. H.R. 2175 would allow these groups to receive funds through their States to maintain and improve their services.

In addition to the 80 percent of the \$170 million available for State grants, 20 percent would be used for national programs. One candidate for such funding might be the National Association of Town Watch, an organization whose executive director is Matt A. Peskin of Wynnwood, Pa. The National Association of Town Watch is working with citizen groups and law enforcement officials throughout the country to promote the town watch concept, to help interested citizens to organize new watch programs, and to share the experiences of existing programs in Montgomery County, Pa., and elsewhere.

That effective neighborhood and town watch programs are organizing throughout the Nation is in some measure due to the dedication, energy, and resourcefulness of people like Matt Peskin. The relatively small amount of anticrime assistance authorized by H.R. 2175 could strengthen their efforts enormously.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DOES PROSPERITY CAUSE
INFLATION?

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, my goal in life is to conquer root canal economic theory. These theories of austerity come in all shapes and sizes, but they have one thing in common: Stick it to the poor working man and woman and those who hope to achieve a better life for themselves and their family.

In Washington the root canal theory is usually embodied in the Phillips Curve tradeoff between inflation and unemployment. And every time an old guard conservative decides to fight inflation with higher unemployment, an old guard liberal comes along and says we should fight unemployment with inflation. The result has been unprecedented unemployment and inflation, simultaneously, something the Phillips Curve used to say cannot happen.

I have said, and I say it again today, that the idea is pernicious that you fight inflation with unemployment. I think it is an idea that is threatening the democracies of the West. I also believe that inflation is no answer to unemployment.

The supposed tradeoff between unemployment and inflation is something this body has to reject sooner or later. I want to commend the following essay to my colleagues by M. S. Forbes, Jr., one of the most outspoken political and economist journalists writing today. If we follow Mr. Forbes advice and pursue stable monetary and sound fiscal policies, I believe we can achieve the ultimate goal of full employment without inflation.

DOES PROSPERITY CAUSE INFLATION?

(By M. S. Forbes, Jr.)

This recent headline generated by Martin Feldstein, chairman of President Reagan's Council of Economic Advisers, underscores one of the glaring flaws of economics today, a theoretical shortcoming that has cost the economy, and investors, dearly—and could do so again.

It's the notion that there is a tradeoff between inflation and unemployment: If you want to bring down inflation, the price is high unemployment; conversely, if you want to reduce unemployment, you will get more inflation. Martin Feldstein reflects the notion well when he says: "One of the reasons (inflation won't come roaring back) is that we will have a moderate recovery. . . . A slower-than-average recovery strikes me as really very good in that it will keep the inflation rate from heating up."

In other words, good times cause inflation; bad times, stabler prices.

CURVE BALL

The tradeoff is known to economists as the Phillips Curve, and they were taught in school that policymakers should strive for an acceptable mix between the two. This meddling didn't "smooth out" economic cycles; instead, it sapped the economy's vi-

May 11, 1983

tality. Neither the government nor the Federal Reserve can bring about "equilibrium," for reasons brilliantly explained in our cover story.

The Phillips Curve, fallacious though it may be, dominates the economic thinking even of those who might mistake the name for a baseball pitch.

For example, carefully read bond-market commentaries: If the economy appears buoyant, bond experts are bearish. Economic activity is equated with higher interest rates. If the economy looks sluggish, they're bullish.

Men like Federal Reserve Chairman Volcker and his probable successor, Alan Greenspan, share Feldstein's Phillips Curve mentality. That's why Volcker is loath to nudge interest rates down until he is convinced the recovery will be anemic. Too strong a bounce-back, he repeatedly intones, will "rekindle inflationary expectations."

This thinking has its roots in the Great Depression, a shattering experience which convinced thinkers that an economy would sputter if left to its own devices. Thus, to prevent stagnation, government would stimulate activity through increased spending, through manipulating interest rates.

So economists saw the economy as an engine—it wouldn't work without fuel, the fuel being money pumped in by Uncle Sam or the Federal Reserve.

To economic experts, then, inflation is a sign that people have too much money in their pockets; inflation, after all, is "too much money chasing too few goods." Stagnation and recession, on the other hand, mean people have too little money.

The stagflation of the 1970s—when we had both high inflation and high unemployment at the same time—should have prompted deep soul-searching. How could people simultaneously have too much money (inflation) and too little money (stagflation)? Experience may be a hard teacher to practical people in the everyday world, but theorists simply fault the world, not their philosophies, when things don't go according to the textbook.

IGNORING HISTORY

Contrary to what the Volckers and Feldsteins of the world may think, history shows prosperity doesn't cause inflation, and bad times don't mean lower interest rates. Most countries boomed as never before in the 1950s and through the mid-1960s with minimal inflation. The steep recession of 1980-82 saw real interest rates zoom.

One hopes Alan Greenspan, should he be appointed Volcker's successor, will be strong enough to overcome his education, that he will realize vigorous economic activity isn't a cause of inflation; that he will have the courage to examine the successful monetary systems of the past to see what their common denominator was. (Hint: It's a four-letter word.)●

INCREASING CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR WASTE DUMPERS

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, JAMES J. FLORIO, our colleague from New Jersey, has taken a leadership role in the Congress for many years to tight-

en up the criminal provisions of the laws governing solid and hazardous waste.

For example, corporations now face fines up to \$1 million—the highest fine for any Federal crime—for knowingly endangering an individual with toxic waste, as one result of Mr. FLORIO's previous work.

Currently, Mr. FLORIO is the author of legislation that soon will be voted on in the House that will put more teeth in the law. For example, the maximum prison sentence will be doubled, from 5 to 10 years, for anyone who knowingly endangers the health or life of another during the improper treatment, storage, transportation, or disposal of hazardous waste.

An editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer yesterday made an excellent case why the Congress must approve Mr. FLORIO's amendments to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). In order to bring it to the attention of my colleagues, I include the editorial in the RECORD at this time.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, May 10, 1983]

FLORIO'S BILL ON TOXIC WASTES

A bill sponsored by Rep. James J. Florio to increase criminal penalties for illegal hazardous waste dumping, and to provide for more effective enforcement, is expected to come before the House Energy and Commerce Committee this week. It should be approved and advanced for early action on the House floor.

The Florio bill would amend the 1976 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, which is up for renewal this year. A Bucks County chemical company and its owners were recently indicted by a federal grand jury on charges of dumping hazardous wastes in violation of the act, but enforcement generally in the Philadelphia area, as nationwide, has been spotty at best. While that may be attributable largely to the highly publicized reluctance of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency under the Reagan administration to effectively enforce laws related to hazardous waste dumping and cleanup, weaknesses in the law are also at fault.

Proposed changes by Rep. Florio would close loopholes such as one that apparently allows legal evasion of responsibility for improper dumping of hazardous substances in certain circumstances when chemical firms contract with independent haulers. Revisions also would increase the number and authority of enforcement personnel in EPA. Maximum prison terms for violators would be increased from five to 10 years. Penalties would apply specifically to persons involved in improper treatment, storage and transportation of hazardous wastes as well as to those who actually dispose of them.

A change in command at EPA won't automatically resolve all of its problems. Effective legal safeguards against hazardous handling of toxic wastes at every step, and strong enforcement in every part of the country, are required.

Congressman Florio, who has won national recognition, and deservedly so, for his leadership in strengthening the nation's legal arsenal to protect the public from toxic wastes, recognizes that existing law must not be the last word on the subject.

His proposed amendments would sharpen the enforcement provisions.●

BANKRUPTCY FILINGS RISE DRAMATICALLY

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, Federated Department Stores, which owns Foley's in Houston (14 stores, annual sales \$598 million) and Sanger Harris in Dallas (14 stores, annual sales \$330 million) has told me of the interest it shares with others in the retail industry in bankruptcy reform.

Since the new bankruptcy code became effective on October 1, 1979, personal bankruptcy filings have risen dramatically, and now run at an annual rate of approximately 450,000 or 200 percent of the rate for the 12 years prior to 1979. Although some of this increase is attributable to inflation, unemployment, lawyer advertising, and other factors, much is due to the fact that an increasing number of debtors are seeking chapter 7 or straight bankruptcy relief when a chapter 13 court supervised repayment plan would be more appropriate.

One study has estimates that of the \$6 billion scheduled in bankruptcy in 1981, at least \$1 billion was unnecessarily discharged.

Losses of this magnitude hurt the consumer credit industry by adversely affecting consumers who do pay their debts through higher interest charges and by restricting availability of unsecured credit.

There seems to be a growing consensus in the Congress that consumer reform legislation must be enacted by the 98th Congress. In the House of Representatives three different consumer bankruptcy reform bills have been introduced: First, H.R. 1169 by Representative MARILYN LLOYD; second, H.R. 1147 by Judiciary Committee chairman, PETER RODINO; and third, H.R. 1800, by Representative MIKE SYNAR.

Each of these bills represents a different approach. H.R. 1800 appears to be the least controversial. Among other things, it deals with credit card loading up by some debtors in anticipation of bankruptcy; creates standards for courts to follow in confirming repayment plans, and provides for court counseling of consumer debtors respecting their rights and protections. It also eliminates the future income, or threshold test and deals with the special problems of farmers caught in grain elevator bankruptcies.

Federated Department Stores, Inc., is one of America's largest employers—124,000 employees; 508 stores in 30 States; \$7.7 billion in annual sales. We are pleased to have this multibillion-

dollar diversified retail firm, which was founded in 1928, playing so important a role in the economic life of Texas.

Hopefully some version of bankruptcy reform will be passed in this Congress. I urge my colleagues to join in enacting bankruptcy legislation.●

NCEE

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the National Commission on Educational Excellence (NCEE), appointed by the Secretary of Education to evaluate and report on our Nation's educational system, has spoken. The words are clear and the message is unmistakable. They send out resounding signals that should reverberate deep inside every responsible American who has concern for our children, who are the future of our country.

The NCEE report, entitled "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform," is a frightening revelation of the astounding neglect suffered by the educational system in our country—a country which we regard as the greatest nation in the world. The Commission warns:

American education has deteriorated so drastically in the past two decades that our very future as a Nation and a people is threatened.

If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose upon America the mediocre education performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war.

There is shoddiness and a national sense of frustration as more and more young people emerge from high school ready neither for college nor for work.

These are indeed strong and troubling words, spoken unanimously by the 18-member Commission consisting of some of the topmost intellects from the educational community and other distinguished professions.

Yet, however frightening these words may be, President Reagan's response to the report is even more frightening. The President would offer a Band-Aid approach to a massive hemorrhage. He blames the problem on the Federal presence in education. His answer is not more Federal money, but prayer in the schools, tuition credits, vouchers, educational savings accounts, and the dismantling of the Department of Education.

It is hard to fathom a response to such a callous and irresponsible statement.

The road to educational excellence will not be paved by money alone. However there is no doubt that the Commission's recommendations for

educational reform call for greater spending for education.

In his January state of the Union message, the President acknowledged a gap in the educational areas of science and mathematics. Yet, he sent forth to congress a budget for fiscal year 1984 which proposes a \$2 billion cut in spending for education, 12 percent below the 1983 level. Last year, the President proposed a 30-percent cutback in education spending, a proposal so ridiculous that it was almost completely ignored by Congress.

Mr. Reagan has continued to call for abolishing the Department of Education in his budget messages to Congress, and has reiterated that call in response to the NCEE report. What the President proposes is to build up our educational system by tearing down the very foundation upon which it rests.

Contrary to what Mr. Reagan thinks, the National Commission itself has concluded that "the Federal Government has the primary responsibility to identify the national interest in education. It should also help fund and support efforts to protect and promote that interest. It must provide the national leadership to ensure that the Nation's public and private resources are marshaled to address the issues discussed in this report".

In response to the NCEE report, I have cosponsored the following bills that will help to address the problems which beset our Nation's educational system.

House Concurrent Resolution 118. This bill would reaffirm Federal support for public education from the elementary through postsecondary levels.

H.R. 2483, The National Defense Education Act of 1983. The act calls for a full-scale national commitment to mathematics, science, engineering, and foreign language education. The bill provides a multiphase package of competitive grants to primary, secondary, and postsecondary schools to improve their technical and foreign language programs, and scholarship aid to students who are interested in pursuing careers as teachers of math, science, and foreign languages.

H.R. 2708, foreign language for national security. This bill would authorize funds to conduct intensive language training and encourage more language classes in our elementary and secondary schools and in institutions of higher education.

House Joint Resolution 203, State commissions on teacher excellence. This bill would continue the efforts of the National Commission on Educational Excellence and seeks to increase the quality of our Nation's school systems. It calls for States to establish temporary commissions on teacher excellence to evaluate the preparation, certification, and retention of teaching professionals.

I ask that my colleagues sincerely and thoughtfully reflect upon the Commission's call for educators, parents, and public officials to all assist in bringing about needed educational reform in this country. The task which we face will not be easy; and the costs will be high in terms of time, energy, commitment, and money. But it is a task that we can ill afford to ignore.

I would like to submit for the RECORD an April 27 Washington Post article which provides excerpts from the NCEE report.

As stated so dramatically by the NCEE, "Excellence costs. But in the long run mediocrity costs far more".

RIISING TIDE OF MEDIOCRITY THREATENS OUR VERY FUTURE AS A NATION

(Excerpts from the text of the National Commission on Excellence in Education's open letter to the American people, "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform.")

Our nation is at risk. Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world

This report is concerned with only one of the many causes and dimensions of the problem, but it is the one that undergirds American prosperity, security, and civility. We report to the American people that, while we can take justifiable pride in what our schools and colleges have historically accomplished and contributed to the United States and the well-being of its people, the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and a people.

What was unimaginable a generation ago has begun to occur—others are matching and surpassing our educational attainments. If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves. We have even squandered the gains in student achievement made in the wake of the Sputnik challenge. Moreover, we have dismantled essential support systems which helped make those gains possible. We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament.

Our society and its educational institutions seem to have lost sight of the basic purposes of schooling and of the high expectations and disciplined effort needed to attain them.

This report, the result of 18 months of study, seeks to generate reform of our educational system in fundamental ways and to renew the nation's commitment to schools and colleges of high quality throughout the length and breadth of our land. * * *

INADEQUACIES

We conclude that declines in educational performance are in large part the result of disturbing inadequacies in the way the educational process itself is often conducted:

Secondary school curricula have been homogenized, diluted and diffused to the point that they no longer have a central purpose. In effect, we have a cafeteria-style curriculum in which the appetizers and desserts can easily be mistaken for the main courses.

Students have migrated from vocational and college preparatory programs to "general track" courses in large numbers. * * *

Twenty-five percent of the credits earned by general track high school students are in physical and health education, work experience outside the school, remedial English and mathematics, and personal service and development courses, such as training for adulthood and marriage. * * *

The amount of homework for high school seniors has decreased (two-thirds report less than one hour a night) and grades have risen as average student achievement has been declining.

In many other industrialized nations, courses in mathematics (other than arithmetic or general mathematics), biology, chemistry, physics and geography start in grade 6 and are required of all students. The time spent on these subjects, based on class hours, is about three times that spent by even the most science-oriented U.S. students. * * *

A 1980 survey reveals that only eight states require high schools to offer foreign language instruction; none requires students to take the courses. Thirty-five states require only one year of mathematics, and 36 require only one year of science for a diploma. * * *

Expenditures for textbooks and other instructional materials have declined by 50 percent over the past 17 years.

In England and other industrialized countries, it is not unusual for academic high school students to spend eight hours a day at school, 220 days per year. In the United States, by contrast, the typical school day lasts six hours and the school year is 180 days.

Too many teachers are being drawn from the bottom quarter of graduating high school and college students. The teacher preparation curriculum is weighted heavily with courses in "educational methods" at the expense of courses in subjects to be taught. * * *

The average salary after 12 years of teaching is only \$17,000 per year, and many teachers are required to supplement their income with part-time and summer employment. * * *

Despite widespread publicity about an overpopulation of teachers, severe shortages of certain kinds exist: in the fields of mathematics, science, and foreign languages; and among specialists in education for gifted and talented, language minority and handicapped students.

Half of the newly employed mathematics, science, and English teachers are not qualified to teach these subjects; fewer than one-third of U.S. high schools offer physics taught by qualified teachers. * * *

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that state and local high school graduation requirements be strengthened and that, at a minimum, all students seeking a diploma be required to lay the foundations in the five new basics by taking the following curriculum during their four years of high school; (a) four years of English; (b) three years of mathematics; (c) three years of science; (d) three years of social studies; and (e) one-half year of computer science. For the college bound, two years of foreign language in high school are strongly recommended in addition to those taken earlier. * * *

We recommend that schools, colleges and universities adopt more rigorous and measurable standards, and higher expectations,

for academic performance and student conduct, and that four-year colleges and universities raise their requirements for admission. * * *

Standardized tests of achievement (not to be confused with aptitude tests) should be administered at major transition points from one level of schooling to another and particularly from high school to college to work. The purpose of these tests would be to: (a) certify the student's credentials; (b) identify the need for remedial intervention; and (c) identify the opportunity for advanced or accelerated work. The tests should be administered as part of a nationwide (but not federal) system of state and local standardized tests.

We recommend that significantly more time be devoted to learning the new basics. This will require more effective use of the existing school day, a longer school day, or a lengthened school year. * * * School districts and state legislatures should strongly consider 7-hour school days, as well as a 200- to 220-day school year. * * *

Students in high schools should be assigned far more homework than is now the case. . . . Instruction in effective study and work skills should be introduced in the early grades and continued throughout the student's schooling. * * *

Persons preparing to teach should be required to meet high educational standards, to demonstrate an aptitude for teaching and to demonstrate competence in an academic discipline. * * *

Salaries for the teaching profession should be increased and should be professionally competitive, market-sensitive and performance-based. Salary, promotion, tenure and retention decisions should be tied to an effective evaluation system that includes peer review so that superior teachers can be rewarded, average ones encouraged and poor ones either improved or terminated.

School boards should adopt an 11-month contract for teachers. This would ensure time for curriculum and professional development, programs for students with special needs and a more adequate level of teacher compensation.

School boards, administrators and teachers should cooperate to develop career ladders for teachers that distinguish among the beginning instructor, the experienced teacher and the master teacher.

Substantial nonschool personnel resources should be employed to help solve the immediate problem on the shortage of mathematics and science teachers. Qualified individuals, including recent graduates with mathematics and science degrees, graduate students and industrial and retired scientists, could, with appropriate preparation, immediately begin teaching in these fields. * * *

Incentives, such as grants and loans, should be made available to attract outstanding students to the teaching profession, particularly in those areas of critical shortage. * * *

The federal government, in cooperation with states and localities, should help meet the needs of key groups of students such as the gifted and talented, the socio-economically disadvantaged, minority and language minority students and the handicapped. * * *

The federal government's role includes several functions of national consequence that states and localities alone are unlikely to be able to meet: protecting constitutional and civil rights for students and school personnel; collecting data, statistics, and infor-

mation about education generally; supporting curriculum improvement and research on teaching, learning and the management of schools; supporting teacher training in areas of critical shortage or key national needs, and providing student financial assistance and research and graduate training.

The federal government has the primary responsibility to identify the national interest in education. It should also help fund and support efforts to protect and promote that interest. It must provide the national leadership to ensure that the nation's public and private resources are marshaled to address the issues discussed in this report.

This commission calls upon educators, parents and public officials at all levels to assist in bringing about the educational reform proposed in this report. We also call upon citizens to provide the financial support necessary to accomplish these purposes. Excellence costs. But in the long run mediocrity costs far more. * * *

[Source: The National Commission on Excellence in Education]

A NATION AT RISK

The indicators

International comparisons of student achievement, completed a decade ago, reveal that on 19 academic tests American students were never first or second and, in comparison with other industrialized nations, were last seven times.

Some 23 million American adults are functionally illiterate by the simplest tests of everyday reading, writing and comprehension.

About 13 percent of all 17-year-olds in the United States can be considered functionally illiterate. Functional illiteracy among minority youth may run as high as 40 percent.

Average achievement of high school students on most standardized tests is now lower than 26 years ago when Sputnik was launched.

The College Board's Scholastic Aptitude Tests (SAT) demonstrate a virtually unbroken decline from 1963 to 1980. Average verbal scores fell over 50 points and average mathematics scores dropped nearly 40 points.

College Board achievement tests also reveal consistent declines in recent years in such subjects as physics and English.

Many 17-year-olds do not possess the "higher order" intellectual skills we should expect of them. Nearly 40 percent cannot draw inferences from written material; only one-fifth can write a persuasive essay; and only one-third can solve a mathematics problem requiring several steps.

Average tested achievement of students graduating from college is also lower.

Business and military leaders complain that they are required to spend millions of dollars on costly remedial education and training programs in such basic skills as reading, writing, spelling and computation. The Department of the Navy, for example, reported to the commission that one-quarter of its recent recruits cannot read at the ninth-grade level, the minimum needed simply to understand written safety instructions. Without remedial work they cannot even begin, much less complete, the sophisticated training essential in much of the modern military.

The recommendations

Content: We recommend that state and local high school graduation requirements be strengthened and that, at a minimum, all students seeking a diploma be required to lay the foundations in the Five New Basics

by taking the following curriculum during their 4 years of high school: (a) 4 years of English; (b) 3 years of mathematics; (c) 3 years of science; (d) 3 years of social studies; and (e) one-half year of computer science. For the college bound, 2 years of foreign language in high school are strongly recommended in addition to those taken earlier.

Standards and expectations: We recommend that schools, colleges and universities adopt more rigorous and measurable standards, and higher expectations, for academic performance and student conduct, and that 4-year colleges and universities raise their requirements for admission.

Time: We recommend that significantly more time be devoted to learning the New Basics. This will require more effective use of the existing school day, a longer school day, or a lengthened school year. ●

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 2174

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 9, airline delays prevented me from being present to vote in support of H.R. 2174, the Federal Antitampering Act. I am pleased that this important legislation, which would make it a Federal crime to tamper with consumer products, mislabel products or make plausible threats to carry out tampering, was passed by this body.

The Tylenol tampering tragedy opened many eyes to the necessity for legislation of this nature. Those who would deliberately cause loss of life through tampering should receive severe penalties, which this legislation provides.

Additionally, I also want to voice my support of H.R. 2357, the Congressional Award Act, H.R. 2173, Contract Services for Drug Dependent Federal Offenders and S. 653, which will establish a Foundation for Advancement of Military Medicine. ●

TRIBUTE TO RABBI HILLEL COHN

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, May 20, 1983, the members of Congregation Emanu El will join with others from the San Bernardino community in paying tribute to the 20 years of dedicated service provided to them by Rabbi Hillel Cohn. I would like to take this opportunity to personally recognize and commend my friend Rabbi Cohn for his unselfish contributions of time and energy to both the Jewish

and the Christian community of San Bernardino.

Rabbi Hillel Cohn has served as rabbi of Congregation Emanu El in San Bernardino since 1963. A native of Germany, he was brought to the United States as an infant by his parents who were refugees from Nazism. Rabbi Cohn received his undergraduate degree (bachelor of arts) in political science from UCLA in 1959 and his rabbinical training was taken at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati where he was ordained as a rabbi in 1963 and from which he received the master of arts and bachelor of Hebrew letters degrees. While studying for the rabbinate he served congregations in California, Iowa, and Ohio and also served as chaplain to Jewish inmates at Marion Correctional Institution of the Ohio State prison system.

Rabbi Cohn has been active in many community organizations in the San Bernardino area. He has served as president of the San Bernardino Area Mental Health Association and Family Service Agency. He has served on the boards of such organizations as the Inland Area Urban League, Planned Parenthood Association, Inland Adolescent Clinic, Kiwanis Club, American Red Cross, Arrowhead Social Planning Council, Arrowhead United Way, County Council of Community Services, and San Bernardino Community Hospital. He was appointed a member of the Adult Detention Commission for San Bernardino County and served in that position from 1974-78. From 1979 to 1982 he was a commissioner of the Juvenile Justice Commission and Delinquency Prevention Commission of San Bernardino County. Rabbi Cohn also serves as a member of the committees which approve research on human subjects at Patton State Hospital and San Bernardino County Hospital. He is a member of the president's advisory committee of Loma Linda University.

The rabbi has served as general chairman of the San Bernardino United Jewish Welfare Fund campaign. He established the program of resettling Soviet Jewish refugees for the San Bernardino area. He has also served as president of Paradise Lodge No. 237 B'nai B'rith.

From 1975 to 1977 Rabbi Cohn served as a member of the executive board of the Central Conference of American Rabbis and from 1973 to 1977 served as national chairman of the committee on resolutions of the CCAR. He has held all of the elected offices in the Pacific Association of Reform Rabbis and was its president during 1979. He is also a member of the Reconstructionist Rabbinical Association, the Board of Rabbis of Southern California (and a member of its media committee), National Association of Temple Educators and the San Bernardino Clergy Association. The

rabbi serves as auxiliary chaplain at Norton Air Force Base. He has served on the faculties of the University of Redlands, Calif., State college, San Bernardino, and San Bernardino Valley College.

In 1964 and again in 1975 Rabbi Cohn was awarded the Emanuel Gaboran Memorial Award of the National Association of Temple Educators for the best religious school curriculum design in the country. He has also been selected as the Outstanding Young Man of the Year for San Bernardino by the Jaycees, received the Scroll of Honor award of State of Israel bonds and has received commendations by San Bernardino city and county governments.

Rabbi Cohn has written for numerous publications. His sermons have been published repeatedly by the American Rabbi and he has edited a number of educational and liturgical texts. In 1977 he delivered the invocation here at a session of Congress. He is a frequent participant on KABC radio Religion on the Line and religious television broadcasts. He lectures frequently to church, community, and educational groups.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in commending to my colleagues Rabbi Hillel Cohn for his years of unselfish service to all the people of our community. I consider myself very fortunate to have Rabbi Cohn as a personal friend and I know his tireless hours of work have made San Bernardino a better place in which to live.●

A TRIBUTE TO "MO" MORLEY

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Mr. Howard W. "Mo" Morley. The U.S. Department of Labor announced his retirement on April 1, 1983. Mr. Morley was area director of the Cleveland Central Office of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance programs. He completed a distinguished career, in both the military and the Federal civil service, that spanned over 42 years.

Beginning in 1941, Morley spent 22 of those years as a naval aviator before finally closing the book on his military career in 1963. He retired from the Navy with the rank of captain. His career in the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) program began later that year, and during the next 20 years "Mo" served as a Compliance Officer—6 years—and Deputy Chief—9 years—with the Department of Defense, and the final 5 years as Area Office Director with the Department of Labor. Morley received

five outstanding performance awards during this time, as well as a special achievement award in 1979.

At his retirement dinner, held at the Guv'nor Pub in Cleveland on April 7, the awards continued. A certificate of meritorious service to "Mo" from myself along with resolutions from both the city of Cleveland and the State of Ohio, honoring his many years of distinguished service, were presented to him at the dinner attended by more than 100 of his friends, fellow workers, and well-wishers.

Morley intends to sharpen up his golf game and to do some part time consulting work for a law firm in Cleveland.●

FIGHTING COMMUNISM IN CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. J. KENNETH ROBINSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, editorials have appeared recently in two Virginia dailies, the Richmond Times-Dispatch and the Winchester Star, opposing legislation pending before this body to prohibit U.S. support for military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua.

As ranking minority member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I should like these commentaries brought to the attention of our colleagues through insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, May 8, 1983]

ASSURING LIBERTY'S SUCCESS

In his inaugural address, President John F. Kennedy vowed that the United States would be the standard-bearer in freedom's fight against tyranny, promising that "we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty." That lofty rhetoric sputtered into a fiasco in South Vietnam, whose war against communism proved to be too high a price, too heavy a burden and too grueling a hardship for the United States to bear. Now Congress is balking at paying the price, bearing the burden and meeting the hardship of fighting communism in Latin America. The latest manifestation of this repudiation of the Kennedy promise was the House Permanent Select Committee's vote against further American financial and military aid for the guerrillas fighting the Marxist government of Nicaragua.

Now, it can be argued that American-backed forces in South Vietnam and in Central America were not and are not the most unimpeachable champions of liberty ever to appear among mankind. But in this imperfect world, there are few nations that practice the American version of democracy. Even so, there was more hope for liberty in non-communist South Vietnam, and there is more hope for liberty in non-communist Latin America, than there can ever be under

communism. Certainly the "survival and success of liberty" are not assured in any country by allowing it to fall under communist domination.

The United States recognizes this in Afghanistan, where anti-communist insurgents are waging a fierce and determined fight against a Marxist government protected by Soviet tanks and rifles. It would be fatuous to pretend that the insurgents are ardent exponents of Jeffersonian democracy. Yet, the United States is providing them with weapons and ammunition, as it should be doing. On the same day the House committee voted against continuing aid to Nicaraguan guerrillas, The New York Times dispatched a story saying the United States had increased its covert assistance to Afghan insurgents.

Demonstrably, the present government of Nicaragua, which seized power by force, is a foe of liberty. It promised the people of that hapless nation relief from the repressions of a right-wing dictatorship but has given them, instead, more repression. Moreover, it has become a base and haven for Marxist guerrillas seeking to topple the government of El Salvador. Those Nicaraguans who are now willing to fight to rescue their country from the clutches of communism would seem to be as deserving of American support as the guerrillas who are fighting to rout communism from Afghanistan.

Congress should reject the House Committee's recommendation and authorize the continuation of aid, covert or overt, to Nicaragua. If the United States is not prepared to redeem President Kennedy's pledge in Latin America, where in the world would it be willing to do so?

[From the Winchester Star, May 6, 1983]
PRESIDENT IS RIGHT

The House Intelligence Committee this week defied the Reagan Administration and voted along party lines to prohibit by law any United States involvement with guerrilla forces fighting the Communist government of Nicaragua. The vote of nine Democrats against five Republicans followed five hours of closed committee deliberation and a last minute warning from CIA Director William C. Casey that forcing the CIA to stop supporting the guerrillas inside Nicaragua could lead to a "blood bath".

In our judgment, the nine Democrats were wrong. The Nicaraguan government which came to power, not by election but by bullets, is a Marxist dictatorship seeking to export communism to its neighboring countries. President Reagan, we think, is right in attempting to prevent such action.●

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

HON. DOUG BARNARD, JR.

OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1983

● Mr. BARNARD. Madam Speaker, when it comes to innovation and hard work, I do not know of anyone who is doing a better job than the small businesses of our Nation.

Even during the recession, 1981 was a record year for new business starts. In my Sun Belt area, there was even an increase in 1982.

Statistics are nice, of course, but behind the numbers are dozens of men

and women. Behind the numbers are countless hours of hard work and creativity that turned those ventures into success.

In my district in Georgia, for instance, there is a businessman named Tom Griffith. More than a dozen years ago, Tom got a loan to open one convenience store, the Golden Pantry. Tom did not have much of a formal education, but he had the skill and the insight to know what customers needed—and he provided that.

Now he has expanded his 1 store into a chain of 150 stores—and he has his eye on expanding into South Carolina.

I could tell you the stories of dozens of other men and women in my district, and they all exhibit the same traits of pluck and luck, energy, and enthusiasm.

As the economy is recovering, I am convinced that small business is going to lead in that recovery. I, for one, applaud their efforts.●

TRIBUTE TO SIX WASHINGTON ARTISTS

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, a major review of the works of six Washington artists-painters Richard Dempsey, Lois Jones, Delilah Pierce, James Porter, Alma Thomas, and graphic artist James Wells, held at the Evans-Tibbs Collection is taking place this spring. Located at 1910 Vermont Avenue NW., the Evans-Tibbs Collection is a nonprofit tax-exempt organization primarily formed to preserve and exhibit works of art by and bibliographic material on African American artists. Located one-half block south of Washington, D.C.'s historic U Street corridor, the museum and research center are currently housed where Lillian Evans Tibbs lived. As an internationally acclaimed lyric soprano known professionally as Madame Evanti, Mrs. Tibbs sponsored many artists and art activities during her life. The six Washington masters exhibition is one of many such activities held by the collection in continuance of that tradition.

The six artists have lived in Washington for many years. Of this group Miss Thomas and Mr. Porter are now deceased. The important achievements made by each artist have been individually recorded in various publications over the years. However, a review of their work through a catalog exhibition specific to them as a group has never occurred. In filling a gap, this exhibit reveals their collective achievements in the visual arts. What is exciting is that these six managed to sur-

vive during a period when visual artists in the United States had a limited audience and the Afro-American artist in particular, had occasional if not rare outlets for artistic expression and review.

Our six Washington masters produced work not only reflective of the Afro-American perspective but survived artistically utilizing the most basic skills of self-promotion and professional growth. While none of these artists could have survived on sales alone, each utilized his or her teaching abilities to earn a living and to communicate respect for the profession to a younger group of artists now emerging. Moreover, socioeconomic conditions before 1960 not only fostered full-time jobs as educators, but also fostered internal support activities. At one time or another, each of these artists participated in Saturday workshops or studios as they were known. One of these was the Atelier run by Lois Jones and fellow artist Celene Tabary. This studio fostered professional exchanges as well as provided a social outlet for the artists. Equally important during this period was the development of Howard University's Art Department which depended so heavily on these talents, and the evolution of the Barnett-Aden Gallery which gave many of these artists first commercial exhibitions.

The contributions of the six are so great individually and collectively, that we must develop a sense of how they have been influenced by their environments. Like many Washington artists, our six masters, while influenced by a range of experiences, have spent a significant portion of their lives in an environment shaped under the classical design vocabulary. Washington's geometric street plan and its uniform building heights and designs have influenced their art. Significantly, the four living continue to create under these environmental conditions and as such there is a reason to suspect that their work provides clues about our behavior in this environment.

Richard Dempsey spent his early years in California under the influence of muralist and sculptor Sargent Johnson (1887-1967). Arriving in Washington during the New Deal, the east coast cityscapes consisting of row houses are reflected in his abstract art. Dempsey recalls the rear of homes that have provided the imagery in this art. In all of Dempsey's work there is concern for time and place as fourth dimensional pictorial qualities where color and line placement is based directly on where the work was done and at what time it evolved. Dempsey is therefore documenting time, place, and feelings in his work.

Born in Boston, Lois Jones attended the Museum of Fine Arts school on a

4-year scholarship from 1922-27. On request from Prof. James Herring at Howard University, she joined that department of art in 1930—a position she would hold for the next half century. A general education board grant (1937-39) allowed her to pursue further study at the Academy Julian in Paris. It was in 1941 that Jones won the Robert Woods Bliss Landscapes prize in oil painting from the Corcoran Gallery. Interestingly enough, a friend and fellow entered the painting and when the identity of the true artist was revealed there was some discussion of recalling the award in much the same manner that Afro-American artist Edward Bannister had been treated in Philadelphia at the 1876 National Centennial. By the early 1940's and through the suggestions of Dr. Alain Lock, Jones documented the Afro-American personality. She developed the Jones-Tabary studio representing the first Afro-American artist atelier or school where art ideas and techniques were exchanged. Her primary focus today is her documentation of the icons of Afro-America both in the United States and the Caribbean and is her design legacy.

Born in Washington, D.C., Delilah Pierce studied at Howard in the late 1930's with James Porter. In 1962 Pierce received an Agnes Meyer Fellowship to study and travel in several African countries. The realities of an American of part African ancestry visiting Africa was significant for it not only represented links to ethnicity in a historical sense, it provided for Pierce an opportunity to become one of a handful of African-American artists to travel to Africa and to do so before it became popular in the late 1960's. In doing so, Pierce was exposed to color esthetics and environmental design influences that would emerge in her late work as abstract surrealism to be called Post Modern Expressionist where color is as important as form. It is this expressionism that offers a fresh stylistic evolution essential to the artistic leadership Pierce is about to exert.

James Porter was an art historian and artist. His early life was marked by enormous success as a painter of scenes and portraits. His important literary work "Modern Negro Art" was published in 1943. The result of these scholarly activities was the development of an important group of documents which for the first time reported as well as interpreted the contributions of Afro-American artists. In fact, many of his publications continue to be the most complete account of an artists' work and as such so many cannot avoid referencing him in their research. In 1962-63 Porter traveled throughout west Africa. Work influenced by this travel documented the reacquaintance with Africa that many were indulging in during the late

1960's, concurrent with the rise in African sociopolitical expansion. As a result, this later work is of extreme cultural importance.

Alma Thomas moved to Washington in 1907. Like James Porter her enrollment at Armstrong Technical High School in Washington was significant. She developed her interests in art, architecture, and drawing under the philosophical guidance of organizer and first principal Wilson Bruce Evans whose belief in "work with the hand, the mind, and the spirit," set the atmosphere for the training available to his students. The work that Thomas pursued reflected this training philosophy. By the time she had retired from the public school system in 1960, Alma Thomas began to exhibit widely. Thomas was invited by Prof. James Porter, who directed Howard's Gallery of Art to exhibit a retrospective of her work. Late in life Thomas received her greatest recognition with exhibitions at the Whitney Museum and the Corcoran Gallery. Thomas donated a large body of her work to the National Museum of American Art which gave her a major retrospective last year.

Known as a master printmaker, James L. Wells' early religious training permanently influenced his art. In 1921, the 135th Street Branch Library in New York City sponsored his first exhibition, and later that year, the Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity also sponsored an exhibition of his art. These early exhibitions gave Wells encouragement. Wells first explored the raising interest in African imagery in his work paralleled the emergence of a cultural renaissance in the Afro-American community centered in Harlem. During his nearly 40 years as professor of graphics at Howard University, Wells' greatest achievement has been the leadership he has shown as the dean of printmaking in an institution where so many have developed their individual printmaking techniques under his guidance and encouragement. Wells' ever present concern with African themes, and on themes of man's reflection and isolation in a changing world are evident. His work forms a cohesive body of design statements, richly African-American, and a historical record for all humanity. ●

RABBI ALFRED GOODMAN HONORED AT RETIREMENT PARTY IN COLUMBUS, GA.

HON. RICHARD RAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to recognize an outstanding citizen upon the occasion of his retirement. Rabbi Alfred L. Goodman is being honored at a retirement party

on Saturday, May 14, 1983, at the Columbus Country Club in Columbus, Ga.

Rabbi Goodman is that rarest of human beings—he can combine the majesty that makes people instinctively want to follow him in crowds, with the humility that makes people trust him and open up to him. His qualities of leadership are known not only throughout the Jewish community in Columbus, but also throughout the entire city, and across the State of Georgia.

Although he is retiring, his influence will continue to be felt. A spirit of involvement such as he has is not canceled simply by the passing of a chronological milepost. He will stay involved, and all the citizens of Columbus will be better for it.

Rabbi Goodman was born in Cleveland, Ohio, and educated in the public schools there. He is a graduate of Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, and the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York City, where, in 1945, he was ordained. In 1970, Rabbi Goodman was awarded a doctor of divinity degree from the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion.

Rabbi Goodman began his career in 1944 at the Temple Beth Israel in Lima, Ohio. After 2 years of military service, he returned to Temple Beth Israel and stayed until 1950, when he moved to Temple Israel in Columbus, Ga. In August 1983, Rabbi Goodman will retire after 33 years of service to Temple Israel.

Rabbi Goodman is currently serving as the president of the Family Counseling Center in Columbus, Ga.; the Jewish chaplain for the Warm Springs Foundation, Warm Springs, Ga.; executive board member of the Georgia Council on Human Relations; and the auxiliary chaplain at Fort Benning, Ga.

These are only a few of the organizations that Rabbi Goodman has been associated with throughout his many years in Georgia. He is truly a man to be admired and emulated and I am happy to take this opportunity to wish him an enjoyable and productive retirement. ●

THE PONTIAC FIERO: QUALITY
MADE IN AMERICA

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, the American auto industry is facing enormous challenges. How the industry meets those challenges means a great deal to our Nation's economic strength and to the jobs of hundreds of thousands of Americans. For cities such as Pontiac,

Mich., the largest city in my district, that response is particularly critical.

That is why I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House the commitment by the Pontiac Motor Division and the United Auto Workers to produce a new automobile with the most up-to-date technology and with the best quality workmanship and management. The Pontiac Fiero, and the commitment to quality which will go into it, are described in this editorial by Neil Munro of the Oakland Press.

[From the Oakland Press, May 1, 1983]

FIERO PLANT OFFICIALS TAKE UP QUALITY CHALLENGE

(By Neil Munro)

An impassioned response has come to questions raised in this space about quality problems with American cars.

You'll recall that a surprising number of readers are wary of U.S.-built vehicles on that score and that data indicates their quality—while vastly improved in the last couple of years—still falls somewhat short of the competition overall.

Now, in a letter to The Press, the top union and Pontiac Motor Division officials at the new Fiero plant promise flatly that the cars they will build will be better than, not merely as good as, the imports from Japan.

UAW shop committee chairman Gerry Lewis and plant manager Ernie Schaefer vow that "the people in our plant are committed to making it happen."

They add "now that we (union and management) have gotten our act together, we're going to give all our competition a run for their money. The Pontiac Fiero, built right here in Pontiac by Pontiac people, is going to be competitive both in terms of quality and price."

Lewis and Schaefer also say they've invited all of you who responded to the why-aren't-cars-selling question to visit the plant and "talk to the people about the quality of our new Fiero."

These guys are laying it on the line. They're serious.

There is no reason they can't do what they say they're going to do.

For one thing, the Fiero will be powered by the Pontiac-built engine that has benefited so enormously from Japanese-style quality control methods.

The division, you may remember, now employs the same man, an American, ironically, who taught the Japanese how to do it.

It has been demonstrated many times that American workers and managers are fully capable of turning out Japanese-level quality.

The Wall Street Journal tells, for example, of a Japanese-owned Sharp Electronics television and microwave oven plant in Memphis, Tenn., which meets their high standards.

Their secret is simple. They demand quality and get it. The workers are pleased with the Japanese management style and are proud of what they do.

The story is not the same for some of Sharp's competitors.

For example, a supplier of plastic TV parts to the Sharp plant says "they demand jewelry. There just is not any comparison between the quality Sharp demands and that demanded by RCA and Zenith."

That tells you a lot.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

If Sharp can do it in Memphis, the folks who run the Fiero plant can do it in Pontiac.

They intend to, and it would be foolish to doubt their resolve.

The "bottom line" obviously is that American automakers no longer have the option of turning out products of lesser quality than those turned out by the Japanese.

Too many would-be buyers are no longer in a mood to put up with it.

To be a success, to keep the workers on the job, the Fiero is simply going to have to be as good or better than the competition.●

INTERFAITH CONFERENCE OF METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON HONORS DAVID KREINDLER

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, the Interfaith Conference of Metropolitan Washington is honoring David Kreindler, who is retiring after 2 years of exceptional service to the organization. Mr. Kreindler, approaching his 80th birthday, is a resident of my district in Maryland.

I have often had the privilege of working with the Interfaith Conference, and am pleased to have this opportunity to place their letter of appreciation to David Kreindler in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Members of the Congress:

There is much talk these days about voluntarism. The spirit of voluntarism in the service of humanity takes many forms. One of them is epitomized by David Kreindler, retiring this month as the volunteer accountant for the Interfaith Conference of Metropolitan Washington and for the Coalition for the Homeless.

The Interfaith Conference brings together the religious leaders of the Protestant, Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Islamic faith communities in the Metropolitan Washington area, for interfaith dialogue and joint action on issues of social justice. The Coalition for the Homeless works as an advocate for the homeless.

Mr. Kreindler retired after 50 years as general manager and comptroller of a major hotel and moved to Washington to be near his family. In his late 70's, he stepped forward 2 years ago to help the Interfaith Conference. He brought our financial records into a more complete set of books with hundreds of hours of volunteer labor and has maintained the conference's books in perfect order. When the Coalition for the Homeless was spun off by the conference 16 months ago, he became its bookkeeper as well.

Now, as he approaches his 80th birthday, Mr. Kreindler is once more "retiring." He can never be replaced, only succeeded. The Interfaith Conference and the Coalition for the Homeless are deeply grateful to him for his selfless labors. We hold him up as a shining example of how a person's faith and interests can combine to satisfy both himself and the larger needs of society, and we give thanks to God for him.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAN COATS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, Due to the death of former Congressman E. Ross Adair, I was not present on the House floor for the sessions of Monday, May 9, or Tuesday, May 10.

Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

"Aye" on H.R. 2357, to provide for an increase in the number of members of the Congressional Award Board;

"Aye" on H.R. 2173, to amend the Contract Services for Drug Dependent Federal Offenders Act of 1978 to authorize additional appropriations;

"Aye" on H.R. 2174, to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit certain tampering with consumer products;

"Aye" on S. 653, to amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish a Foundation for the Advancement of Military Medicine;

"Aye" on House Resolution 184, a bill providing for consideration of H.R. 2175, the Justice Assistance Act of 1983;

"Aye" on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal;

"Aye" on the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to add programs to help fight crimes against the elderly;

"Aye" on final passage of H.R. 2175, the Justice Assistance Act of 1983;

"Aye" on House Resolution 185, a bill providing for consideration of H.R. 2587, to authorize appropriations to the Department of Energy for civilian research and development programs;

"Aye" on House Resolution 183, a bill providing for consideration of H.R. 2066, to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for fiscal years 1984 and 1985.●

JOHN P. HRZICH: POLICEMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, this week the House of Representatives began debate on the Justice Assistance Act of 1983. Once enacted into law, the legislation will provide \$170 million in grants to States and localities for anticrime programs, activities to control arson, to deal with career criminals, to respond to serious crimes by juveniles and the like. This is a worthy effort, and I intend to do all that I can to insure that this legislation passes the Congress in a timely fashion.

Ultimately, the success of our programs to control crime rest on the shoulders of a few individuals who have the courage and the commitment to make the fight against crime their profession. I am talking, of course, about our Nation's police. All too often their contribution, a contribution more important than all others, receives an insufficient amount of recognition. From time to time, community groups help bring to the attention of the public efforts by policemen which really should not go without notice. I am pleased to bring to the attention of my House colleagues one such instance.

On Thursday, May 12, Police Officer John P. Hrzich will be honored by the Greenpoint Lions Club, the Greenpoint Merchants Association, and the New York State Assembly as the 1983 Policeman of the Year. Police Officer Hrzich, after 10 years of valiant and meritorious service, is winning the kind of recognition that he, as a dedicated public servant, richly deserves.

Mr. Hrzich is a lifelong resident of New York City. He attended Martin Van Buren High School where he lettered in baseball and basketball. After high school, John worked for 6 years at the Chase Manhattan Bank, though his tenure was interrupted by a 2-year absence during which he served in the military.

His Army career lasted from 1967 to 1969; he served 1 year in Vietnam. During this period, he was awarded the Army Commendation Medal. Wishing to further his education, he enrolled at the New York Institute of Technology, from which he graduated in 1976 with a B.S. degree in behavioral science.

On April 30, 1973, Mr. Hrzich realized a dream: He received appointment as a probationary officer in the New York City Police Department. During his 10-year career, he received three departmental decorations. Among these, he was awarded the Meritorious Service Medal for capturing an armed

burglar on a crowded street—he did so while endangering his own life for the benefit of his community.

This has been the hallmark of John Hrzich's career: Sacrificing himself, putting his life and his livelihood on the line, for the benefit of others. For this reason, the organizations in Greenpoint which are taking time to honor him deserve to be honored themselves.

We as a society owe so much to our courageous police officers. And we as citizens, who owe so much to this courageous few, should seize every opportunity to respond, at least with a thank you, for the great work they do.

As the Congressman from Greenpoint, I salute Officer Hrzich for his service as 1983 Police Officer of the Year.●

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1983

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, National Small Business Week is an appropriate time for us to reflect on the important contributions small businesses and small business people make to our society and our way of life. It is also a time to focus our attention on some of the problems facing the small business community and to concentrate our efforts on finding ways to alleviate them.

As President Reagan has correctly pointed out, small business is the cornerstone of our free enterprise system. Small businesses account for nearly 40 percent of our gross national product; they employ over half of the American work force; and they provide an overwhelming majority of the new jobs created each year in this country. The small business sector is the source of many of our most creative ideas and new inventions. In fact, according to the National Science Foundation, small businesses provide 25 times more innovation per research dollar than larger firms. In addition, the small business community provides invaluable opportunities for women and minorities to fulfill their goals of economic self-reliance.

Since America's small businesses play such a vital role in our society, we cannot afford to turn our backs on the problems that many are now facing. Small firms, with their narrow profit margins and limited capital reserves, have been particularly hard-hit by recent high interest rates, economic recession, and overly restrictive Federal regulation.

We must take steps now to create a more favorable climate for the small businesses of this country. We have already made progress in lowering the

rates of interest and identifying burdensome Federal regulations. We must now pursue this course in order to allow the small business people of this country to make the best possible use of their creativity, imagination, and hard work. Such an effort is absolutely critical to the future health of our economy and our society in general.●

A SALUTE TO OUR CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to the civil service system, which has supplied our communities and Nation with an army of dedicated servants of the people.

On January 4, 1983, Public Law 97-420 of the 97th Congress, in joint resolution, adopted the following, designating January 17, 1983 as Public Employees Appreciation Day:

Whereas public employees have made great contributions to American society in many areas including health care, crime prevention, science, transportation, agriculture, housing, energy, and the national defense;

Whereas public employees are the often forgotten individuals who make government run smoothly;

Whereas professionals in the public work force provide continuity and security in government operations in times of national emergency and stress;

Whereas the merit system of employing public employees has provided our Federal, State, and local governments with the finest public work force in the world; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States recognizes the dedication, talents, and contributions made by public employees at all levels of government; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that January 17, 1983 is designated as "Public Employees' Appreciation Day" and the President is requested to issue a proclamation inviting the Governors of the several States, the chief officials of local governments, and the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The U.S. civil service system is celebrating its 100th anniversary this year, while in New Jersey the 75th anniversary is being celebrated.

To further honor these dedicated employees, I have asked the U.S. Postal Service to issue a commemorative stamp, which would pay tribute as well as being inspirational.

The New Jersey State Civil Service Commission is composed of Eugene J. McCaffrey, Sr., president, and commissioners S. Howard Woodson, Jr., of Trenton, Mercer County; Charles M. Walther, Jr., Upper Montclair, Essex County; Barbara Claman, of West-

field, Union County; and Philip Matalucci of Middle Township, Cape May County.

An important arm of assuring the proper administration of laws and regulations to the employees in New Jersey is its excellent New Jersey Civil Service Association, whose officers are: president, John Lazzarotti of Mount Holly; first vice president, Charles King of New Brunswick, second vice president, Olga Sachenski of Clark; third vice president, Richard D'Elena of Delran; fourth vice president, Paul Kalnas of Phillipsburg; fifth vice president, Thomas Tammaro of Vine-land; sixth vice president, Virginia Clancy of Monmouth; recording secretary, Carol Cash of Burlington; treasurer, Theresa Long of Williamstown, financial secretary, Isadore G. Padula, Jr. of Belleville; sergeant-at-arms, William Carter of Jersey City.

The presidents of the local councils of the New Jersey Civil Service Association are Essex No. 1, Tally Talbot; Hudson No. 2, Frank Basillo; Passaic No. 3, Charles Arangio; Mercer No. 4, Norman Leavens; Bergen No. 5, Agnita Hastings; Morris No. 6, Betty Lisovsky; Middlesex No. 7, Ann Montanti; Union No. 8, Olga Sachenski; Monmouth No. 9, Virginia Clancey; Camden, No. 10, William James; Kearny No. 11, Raymond Duger; Ocean No. 12, Mary McDonald; Hunterdon No. 15, Andrew Weiman; Burlington No. 16, Richard D'Elena, Warren No. 17, Paul Kalnas, Cumberland No. 18, Thomas Tammaro; Cape May No. 19, Andrew Cipaldo (acting); Sussex No. 29, Edward Sanders; Salem No. 21, Mary Spaulding.

The watchdog of the civil service in New Jersey is the Shield, a viable newspaper, which was founded in 1935 by Irving "Steve" Brody, a former Hudson Dispatch reporter. He was covering the State House in Trenton at the time he began the paper.

After Brody's death in 1948, Milton E. Goldman, who had been advertising manager of the Shield assumed command of the paper. He died in 1979.

Editor of the Shield, since 1947, is Leo W. Steiner, who has been a newspaperman for the past six decades.

The Shield staff is composed of Beatrice Z. Goldman, publisher, Leo W. Steiner, editor, Caye Bolte Jehn, staff writer and graphic arts coordinator, Stephen R. Goldman, general manager, Jack Hasbrouck, assistant editor, Russell T. Jehn, circulation manager, and Madeline Goldman, office administrator.

Civil servants have manned our hospitals, operated our vehicles, provided programs of social, cultural, recreational, historical, and economic enrichment.

They have fed our Nation, they have participated in America's battles, in its social, economic, religious, and historical growth. They have given thou-

sands of hours and millions of dollars in voluntary efforts to aid causes aimed at relieving human suffering.

They have worked in the causes of peace, knowing that this is the noblest work of God-fearing men and women. They have worked for the success of our State and Nation, knowing that if they make this a great land to live in, reflecting our energy and strength and vitalities throughout the world, then and only then, will the cause of freedom, human dignity, and freedom of opportunity be strengthened.

The Shield, in its editorial of April 2, 1983, reminds us:

The dramatic adoption of Civil Service for the national public workforce—a direct result of the murder of President Garfield by a disappointed office seeker—showed in the clearest of terms how the U.S.A. was shocked by the powerplay of job seeking and job rewards for political services. As an antidote America wanted merit, competence, as shown in competitive examinations.

States, counties, municipalities, school districts joined the procession—all by popular referendum, thus proving that what the people wanted was not politics as usual but appointees to public jobs who deserved their appointments because of their competence, not because they could line up votes or contribute large sums of money for campaign purposes or even worse, to line pockets.

It is my privilege to prepare this tribute in time for the New Jersey Civil Service 72d Annual Convention, which will be conducted at Atlantic City from May 21 to May 25, 1983.

I am asking all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in this salute to my fellow New Jerseyites who will spotlight their diamond jubilee at the convention, while joining their fellow civil service workers on a Federal level, working in the system, which has helped America work so effectively for the past 100 years.●

JUDICIAL REFORM

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a proposed amendment to the Constitution requiring that Federal judges be reconfirmed by the U.S. Senate every 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, presently Federal judges, once appointed, serve life terms. The only constitutional mechanism for removal of these judges is impeachment. And as we all know, impeachment is a long and arduous process which historically has been exercised on only nine occasions, resulting in actual removal from office of only four judges.

In the absence of any other effective formal procedure for dismissal, Federal judges have been elevated to a stature unprecedented and unequalled by

any other Federal official. Unfortunately, as a consequence, there is no procedure for removal of a judge who may be senile, disabled, dishonest, or in any other way unfit to fulfill his or her constitutional responsibilities.

According to article III of the Constitution, Supreme and inferior court judges are appointed to their office for a term of good behavior. I certainly recognize and compliment the wisdom of the framers of the Constitution who, by separating judicial officials from the political process, preserved and defined the principle of separate but equal branches of Government. However, I continue to believe that this separation has resulted not in a more effective judicial system but rather in a greater disparity between the various branches of Government. The life tenure of these judges has made them less, not more accountable for their actions and decisions.

Furthermore and more significantly, is the increasing use by judges of their judicial power as a forum for legislating social policy. Our judicial system was established to interpret law, not to formulate national policy. However, in the last several years, many of our Federal judges have taken to backdoor legislating on such controversial issues as school prayer, abortion, and school busing.

I sincerely believe that neither this legislative body nor the American public can stand by and watch this transgression of constitutional authority. National policy decisions should not be formulated in our courts but rather should be duly deliberated and decided by the people's elected Representatives in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge expeditious consideration of this legislation so that our Nation can once again be assured of three separate but equal branches of Government.●

DEBT CEILING RULE

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform my colleagues that the Committee on Ways and Means will be considering legislation tomorrow to further extend the temporary limit on the national debt.

I wish to serve notice, pursuant to the rules of the Democratic Caucus that when this measure is reported from the committee, it is anticipated that we will seek other than an open rule.●

STUDENTS AT KINDER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN MIAMISBURG, OHIO, RAISE MONEY TO RESTORE STATUE OF LIBERTY

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Statue of Liberty will be 100 years old October 28, 1986, and millions of schoolchildren are raising money to help restore this landmark for her birthday. This is particularly appropriate because it was the pennies of our schoolchildren which paid for the statue's pedestal a century ago.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues one special effort to raise money for this cause by the students in Florell Shaffer's second grade class at Kinder Elementary School in Miamisburg, Ohio, within my district.

Kinder is the oldest school building in Miamisburg, located in the center of the city. Many parents of Kinder's students are out of work; yet, the 25 students in the class have so far raised a total of \$152.16 to pay for Miss Liberty's repairs.

What makes this effort even more special is that the diverse backgrounds of these children have given them an unusually personal understanding of the statue and its message to millions of Americans who sought freedom on our shores.

An article in the April 1, 1983, issue of the Dayton Daily News tells the story. The text follows:

STUDENTS PITCHING IN FOR STATUE'S RESTORATION

(By Mary Sikora)

The Statue of Liberty is falling down ... well, at the least it needs extensive repairs. And students in Florell Shaffer's second-grade class at Kinder Elementary School in Miamisburg want to be part of its restoration.

Five of the second-graders—Phet Phong, Jimmy Osborne, Casey Holp, Robert Gibson and Aaron Sparks—have put in considerable time researching the statue's history, making posters and collecting the money needed to help repair the New York harbor landmark.

Mrs. Shaffer said that the students read of the statue's plight in their edition of Scholastic News.

Phet Phong, a Laotian citizen, and Robert Gibson asked her if they could help save it, she added.

"The teacher asked us," Phet explained, "Do you want to draw a poster to hang up and do you want to go around collecting money?" I asked Robert and Aaron (Sparks), then we went out to collect money."

It really wasn't that simple but, before long, the students set a goal of \$100 to send on to the statue repair fund. They solicited the help of their other classmates. They made posters. They decorated small cups for money collection and, every day, they made the rounds of the classrooms at Kinder in their search for donations.

One of the big contributors was classmate Jimmy Osborne. "I told my family about it

and they all gave money," he said, adding that he brought in a total of \$10.10.

Casey Holp helped make the posters placed throughout the school. She said that the students read as much as they could about the statue and learned that, not only had France given it to the United States as a gift in the 1870s, but the statue's base was made possible by gifts from American school children.

She further explained that the second-graders discussed the present state of affairs and decided that "we were afraid if we didn't repair it, that France would get mad."

Last week, the students surpassed their goal and collected more than \$126. "It's big—a big amount of money," Phet said with a self-satisfied grin.

The money and bookkeeping were taken care of by school secretary Arlene Suttman, Mrs. Shaffer said, adding that "She has been our accountant and helped the children keep the records straight.

"Schools have done similar things, but it's the first time a class of mine did something like this," she said. "I never dreamed—I thought maybe (they'd collect) \$25. I think it's really kinda neat."●

ECONOMIC INJURY DISASTER LOANS

HON. CHARLES W. STENHOLM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, in September of last year, a 38-county area in west Texas was declared a disaster area for purposes of offering assistance to legitimate small businesses indirectly injured by a natural disaster. Severe hail and rain storms earlier in the year had led to the declaration. Because economic intervention was necessary, the assistance that was ordered into the area included economic injury disaster loans, also known as EIDL's—pronounced idles.

As you know, EIDL's are provided by the Small Business Administration to firms that have suffered economic damage when normal free market forces are disrupted by a declared natural disaster. For example, when crops are damaged in such a disaster, gins, implement dealers, and others not assisted by direct FmHA aid qualify for EIDL's if their business is adversely affected by poor crop performance.

To qualify for assistance, an entity must meet size standard regulations (13 CFR 121) to insure that only small concerns are assisted. Agricultural co-ops, however, are not considered businesses by the SBA. Instead, despite obvious differences, SBA officials have said that:

Co-ops are nonprofit in the same sense that the American Heart Association is nonprofit.

Therefore, they can receive such aid only if each and every member of the co-op completes the SBA's form 355 and is certified as being small.

To anyone who understands the nature of agricultural co-ops and the

statute establishing them—the Capper-Volstead Act, Public Law 67-146—it is clear that the SBA's requirements can often inequitably disqualify a co-op from EIDL assistance. For example:

Some co-ops have hundreds of members, many with only a tenuous relationship with the financial structure of the co-op itself, and it is unreasonable to require that each member provide financial statements to substantiate size; if 149 out of 150 members comply, the co-op remains ineligible.

Some members are passive, being landowners who are co-op members only because their tenants desire to market crops through a cooperative. Frequently, these landowner/members are substantial investors who do not, themselves, qualify as small; their affiliation, however peripheral, makes the entire co-op ineligible for an EIDL.

Therefore, for two gins located in the same town, having the same size and scope of operation, the result is that one gin, privately owned, receives a loan, while the other, cooperatively owned, cannot qualify.

In the past, some SBA regional offices have recognized these problems and have waived the every-member size standard requirement. Because the Small Business Act is unclear in its application to co-ops, however, size standard provisions were applied unevenly. Under its interpretation of the law, the present administration refuses to waive these paperwork requirements or change the regulations governing EIDL assistance.

For these reasons, I am today introducing legislation to amend section 7(b)(2) of the Small Business Act to clarify the standards of eligibility of farm co-ops for EIDL aid, for the purpose of preventing uneven or inequitable applications of this statute. This legislation would provide the necessary technical language to exempt farm co-op members from the size standard determination when being considered for an EIDL and would apply only to EIDL's.

I also believe it is important to note what this legislation would not do. First, it would not exempt the co-op itself from the requirement to meet SBA size standards. The waiver of size standard requirements would apply only to the members of a small agricultural co-op that otherwise would qualify for an EIDL.

It would not encourage corporate reorganization into cooperative form, since board members would have to resign or not be involved in the operation of the co-op; it prevents this type of abuse by still requiring size determination of a co-op's principals—such as board members or other governing officers.

It would not waive size standard determination for SBA assistance under

otherwise normal free market conditions; for aid other than disaster assistance, the SBA could still require size standard compliance by all co-op members.

Mr. Speaker, last year was not the first time and west Texas is not the only area in which the SBA's interpretation of an unclear law has resulted in the unjust disqualification of cooperatives from small business assistance. Now is the time to rectify this problem and the legislation I am submitting does so in a way that is fairest to all concerned: It will eliminate red-tape, redress a present inequity, and speed relief to small businesses owned by hard-pressed farmers who are already suffering in today's weak economy. ●

BEYOND THE FREEZE

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, my friend and distinguished colleague, Mr. GORE, a recognized authority on strategic issues, recently made a valuable contribution to the debate on our Nation's future in an article called "Beyond the Freeze."

The article was published in the May 9 issue of the Washington Post, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

BEYOND THE FREEZE

(By Albert Gore, Jr.)

The House freeze debate, mobilizing scores of congressmen on both sides and delaying many other urgent actions, demonstrated that preventing nuclear war has become a premier mainstream concern.

For decades, the public by and large left strategic issues to the executive branch. No one in government, least of all Congress, foresaw the stunning growth of the freeze idea, particularly at a time when bread-and-butter issues were becoming more intense.

What took place was a kind of chain reaction. After the glow of détente began to fade, Americans slowly realized that U.S.-Soviet relations were deteriorating. Soviet military power continued to develop and, in Afghanistan, the Soviets drove home to a new political generation the fresh lesson that they were prepared to use naked power.

Most Americans still believed our leaders would manage disagreements with the Kremlin in a fashion to avoid any flirtation with nuclear war. But the Reagan administration's bellicose anti-Soviet rhetoric, combined with its careless and often uninformed references to nuclear war, gave rise to a fear that the distance between political conflict and nuclear catastrophe was narrowing.

There remained an abiding faith that good old American technology would come up with the design for invulnerable nuclear forces and with the means to use them to intimidate the Soviets at minimal risk to ourselves. That idea also died a hand death, as successive schemes for basing the MX

were unveiled and dismissed, and as MX proponents made clear its importance to them as the centerpiece in nightmare scenarios for "nuclear war fighting."

The freeze concept was born in the minds of analysts conversant with nuclear strategy and exasperated by the failure of traditional approaches to arms control. It was an idea simple, audacious and available at a time when the American people realized that humanity was in profound danger.

Whether or not its intellectual premises have been vindicated, freeze forces have challenged the foundations of orthodoxy and shown that the freeze compares favorably to the Byzantine scenarios that led to "dense pack" and "racetrack" before it. They have forced the experts to revisit the essence of the issue: not how best to design imaginary geopolitical scenarios but how best to save civilization from the horror of nuclear destruction.

Sophisticated critics of the freeze resolution seized upon qualifications made in the debate as evidence that the idea and the movement behind it suffered an intellectual and moral defeat. But that the freeze remained unacceptable to the president in a sense confirms its victory. The final vote in the House was therefore the closest we can come to a vote of no confidence.

Were this to be the only outcome, we would now be facing a bleak prospect: yet another president at bay, and unable to lead; a country polarized and unable to support coherent policy; the Soviets at liberty to develop their strengths and play on our weaknesses.

Fortunately, however, something else has occurred. The House has realized that the freeze was not an end in itself but a proposal for a new beginning. Moreover, there now appears to be a consensus that in this new beginning we must try not only to reduce the number of nuclear weapons in the world but also to ensure that nuclear relationships are kept stable. All sides of the debate seem to realize we must eliminate the conditions that would make either superpower fear the other has the means and, therefore, may be harboring the ambition, to carry out a nuclear coup: a first strike that would leave the victim with choice of submission or suicide.

The president, perhaps to his own surprise, now finds himself approaching the same idea, albeit from his own perspective. Because Congress proposed to choose between his conduct of arms control and the audacious freeze, it was imperative for him to make his conduct in arms control and arms planning more persuasive. That led him to expand the charter of the Scowcroft Commission to encompass arms control, and to embrace its recommendations, even though they are in many ways contrary to his original goals.

I believe, along with many of my colleagues, that the long-term recommendations of the report are correct. Arms control and nuclear weapons decisions needs to be integrated into a common strategy focused on the pursuit of stability. Stability requires that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union possess the means to conduct even a theoretically advantageous first strike. Insofar as the development of increasingly more numerous and accurate MIRVed warheads leads toward first-strike capabilities, we must reverse that trend. We can do so by moving toward less threatening nuclear forces with fewer warheads on each side compared to the number of missiles silos on the other side, ideally in a transition orchestrated through arms control.

The president still wants the MX, although he asserts that its deployment is now needed as part of a strategy for achieving the longer-term objectives of the commission report. How this can be so, he has not demonstrated. He correctly sees the idea of a small, single-warhead ICBM as a way to move toward nuclear stability, but the Pentagon suggests that this idea is a price it is willing to pay only under duress, in order to get the MX.

The president asserts that he intends eventually to blend these ideas into a new approach to START, but he states that his existing proposals in Geneva are completely consistent with the Scowcroft recommendations, which they are not.

Once again, the initiative and the burden fall to the Congress and especially to the House. There, a vote in favor of the president's proposals is far more difficult, given all that has happened, than in the Senate. But the Congress, too, has changed. Because of the freeze, there is now some of the same sense of nuance and detail in nuclear matters that formerly was reserved for tax laws and highway construction bills.

Ronald Reagan now has what no other president has had: a Congress that is able to engage in a dialogue on the problems of the nuclear age and that is motivated to support a line of march that makes sense.

Last Monday, two letters—one from a group of senators, the other from a group of representatives—went to the president. Consistent on basic points, they say that agreement is possible with the president on the basis of the Scowcroft Commission report, but that Congress must have at the beginning and at critical points along the way (1) his assurances of support for the report and (2) evidence that he is moving vigorously on arms control and on serious technical questions hanging over MX and the single-warhead ICBM.

The self-education of the House was the result of a political imperative. It makes possible, together with the Scowcroft report and the president's endorsement of it, the beginning of a second round of informed and constructive debate. This debate must turn on a crisply defined objective: stability through arms control. It provides the basis for a durable bipartisan consensus. That, too, should be counted as a victory for the freeze. ●

A TRIBUTE TO HEAD COACH JOHN GURSKI

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct privilege to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. Congress, the achievements of Mr. John Gurski, who is retiring this year as head football coach at Wilson High School.

In recognition of John's outstanding record and achievements as head coach for 19 seasons, many of his admirers, friends, colleagues, and students will be hosting a dinner in his honor to be held June 12 at Stokesay Castle. It is my pleasure to pay tribute to John through these remarks.

Under Coach Gurski's direction the Wilson High School Bulldogs have brought distinction and a high level of success to this school and the community. As head football coach, John's teams have a record of 144 wins, 41 losses, and 3 ties. He was named coach of the year last season by his fellow coaches in the Lancaster-Lebanon League and of Berks County.

For 4 consecutive years he has led his team to the championship of section 1 of the Lancaster-Lebanon League. His 1981 team was ranked third in Pennsylvania. In the last three seasons his teams have attained the outstanding record of 43 wins and 2 losses. His 1980 and 1981 teams tied the Wilson High School record set by the 1978 and 1979 teams for the longest winning streak with 22 consecutive wins. The 1978 team coached by Mr. Gurski finished with an undefeated record of 11 and 0 and was ranked No. 1 in the Middle Atlantic ratings and No. 4 in the State. His 1967 and 1969 teams were also undefeated with 10 and 0 records and they won the championship of the Tri-County Football League. His 1974 team was co-champions of this league. John Gurski was also named coach of the year in 1969 and 1978 by the Reading Eagle and Reading Times newspapers. He also achieved the honor of being selected as one of the east coaches of the Pennsylvania Big 33 game played at Hershey in 1970 and the P.I.A.A. Big 33 game played in Wilkes-Barre in July 1980.

Coach Gurski began his career at Coal Township High School where he served as assistant football coach and head wrestling coach. He then became the head football coach at Minersville High School, which he left to become head football coach at Wilson High School. He had achieved 100 wins as a head football coach by 1971 and reached this goal at Wilson High School in 1977. In 1974, he was selected as the Coach from the State of Pennsylvania to be the recipient of the Master Coaching Award presented by the National Football Clinic in Atlantic City, in recognition of his outstanding achievements.

Mr. Gurski graduated from the University of Pennsylvania with a degree in economics and received his masters degree in education from Bucknell University. He received honorable mention All-American honors in college football. Coach Gurski has always stood as an inspiration to the members of his teams, who have sought his advice and have learned from his years of service and excellence.

He will be sorely missed by his players and all those who love the sport of football. I know that my colleagues will join me in paying tribute to John Gurski on the outstanding job he has done in coaching and working with young people. He is a man of principle

and determination, a man of compassion and dedication—truly a remarkable American. It has been an honor to bring his achievements to the attention of this body and to have the opportunity to wish him success in all his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO JOE PARKER

HON. NORMAN SISISKY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to share with my colleagues the achievements of a very special person, Mr. Joe Parker.

Joe Parker had a vision. As a child, he dreamed that his poor, crime-ridden neighborhood could be a safe, respectable community. He dreamed that the decaying houses of his city of Portsmouth, Va., could become homes that families would be proud to own.

But Joe Parker was more than a dreamer, he was a worker and an achiever. Through this one man's force of will, one of the city of Portsmouth's worst neighborhoods, Mount Hermon, has become a national success story.

Joe Parker distrusted urban renewal, fearing it would destroy black neighborhoods and merely shift ghettos from one site to another.

Instead, he inspired his neighbors, making them believe in the resurrection of their community. He motivated them by example, telling them that belief was not enough, that they had to work to make things possible.

Today, that community serves as a monument to Joe Parker's energy and commitment. Mount Hermon boasts 150 new single-family homes, 40 rehabilitated homes, a new 90-unit cottage development for the elderly and handicapped, and a 296-unit family apartment building.

In all, Mount Hermon has 600 new residential units. Yet the figures cannot show the new streets, and the fierce pride taken by each resident in their own home and in their community. Theirs is not a typical Government operation. In this community, the residents run the program themselves. Thanks to Joe Parker's efforts, 75 percent of the original families stayed to rebuild.

To work the miracle, Joe Parker persuaded the city to apply for Federal urban renewal funds to help his neighbors rebuild. The private investors were willing to take a chance because of Joe Parker's drive and vision. In all, \$16.9 million came from community funding.

In 1980, Joe Parker received an award for the community's design from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Communities

across the Nation called upon him for help in rejuvenating their own communities.

We lost Joe Parker not long ago. He passed away at the age of 55. He will be sorely missed by his family, by his community, and by those of us who worked with him. But he has left behind a fitting tribute, Mount Hermon. Thanks to Joe Parker, it is a living community, with a sense of pride and purpose. ●

AN INFORMED VIEW ON CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to read the views of our former colleague, Bob McClory of Illinois, concerning problems in Central America.

He writes of the difficulties involved in having congressional committees oversee covert intelligence operations. As a former member of the House Select Committee on Intelligence, he knows his subject intimately. I believe our colleagues can benefit from reading his sage advice.

At this point, I wish to insert in the RECORD, "Congress Should Act With Restraint on Central American Issue," by Robert McClory.

CONGRESS SHOULD ACT WITH RESTRAINT ON CENTRAL AMERICAN ISSUE

(By Robert McClory, Former Member of
Congress from Illinois)

Well-grounded fears of an ever-increasing involvement in the political and military battles being waged in Nicaragua and El Salvador are giving rise to demands for the Congress to assume a larger role in covert intelligence decisionmaking.

From the time, the Central Intelligence Agency was established in 1947 until 1974, covert (or secret) projects of our intelligence agencies were undertaken with no accountability whatever to the Congress.

In 1974, the Hughes-Ryan amendment was attached to the Foreign Assistance Authorization bill which required the CIA to report all covert projects to a total of eight House and Senate Committees. Restrained by that kind of requirement, covert actions came virtually to a standstill.

The action taken by the Congress in 1980 reducing the reporting requirement of the intelligence agencies to the two Select Committees on Intelligence, i.e., the House and Senate Select Committees on Intelligence, was intended as a permanent solution to the problems of excessive or ill-conceived "covert" projects.

The specific statutory authority adopted at that time imposes upon the President of the United States the requirement to report all covert activities to these two Congressional Committees "in a timely fashion." Former President Carter interpreted this language to permit him to postpone the reporting of the abortive hostage rescue mission of 1980 until after that covert project

had ended in a stark and humiliating disaster. Despite the tragedy and Carter's inexcusable delay in informing the Members of the House and Senate Intelligence Committees, several members who are sharply critical of President Reagan's present reporting practices were noticeably silent when Carter's representatives finally tried to explain why the mission had been so poorly planned and so miserably executed.

Still, there was no demand then, as there appears to be now that Congressional oversight of covert actions should be subject to approval or "veto" by one or the other of the Congressional intelligence committees.

Too often members of the intelligence committees of the House and Senate are plagued by one or two members who utilize their committee positions for publicity or political ends. This should be particularly noticeable today while great national attention is focused on covert actions in Central America which seem to be largely misunderstood and where the "cover" of some of those participating in the covert actions has been blown by media zealots who regard the public's right to know above the need to protect the identity of those whose safety is endangered by media exposure.

It is or should be no secret that numerous covert actions may be deemed necessary in order to protect our vital national security interests. That responsibility is necessarily vested in the President and the Executive Branch of our government. Any temporary public, Congressional, or media dissatisfaction with decisions relating to our national security should not justify substituting judgments formulated by a committee of the Congress (the legislative branch) for what is necessarily an executive department prerogative.

Some may even question the wisdom of the establishment of the two intelligence committees in the House and Senate. It might be preferable to vest that entire authority in the Executive Branch and then hold the Executive accountable for intelligence failures and abuses. A temporary Congressional committee could then investigate and report its findings. This was the purpose of the Pike and Church Committees which the Congress created in 1975.

A more logical oversight committee for keeping a constant check on the CIA is the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB), currently headed by the very capable Anne Armstrong, former Ambassador to Great Britain and former Presidential Assistant. Such other members of PFIAB as Allan Greenspan and Eugene Rostow are fully competent to review proposed covert actions and probably better able to do so than are the members of the Congressional intelligence committees, all of whom have other committee assignments to attend to.

Individual or committee inspired letters protesting a proposed covert project can be fraught with potentially dangerous consequences as occurred a little over a year ago when erroneous information from such a letter was "leaked" to a newsman. We should be thankful that Qaddafi (who was erroneously identified as the subject of a covert action) did not retaliate militarily or with a terrorist mission.

Another abortive effort to frustrate policy positions in Central America occurred when a "staff report" was published following the initiative of a few members of the House Intelligence Committee. This may have strained relations between the Committee and the CIA but it did nothing to advance our national interests.

The more recent suggestion is for a Congressional "veto" or the substitution of the judgment of the House or Senate Intelligence Committee for what is clearly a responsibility reposed in the President and the intelligence agencies of our nation. Such is not the law today, and it seems unlikely that a Committee of the Congress could fulfill such a role.

Several additional observations seem to me to be pertinent. First, there is the question as to why a policy should be implemented by covert as opposed to overt action. The CIA and other intelligence agencies have a great preference for secret, undercover activity. Even when overt and above-board military or economic aid would have broad public acceptance, the intelligence community seems bent on concealing its actions.

Still, in other instances, the beneficiaries of our aid frequently insist that the aid must be furnished clandestinely. When this develops—as it does—we are left with no alternative but to help our cooperating friends or allies in the manner in which they choose to be aided. That attitude could explain some not so covert actions taking place today in which the American public and the President may be overtly supportive.

At any rate, committees of the Congress can do little or nothing to ease this dilemma as I learned the hard way as a Member of the House Select Committee on Intelligence since its creation in 1976 and until my retirement from the Congress in January of this year.●

PASSAGE OF THE NUCLEAR FREEZE A MISTAKE

HON. RICHARD RAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, while I think that the nuclear freeze resolution has been improved by the 40-plus hours of congressional debate which have been devoted to it, I am still of the opinion that its passage by the House of Representatives is a mistake.

In my judgment, this is not just the right time in our history to approve a nuclear freeze resolution.

The action that we take is important not only for the provisions it contains, but also for the signal that it sends. History tells us that both Tokyo and Berlin closely monitored congressional debate on national defense in the years preceding World War II. Encouraged by the strength of the "peace movement" and by the defeat of numerous rearmament measures, the Axis powers seriously misread America's will and resolve. The consequence was World War II.

I fear that this House is sending the Soviet Union much the same message that it sent Germany and Japan in the late 1930's. Only recently, Mr. Andropov has proposed to the President that warheads as well as missiles should be counted in the START talks as a means of determining a balance between Soviet and NATO nuclear

forces. The Soviet Union seems now to be reluctantly moving toward the conception of reducing arms and not simply strengthening them. I am convinced that this program is the direct result of their perception that the United States has the will and the strength of purpose required to maintain an adequate and creditable deterrent.

There are other problems with a freeze. First among them is verification. It is relatively easy to determine whether or not a nation has specifically reduced the arms and weapons systems it promised to cut back. A freeze is a different proposition. It is very difficult to examine the whole spectrum of a defense complex as intricate as that of the Soviet Union and guarantee that it is maintaining a status quo.

This problem in verification must be measured against the backdrop of the Soviet record of breaking every international agreement they have entered since Yalta.

Mr. Speaker, I honestly believe that we are not debating the question of world peace. All of us are dedicated to that goal with equal fervor and commitment. The difficulty here concerns the best way of getting there.

I firmly believe that mutually agreed upon reduction talks conducted in an atmosphere of respect provide our most viable option. I intend to work as hard as I can to achieve that goal in my service on the special panel appointed by the Armed Services Committee on disarmament. No one will work harder than I will to this end but I think we are making a mistake today and I cannot support House Joint Resolution 13.●

COMMEMORATING ITALIAN- AMERICAN WEEK

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce that this week is being celebrated as Italian-American week in Allentown, Pa., and I, as the Representative of the Lehigh Valley, would like to extend that Italian-American week throughout our Lehigh Valley cities, townships, and boroughs. To culminate the celebration of this week's activities, a special concert presented by the I Paesani Italian Singers and Dancers of the Lehigh Valley, will feature tenor Walter Rinaldi, soprano Patricia Jense, and accompanist Carl Suppa in a special celebration of America's favorite Italian music "From Verdi to Volare." The event, to be held in Allentown's Symphony Hall on May 14, will be a fitting way to end the week-long celebration dedicated to a people

who have contributed much to the greatness of our Nation.

I have the pleasure of representing an area in Pennsylvania which is ethnically diverse. The steel mills, slate quarries, cement factories, foundries, truck assembly lines, and other industries attracted settlers from many parts of the world. They came seeking a better life and chance to start anew in a land filled with hope and promise. Their toil and sweat helped to build a community that was proud and strong. In doing so, they ingrained in their children the knowledge that hard work and dedication paid off, but they also instilled in them an undying love for their heritages. This is what will make May 14 so special. It is a celebration of Italian-American history and culture, of friendships and good times—an event which will be remembered for some time to come.

The Italian-American community throughout the Lehigh Valley can boast of many favorite sons who have risen to the top in their fields. They are the products of a strong foundation laid by the generations that preceded them. Italians began arriving in the Lehigh Valley in the late 19th century and continued coming until the time of the Great Depression. It was not surprising to find many members from the same region or towns in Italy living in close proximity to one another in the Lehigh Valley.

Bethlehem inherited a large number of artisans, who contributed to the growth and welfare of the city. Some became small shopowners dealing in groceries, clothing, and other dry goods. Others became barbers, tailors, and bankers, creating a strong merchant class. Many of these shops became meeting places for recently arrived immigrants to talk of the land they left behind and the dreams they brought with them. Their hard work and desire to get ahead epitomizes the classic American dream; this was the message that was handed to the next generation, and what a generation that was.

I wish I could, for the benefit of my colleagues, list the many Americans of Italian descent who have blessed the Lehigh Valley with their personal, professional, business, political, and artistic success. They range from distinguished professionals to the Nation's top automobile industry executive to successful businessmen and union leaders who have given greatly to our economy and our communities, to nationally renowned artists, to champion athletes, to religious leaders, and to distinguished elected officials—judges, State representatives, and mayors. These many people who have risen to the top in their fields had the benefit of building on the strong foundations laid by the hard work of their forebearers.

We in the Lehigh Valley are proud of the I Paesani singers and dancers and their dedication in preserving the rich and colorful heritage of Italy. The term "I Paesani" means fellow townspeople and is a fitting name to a group whose members' ancestors, no doubt, came from the same villages and towns in Italy. Today, many of their names do not reveal the heritage they honor and love. Yet, when they appear on stage with the men in black trousers and white shirts complemented with a red scarf and the women adorned in their peasant blouses with brightly colored skirts, one can close their eyes and dream of the land which has given the world the vision of a perfect civilization.

I salute the many Americans in the Lehigh Valley of Italian heritage and am proud to share in the commemoration of Italian-American week in the Lehigh Valley. You have contributed to the greatness of our community and individually you have passed on to your children the values of strong family, work ethic, honesty, and integrity. May God bless you.●

LETTER EXCERPTS FROM
SISTER RAQUEL PINAL, OF
OCOTAL, NICARAGUA

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Sister Margaret Cafferty of San Francisco recently delivered a very moving eulogy at the funeral of our late colleague, Phillip Burton. In her eulogy, Sister Cafferty talked about the continuing violence and disorder in Central America, and particularly about the situation in Nicaragua.

Sister Margaret based her remarks on the letters of another member of her order, the Sisters of the Presentation, Sister Raquel Pinal, P.B.V.M., who is living and working in Ocotal, Nueva Segovia, Nicaragua.

The words of Sister Raquel's letters communicate the sense of intimidation and disorder which the continuing war in Nicaragua brings to the innocent citizens of that country. Her letters also illustrate the personal courage of dedication of this dedicated person who is risking her life daily.

These letters contain more than a message of courage. They contain, too, a message of concern about the covert actions which our own Government is undertaking in Nicaragua, actions which have the effect of worsening the crisis and increasing the jeopardy of thousands of innocent victims. This message should be read and weighed by every Member of this body before we vote on further military aid and on

legislation to terminate such covert actions.

Following are excerpts from the letters of Sister Raquel from December 14, 1982, January 13, 1983, March 22, 1983, and April 13, 1983. They were prepared by Sister Margaret.

DEAR MARGARET: * * * Crimes and kidnappings at the border continue almost daily. * * * The couple that hosted the delegation of religious last September in Esteli were both kidnapped (with five others) cutting coffee. The others managed to escape. We know these two have been tortured. This particular couple are very lovely and very dedicated. Had worked in the cursillo movement for years, at present are on the diocesan council. * * * They could have been home with their families and grandchildren. Instead they responded (as we do each Sunday—and go with an armed guard) to pick the coffee that has fallen on the ground. In that the counter-revolutionaries have succeeded—scared off our professional pickers.

We definitely have an undeclared war going on here now. It is getting closer and closer to us physically. The counter-revolutionaries were all over the hills where we were for Easter. Twenty people from our area were kidnapped. The people are understandably frightened. Our frontier units are just heroic. Our own Ocotal Battalion has been at Jalapa for two months: 6 dead, 28 wounded—the last two were kids aged 13 and 15. I have learned to rage within myself—and ask God to help me forgive all those responsible. * * *

Meantime, Nicaragua goes on paving streets, e.g., to the Mercado in Ciudad Sandino, promoting community gardens in the empty Managua lots (so people won't go hungry), building roads, putting in telephones where there never were any, etc. And the poor who appreciate it really appreciate it. It's in their eyes, in their smiles. * * * if I die of a broken heart * * * it won't be because of a loved one, but rather because of the violence of the jealous outsider. * * *

You can't help think many thoughts, so I share the following * * * I hope, if anything happens, that I go bravely, not like a coward. As far as I am concerned, if anything should happen, just promise me you'll raise a big stink for Nicaragua—my life is too precious for me to give it away so lightly and I don't * * * No, it's been marvelous, especially since I turned forth. * * * Believe me, I shall sing and dance to the Lord in gratitude for the resurrection he granted me in Nicaragua.●

THE APARTHEID POLICIES OF
SOUTH AFRICA MUST END

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, this past week the House Committee on Foreign Affairs took up consideration of the foreign aid package for fiscal year 1984. As part of our recommendation, the committee established a set of legally enforceable fair employment standards for U.S. firms op-

erating in South Africa to combat apartheid policies. The fair employment principles adopted by the Foreign Affairs Committee were inspired by the standards drawn up by Rev. Leon Sullivan. The Sullivan principles are currently adhered to voluntarily by many American firms in South Africa. The committee's action prescribes penalties for noncompliance. On May 10, 1983, an article by Reverend Sullivan appeared in the Washington Post. It discusses the history and progress made by the acceptance of the Sullivan principles by some American firms and focuses on the course to take in the future. The article poignantly portrays the injustice and inhumanity of apartheid and poses important steps that can be taken to end this brutal practice of the South African Government. In light of the Foreign Affairs Committee's recent action regarding the Sullivan principles I commend Reverend Sullivan's essay to my colleagues.

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 1983]

IT'S TIME TO STEP UP THE PRESSURE ON
SOUTH AFRICA

(By Leon H. Sullivan)

(The writer, pastor of the Zion Baptist Church in Philadelphia in 1977 drew up the Sullivan principles, a code of employment practices for American firms operating in South Africa.)

The so-called Sullivan principles that I initiated six years ago were intended to bring the actions and influences of American companies in South Africa to bear against the racist practices and apartheid laws of that country. It was my hope that the principles would initiate similar efforts by multinational companies from other parts of the world, thereby creating a global multinational campaign in South Africa against the racial injustices that have existed there for 300 years. It was also my intent that the principles would serve as a catalyst to help change segregation practices in other private and public places throughout the country.

I have attempted to make it clear from the beginning that the principles are not the total solution to the South African problem, and that even if they were implemented to the optimum, the principles alone could not end apartheid. Apartheid is a ruthless, inhumane system of practices and laws deeply embedded in the world's most racist society, and in order for apartheid to be completely eradicated, it requires the combined efforts of many forces, including governments, companies, churches, unions, the United Nations, those who believe in justice within the country, and world public opinion. But it is my firm opinion that the multinational corporations have a major role to play. In the past they have been the main beneficiaries of cheap labor and profits from this evil and unjust system and among its main supporters. It should be the responsibility of these companies to help change that system. Otherwise, they have no moral justification for remaining in South Africa, and should be compelled to leave the country.

The principles were never intended to be a camouflage for corporation to hide behind, but were meant, along with other thrusts, to help end race discrimination and apartheid

in South Africa. It was hoped this could be done by peaceful means, without the need for devastating war and the loss of millions of lives and the predictable involvement of most of the rest of the world, particularly the superpowers, that could lead to an atomic confrontation.

Though progress is still limited in comparison to the enormous size of the problem, the principles are beginning to work. Starting from where we began six years ago, at a near "zero" base where blacks were not even legally considered "employees" in that country, some significant changes are occurring:

Throughout South Africa, plants are being desegregated in spite of the laws.

Blacks and other nonwhites are being upgraded for the first time, to administrative and supervisory jobs.

Blacks are supervising whites, for the first time, in South Africa.

Blacks and nonwhites are being trained for skilled jobs in ever increasing numbers.

Black representative registered and unregistered trade unions are now beginning to be recognized.

Technical schools training blacks and other nonwhites are being built.

Black businesses, in increasing numbers, are being initiated.

Equal pay for equal work is beginning to be instituted.

Companies are beginning to improve the quality of life for blacks and other nonwhites outside the workplace: in housing, health care, and education.

For the first time, some company executives are beginning to lobby for an end to all racial discriminatory laws and the apartheid system.

Also, the principles have led the way in the initiation of similar codes of conduct for companies operating in South Africa from around the world, including a group of South African companies that employ nearly 1 million workers, most of them black.

In conjunction with the principles, the Arthur D. Little Co. has formulated the most stringent and comprehensive measurement requirements for fair employment and social responsibility practices ever developed for multinational corporations operating in a foreign country.

As a result of the principles, the last six years have marked the beginning of a revolution in industrial race relations in South Africa.

Unfortunately, even considering these beginnings, the vast changes necessary are not happening fast enough. The necessity for greater changes—visible, broad, effective and quick—is imperative. No one is more aware than I that the principles and other codes must be pushed harder for greater and faster results. It is my view that if the principles and codes of other nations are enforced and vigorously implemented and monitored, they can work for change, but in order to bring this about, more pressure is needed on the companies for fuller and swifter compliance.

In my opinion, the voluntary support of the principles has been effective, but is not getting the desired results quickly enough. More enforcement is needed. As I have testified before congressional committees on several occasions: "the full compliance with the principles of all American companies with operations in the Republic of South Africa should be made mandatory by the United States government, and backed up with embargoes, tax penalties, sanctions, loss of gov-

ernment contracts and any other effective means."

There are 150 American companies operating in South Africa that have not as yet signed the Sullivan principles, and against those companies there should be immediate divestment actions by stockholders, institutions, pension funds, government bodies and other fiduciaries. These companies represent 20 percent of the investments of American companies in South Africa.

Of the remaining 150 companies that have signed the principles, one-third are receiving "failing grades" in compliance, according to the annual Arthur D. Little report. These companies should be contacted by stockholders and fiduciaries and asked for written assurances they will do better in the coming year, accompanied by a plan for doing so. Otherwise there should be targeted divestment actions against those companies. Companies receiving "passing grades" according to the Little Report should be urged by stockholders to remain in their top categories, or face divestment.

American companies employ less than 1 percent of the workers in South Africa. For these efforts on the part of multinational companies to be broadly visible and effective, participation will have to be global. I have traveled abroad and have urged divestment actions against foreign companies in South African subsidiaries that are not living up to their codes. I have appealed for strong government action by the nations and their parliaments as pressure against company noncompliance.

Foremost, I see the necessity for the recognition of the rights of association for black workers, and the recognition of their representative registered and unregistered trade unions, thereby empowering black workers to speak out for their rights on the job, as they will one day speak out for their rights in society. The growing strength of the black worker is one of the greatest hopes for peaceful change in South Africa.

It is clear that the main problem in South Africa is not just fair employment practices, or equal opportunity, or better schools, as important as all these needs are. The main problem is freedom, including the end to influx control, and end to the incredible homeland policy, and full political equality for the black population. Therefore, beyond the principles, it is my position that until apartheid ends and full equality is achieved for blacks, there should be no new expansion in South Africa by American companies, no new bank loans to the South African government, and no sales to the South African police or military.

Perhaps the Sullivan principles and the other codes in the world will only do so much, and only go so far. Perhaps the only way South Africa can be fundamentally changed is by massive conflict and a devastating war. But I believe that attempts must be made to find peaceful means for change if it is still possible.

If these world multinational company efforts are aggressively initiated, and broadly and effectively applied and closely monitored, they will have to make a difference.

None of us can be sure the total goals of the principles will ultimately be attained; but things are beginning to happen in South Africa as a result of the principles. They are a catalyst for social change in South Africa.

In this endeavor, powerful support will be needed beyond the companies, including unrelenting and much clearer commitments to racial justice in South Africa from the presi-

dent of the United States, Congress and other government leaders and nations. But I have faith that with God's help, and with all the forces for human justice—within and without South Africa—aggressively pursuing their aims, there is still hope for a non-violent solution to the elimination of apartheid. Considering the awesome consequences and magnitude of death and destruction and international upheaval should these efforts fail, somehow we must succeed. ●

**LEWIS LEHRMAN: LET US TALK
MONEY AT WILLIAMSBURG**

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the economic summit meeting this month in Williamsburg, Va., provides an unparalleled opportunity to begin to end the worldwide economic misery which began with the breakdown of Bretton Woods, the last stable international monetary system, in 1971.

One of the foremost advocates of such international monetary reform has been Lewis Lehrman, who was both a distinguished academic and a successful entrepreneur, before becoming an equally dynamic political leader. In an article in today's Wall Street Journal, Lehrman writes:

The evidence is compelling that reconsideration of the world monetary system is overdue. One need only review the history of the last few years in America, Britain, Germany and France, as their economies declined under the weight of the monetary and interest rate disorders engendered by central bank money market manipulation.

The failure of attempts to solve an international problem with national methods is apparent, Lehrman argues: Diligently pursued austerity programs have left 35 million workers unemployed in the major industrial countries. "And so the West sways between expansionist central bank credit policies that lead to the euphoria of inflation, and austerity policies of credit contraction, which lead to the despair of unemployment, and spiritual poverty"—a tradeoff which "has impoverished us all." The economic contraction and monetary instability leads directly to protectionist tendencies which worsen the problem.

Lehrman continues:

The truth is that there is only one economy. It is the integrated world economy. Therefore, national economies need a monetary coordinating mechanism. And that is why an integrated world economy needs a common monetary standard, which is the best neutral international coordinating device. But no national currency will do; only a world currency will work. That is why having national currencies convertible to gold—an international money—has worked in the past and will work again.

Without such a mechanism, Lehrman concludes:

We shall never restore sustained price stability, long-term capital markets at low interest rates, and the investment boom which alone can lead to reasonably full employment. Only the U.S. can take that lead. We must begin at Williamsburg.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this excellent article to my colleagues and thank Lew for his leadership on this vital issue.

The article follows:

LET'S TALK MONEY AT WILLIAMSBURG

(By Lewis E. Lehrman)

Williamsburg is an economic summit without an agenda. That shouldn't be surprising, for the West today has no coherent economic order—unless you count austerity and sacrifice.

Recently, I returned from a trip to European capitals. Central-bank officials and ministers of trade did acknowledge the profound problems of monetary disorder, exchange-rate fluctuations and their protectionist effects. Yet, while the French government now calls for a return to the Bretton Woods system—profoundly flawed itself but certainly more effective than the present float—no minister with whom I spoke believed international monetary problems would be formally discussed at Williamsburg. This pessimism about the possibilities of reform is striking, coming only six months after Treasury Secretary Regan called for a monetary conference.

The issue of international monetary reform and the new arguments for different systems of fixed exchange rates arise from the failures of the managed currency float of the past 10 years. During this period, economies of the West declined and protectionism intensified. Ideas of reform originated in the 1960s, with the purpose of curing the primary defect of Bretton Woods—the reserve currency status of the dollar, which led to a permanent balance-of-payments deficit in the U.S. These ideas have not yet been sufficiently considered. Now is the time to do so.

The evidence is compelling that reconsideration of the world monetary system is overdue. One need only review the history of the last few years in America, Britain, Germany and France, as their economies declined under the weight of the monetary and interest rate disorders engendered by central bank money market manipulation.

In Britain in 1979, Margaret Thatcher's Conservatives campaigned against the Keynesian credit policy of the Bank of England and the sterling depreciations of the Labor government. Mrs. Thatcher's campaign called for a stable currency, economic growth, low interest rates and financial order. After nearly four years of austerity and an unapologetically monetarist central banking policy, Britain still has 13 percent unemployment. Output is no higher than four years ago. Meanwhile, the pound's value fell from \$2.50 to \$1.45—beneath the lowest level under the Labor. The cost of credit, the touchstone of economic growth, hovers at real rates of 8 percent to 10 percent, depending on the quality of the borrower, even as the public-sector borrowing requirement has diminished as a percentage of GNP.

FRANCE'S CURRENCY COLLAPSED

In France, Francois Mitterrand's Socialist campaigned in 1981 against the credit and budget austerity of President Giscard. They promised a statist industrial program of economic expansion. However, Mr. Mitter-

rand's conventional neo-Keynesian policies of government spending and credit expansion led to the collapse of France's currency. The trade deficit grew to \$14 billion a year and domestic inflation intensified. Now, the new Mitterrand policy of austerity, designed to deal with the crisis is, of all things, Thatcherite monetary targeting joined to the most draconian inequity of all—wage and price controls aimed at lowering real wages. Despite the stringency of the Mitterrand austerity, interest rates have risen and unemployment is over 9 percent. He has repudiated the very goals of economic expansion and job growth for which his government was elected.

In Germany in 1982, Helmut Schmidt's Social Democrats also presided over rapidly rising unemployment occasioned by the government-sponsored Bundesbank policy of credit austerity, monetary targeting and high interest rates. By the summer of 1982, Mr. Schmidt's coalition fell apart as his Free Democrat allies, sensing repudiation, switched affiliation to the Christian Democrats. What made Hans Dietrich Genscher and his Free Democrats jump ship was massive defections from the Schmidt economic policy, as measured by opinion polls. Germans of both parties rejected the policies of austerity.

Capitalizing on discontent with austerity, Helmut Kohl's CDU negotiated a deal with the FDP and shrewdly called for early elections in March 1983. They won those elections by a decisive margin, campaigning for a program of economic recovery.

In the U.S., President Reagan came to office in 1980 after a brilliantly successful campaign based on job creation, new investment, stable money, lower interest rates and economic growth. It is true that inflation has come down. And it is true that, unlike most of his Western European counterparts, Mr. Reagan has significantly reduced marginal tax rates. But the real cost of credit for homes and business is still unacceptably high. Industrial production does not yet exceed 1979 levels. There are still over 11 million unemployed.

The credit policy of Fed Chairman Paul Volcker has brought down inflation while producing one of our greatest recessions, a world banking crisis, and a political setback for the Republicans in November 1982. But the policy of monetary austerity, and the recession it caused, was not President Reagan's program of 1980. It was instead the policy of the Fed and the Office of Management and Budget. Like Mrs. Thatcher, Mr. Reagan unwittingly fell into the trap of his advisers who advocated credit austerity.

And so the West sways between expansionist central bank credit policies that lead to the euphoria of inflation, and austerity policies of credit contraction, which lead to the despair of unemployment and spiritual poverty. In a larger sense, and to some practical extent, this stop-go economics has impoverished us all. European and American workers are punished by Socialists and Conservatives for the "sin" of wanting wages that keep up with inflation.

In the meantime, because of unemployment, Western governments are preoccupied with the balance of trade—an all-time fallacy. The specter of protectionism is on the rise. But our disorders in the world trading system cannot be cured by GATT or by trade agreements. Those disorders are monetary in origin. Protectionism thrives on competitive exchange-rate policies, brought about by the abrupt currency depreciation

and appreciations of well-meaning but uncertain central bankers and politicians.

Many central bank officials in Europe speak with pride about the new austerity. They look with equanimity on the 35 million unemployed of the OECD countries. The question is: Must policy makers put 2.5 million people out of work in Germany, 3 million in Britain, 11 million in the U.S.—in order to reduce inflation? Surely those who still believe in the future of the Free World and in the American dream must answer: No, there is a better way. Only national and international monetary reform can cure our monetary disorders.

It was the German monetary reform of 1948, based on a new convertible currency—a deutschemark tied to gold—that along with deregulation produced the German Miracle. It was the creation in 1959 of a convertible gold franc, which brought forth the savings and investment, that made the Fifth Republic of De Gaulle rich enough to create both nuclear defense and national prosperity. The gold convertibility of the dollar, and multilateral convertibility in Europe—the hallmarks of the Bretton Woods system—created the conditions for postwar prosperity. But the Bretton Woods system had the great flaw of being based on the official reserve currency status of the dollar.

SYSTEM IS IN DEEP TROUBLE

The monetary order of Bretton Woods was never reformed in this respect. As a result, when the dollar collapsed in 1971, Bretton Woods collapsed too, just as Prof. Jacques Rueff and Robert Triffin forecast in 1959.

There is no major country yet willing to look at the fundamental flaw of the international economic system: the notion of political leaders that national economic and monetary policy can be made independent of the world economy.

The truth is that there is only one economy. It is the integrated world economy. Therefore, national economies need a monetary coordinating mechanism. And that is why an integrated world economy needs a common monetary standard, which is the best neutral international coordinating device. But no national currency will do; only a world currency will work. That is why having national currencies convertible to gold—an international money—has worked in the past and will work again.

Even Mrs. Thatcher was recently quoted as saying: "It's absolutely vital for us to jointly pursue policies which enable us to get and keep interest rates down and to keep inflation down." There is such a policy. The policy of convertible currencies, linked to an international monetary standard, is the only one which has worked reasonably well in the past. The policy is imperfect, as are all human institutions; but a system of fixed exchange rates which is the incidental by product of the real international gold standard is the least imperfect of the international monetary systems we know. Without such a free-world monetary order we shall never restore sustained price stability, long-term capital markets at low interest rates, and the investment boom which alone can lead to reasonably full employment.

Without a reformed monetary system of multilateral, unrestricted convertibility of the major Western currencies into gold, we shall continue in a topsy-turvy world, oscillating between autarky and entropy. Incredibly, Socialists will talk of reducing the real wages of workers to increase profits and end trade imbalances, as they do now in France. And self-styled anti-Keynesian Conserv-

atives will rely on neo-Keynesian central bank credit expansion to create economic booms in order to end austerity and get re-elected.

The international monetary system is in deep trouble; we won't just muddle along much longer. The time to deal with the so-called "structural" problems of our monetary order is now. If we do, we can once again create conditions of rapid non-inflationary growth. If we don't make the reforms, sooner or later the world economy will founder.

Only the U.S. can take the lead. We must begin at Williamsburg.●

UNCTAD RESOLUTION

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution relating to U.S. participation in the sixth meeting of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), which will take place in June in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. The purpose of the resolution is to highlight American interests in UNCTAD and to place the Congress on record regarding various issues UNCTAD will address next month.

The Western industrialized countries have tended to view UNCTAD as another acronym in the alphabet soup of U.N. agencies. The developing nations, on the other hand, attach considerable importance to this organization. The developing countries sparked the creation of UNCTAD in 1964. They regard it as the principal world forum for debating international economic matters. UNCTAD has played a pivotal role in shaping the agenda for North-South economic discussions, and is, in fact, a barometer for judging the developing nations' attitudes toward key international trade, monetary and development issues.

The United States has a vital stake in the economic health of the developing countries. They represent a larger export market for American commodities, goods and services than Western Europe; the level of their imports from the United States is four times that of Japan. The developing nations are also the only source of supply for a number of raw materials critical to our industries. They are becoming an increasingly important source for our finished products.

UNCTAD has wielded significant influence in the economic dialog between the First and Third Worlds, and has taken a surprising number of actions in the last 19 years that affect the conduct of U.S. foreign economic relations today.

One hundred and thirty-three countries participated in the first UNCTAD meeting in 1964. At UNCTAD I, 77 developing nations joined together in

support of a common program. This block was christened the Group of 77. The G-77, as it is called in U.N. parlance, often sets the agenda for U.N. conferences.

The second UNCTAD conference, held in 1968, adopted a resolution urging the industrialized nations to contribute at least 1 percent—now 0.7 percent—of their annual GNP to development in the Third World. This figure is the benchmark against which the Third World judges the First World's commitment to development.

The 1972 UNCTAD meeting gave birth to the concept of the least of the less-developed countries, or LLDC's, whose annual per capita income is \$340 or less. Two years later, the Congress drew upon this notion for the new directions mandate in the U.S. Foreign Assistance Act: Our foreign aid should be directed toward meeting the basic human needs of the poorest of the world's poor.

The U.N. General Assembly's sixth special session in 1974 endorsed the developing world's call for a new international economic order (NIEO)—an idea spawned at UNCTAD's II and III. The NIEO continues to serve as the Third World's international economic platform. NIEO has, in turn, generated calls for other, new international orders, such as the new world information order being debated in UNESCO.

In addition to these products, which have become common currency in discussing global economic matters, the generalized system of preferences (GSP), the integrated program for commodities (IPC), and the Common Fund—which seeks to stabilize price fluctuations for selected commodities—and the codes of conduct on line (shipping) conferences, the transfer of technology, and restrictive business practices are all children of UNCTAD. Whether the United States chooses to acknowledge the decisions and standards set by UNCTAD, the developing countries use these yardsticks to measure our actions in the international economic arena. Our increasing dependence upon the global economy and particularly upon trade with the Third World argue in favor of the United States pursuing a constructive dialog with the developing nations in UNCTAD.

The extent to which the U.S. economy is linked to those of the developing nations is readily underscored by the following:

U.S. exports to the Third World have tripled during the last 5 years;

Our exports to developing nations exceed our exports to all of industrialized Europe and are four times greater than our exports to Japan;

Developing countries buy nearly 40 percent of U.S. manufactured exports, and some 6 percent of all our manu-

facturing jobs produce for exports to the Third World;

About 2 million American jobs are generated by all U.S. exports to developing nations;

One out of every 10 acres of our farmland produces solely for food exports to the developing world, and over the past 10 years, the Third World has increased the amount of farm products bought from the United States by 35 percent: From \$2 billion to more than \$14 billion;

We import roughly 50 billion dollars worth of commodities annually from the nonoil producing developing nations; and

The United States depends upon the Third World for 100 percent of our national rubber needs, 96 percent of our tin—essential to the electronics industry—88 percent of our bauxite—vital to our aircraft industry—and 75 percent of our cobalt—needed by the steel and nuclear industries.

Healthy economies in the developing countries serve our national interest. As these nations develop, they become larger and better customers for our farm and industrial products, larger and better markets for American investments, and more accessible and reliable sources of raw materials essential to our economy and national defense. In short, our growing economic interdependence with the developing countries would dictate that we not sit on the sidelines in Belgrade next month, but that the United States assume a forthcoming, positive, and active role in the debate over issues of vital importance to both the developed and developing nations.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution I am introducing encourages U.S. cooperation, not confrontation with the more than 160 countries that will gather at UNCTAD VI. However, some proposals on the UNCTAD VI agenda are simply incompatible with our interests. We do not, for example, agree with the need to create additional international institutions, nor are we in a position at this time to commit massive amounts of resources to new commodity price support programs. Moreover, there are items on the agenda that are clearly outside the organization's mandate. While we must resist such measures, there are a number of areas in which the United States can make a positive contribution.

The resolution urges the U.S. delegation to UNCTAD VI to pursue a constructive exchange of views with the developing countries on world trade, monetary and development issues, and to resist decisions that are the responsibility of other international organizations, such as the GATT, the IMF, and the World Bank. The operative sections of the resolution urge the President: First, to pursue consultations with our allies and other like-

minded states for the purpose of formulating common positions for and to seek practical and mutually beneficial solutions at UNCTAD VI; second, to designate a high-level U.S. delegation to represent us at UNCTAD VI; and third, to instruct our delegation to engage in broad and serious discussions with other countries on the state of the world economy, major problems and issues affecting both industrialized and developing nations, and to explore solutions which will enhance global peace, prosperity, and development.

The state of the world economy has changed drastically since the last UNCTAD session in Manila in 1979. UNCTAD VI should be viewed as an opportunity to review the events of the past 4 years, to explore areas of common concern to the First and Third Worlds, and to seek mutually beneficial solutions. The actions taken at UNCTAD VI could have profound consequences for vital U.S. interests. It is incumbent upon the United States to play a leading role in the debate in Belgrade next month. ●

BOLD INITIATIVE ON SEMICONDUCTOR TARIFF POLICY

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, the Semiconductor Industry Association testified before the Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee on H.R. 1953, a bill I have introduced to eliminate the tariff on six items of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (687.70, 687.72, 687.74, 687.77, 687.81, and 687.85).

The bill is designed to improve the competitiveness of the U.S. semiconductor industry by reducing tariff and personnel costs and to induce Japan to reciprocate. As the SIA witness, Mr. Roger C. Damm, Motorola's director of sector business planning, testified:

It is estimated that the benefits of duty elimination for our customers and the semiconductor industry would amount to roughly \$100 million annually. As compared with some other recent proposals for U.S. Government support to U.S. electronics producers through research projects funded by the Government, duty elimination is a much more efficient and equitable method for achieving similar objectives. Instead of creating more bureaucracy, it eliminates some existing bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of this industry and the importance of ensuring its future competitiveness with Japan, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the full text of the SIA's testimony:

STATEMENT OF ROGER C. DAMM, DIRECTOR OF SECTOR BUSINESS PLANNING, MOTOROLA, INC.

SIA has been and remains a strong advocate of free market competition. We welcome a world with no barriers or distortions to trade in our products, where individual companies are free to compete solely on the basis of their individual competences. At the same time, we recognize that we are a long way from that ideal and that our industry needs to continue to work actively with the U.S. Government toward this objective. SIA believes that the elimination of U.S. semiconductor duties as proposed by Representative Stark in H.R. 1953 would be a constructive step in the right direction.

Members of this Subcommittee will recall the recent U.S.-Japanese agreement to accelerate the full MTN tariff reductions on semiconductors, which took effect in 1982. This agreement was a major negotiating accomplishment made possible only with your support. At the time of that negotiation, SIA urged that the two governments commit to the additional step of duty elimination. We understand that Japan balked at that idea and has indicated it is unwilling to negotiate further tariff reductions unless the European Community reduces its 17 percent duty on semiconductors (which it refused to do during the MTN). While we understand Japan's concern about that high tariff barrier, we do not believe that a European policy that inflicts damage on its own semiconductor consumers should determine United States and Japanese tariff levels.

Unless Japan's negotiating position changes we think it will be difficult if not impossible for the United States to negotiate further tariff reductions on semiconductors. By setting an example ourselves we believe there is a good prospect Japan can be induced to also unilaterally eliminate its tariff. The Japanese Government has been under great pressure to further open the Japanese market, which undoubtedly will continue in the face of the deteriorating bilateral United States trade balance with Japan. Their response has been a series of "liberalization" packages consisting mainly of tariff cuts and relaxation of technical barriers. We believe that one component of a future package can be semiconductor duty elimination if the United States indicates it will unilaterally eliminate its tariff.

U.S. duty elimination alone would make 40 percent of the world semiconductor market duty-free. If Japan follows that will rise to 65 percent. With Europe as the only significant exception to duty-free trade, it is quite possible that internal pressures would develop from European semiconductor consumers to join the United States and Japan. Certainly, a 17 percent components cost disadvantage in highly competitive industries like computers and telecommunications will cause concern in European nations that already are lagging behind foreign competition.

From the standpoint of future negotiations on semiconductor tariffs with Europe or Japan, United States duty elimination would maintain United States negotiating leverage because it would not be bound in the GATT. Thus the United States could return the duty back to 4.2 percent at any time without cause for retaliation. This lack of binding in the GATT also may be another inducement for Japan to act unilaterally if we do.

Beyond promoting freer trade in semiconductors there are two sound national interest reasons for duty elimination.

First, it would improve the competitiveness of our customers by lowering their costs as the tariff savings are passed through to the U.S. market. This would be an advantage in the kind of intensive international competition our customers face due to the targeting of their industries by Japan and other nations.

Second, it would improve the world competitiveness of the U.S. semiconductor industry in at least three respects. Most U.S. producers perform final assembly of semiconductors offshore and pay duties under 806-807. To some extent those duty savings would be retained by U.S. firms for use in research and investment, at a time when the industry's capital requirements are high. Savings would also be realized from the elimination of the substantial duty-related paperwork burden and similar savings would occur for the Government. Finally, lower semiconductor prices are likely to generate additional customers and business revenues.

I don't believe that duty elimination will cause any significant manufacturing operations to move offshore. The effective duty is too small to be the decision factor on plant location. Other factors are far more critical. In fact, the increasing capability to automate production is leading some companies to do more final assembly in the United States. In our own case, we are nearing completion of a state-of-the-art manufacturing plant in Chandler, Arizona.

It is estimated that the benefits of duty elimination for our customers and the semiconductor industry would amount to roughly \$100 million annually. As compared with some other recent proposals for U.S. Government support to U.S. electronics producers through research projects funded by the Government, duty elimination is a much more efficient and equitable method for achieving similar objectives. Instead of creating more bureaucracy, it eliminates some existing bureaucracy.

An inevitable question that arises is how SIA can propose duty elimination while complaining about the damaging effects of Japan's targeting practices in the United States market as detailed in our recent study—the results of which have been presented to you on other occasions. The answer is simple. The 4 percent tariff clearly has not had any effect in deterring such practices. When Japanese producers cut 64K RAM prices from \$25-30 per unit to about \$5 per unit in a little over a year, or when exchange rates shift by 20-40 percent in a short period of time, a 4 percent duty is irrelevant. Besides an MFN duty is a very dull tool for dealing with problems caused by a single country. Such particular problems are better pursued in a more focused manner, as we have been doing most recently in the context of the United States/Japan high tech group.

Mr. Chairman, SIA asks the Committee to give urgent consideration to Representative Stark's bill or the equivalent thereof and to act favorably upon it.●

**HUGH AND DOROTHY DE LACY:
LIFELONG ACTIVISTS FOR
SOCIAL JUSTICE**

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

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

pay tribute to the lifelong struggles of two of my constituents, Hugh and Dorothy De Lacy, who have spent many many years working in the causes of freedom, equality, and social justice.

The De Lacy's struggle extends back to the ravages of the Great Depression and the valiant but unsuccessful effort to prevent fascism from triumphing in Spain. During the 1940's, Hugh and Dorothy worked for the causes of full employment, peace, and prosperity—Dorothy as an organizer and activist, Hugh as a city councilman in Seattle and Member of Congress from 1944 to 1946. In the late 1940's and 1950's, their commitment to the goals of world peace, an end to the nuclear arms race, and racial integration was tested by the dark forces of McCarthyism. Their continued dedication to the struggle in the face of the most severe obstacles serves as a continuing inspiration to all of us who know the De Lacy's. Their work has continued to this day, taking the form of activism and fundraising on behalf of local political causes in the Santa Cruz area.

Mr. Speaker, Hugh and Dorothy De Lacy's lifelong activism is evidence of a faith in progress and in our democratic system which we can all share and admire. The causes to which they have dedicated their lives—peace, jobs, an end to race and sex discrimination, a halt to the costly and dangerous arms race—are causes for which we are still working today. The struggle of the De Lacy's, their commitment and their integrity, reinforce our own faith and conviction that the cause of social justice will triumph in the end. I commend their work, and I join in their hope and their belief in a better tomorrow for all of us.●

**TAX REFORM AND THE OIL
INDUSTRY**

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday and Friday, the Ways and Means Oversight Subcommittee held 2 days of hearings on the special tax subsidies available to oil producers.

One of the best pieces of testimony was provided by Mr. Robert S. McIntyre, director of Federal tax policy for Citizens for Tax Justice.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that this Nation could afford both guns and butter, if everyone paid their fair share of taxes. But oilmen, who love to wrap themselves in the flag of national security and energy independence, do almost nothing to support the National Treasury.

Mr. McIntyre's testimony shows once again the truth of FDR's statement in his second inaugural:

We have always known that heedless self-interest was bad morals; we know now that it is bad economics.

The most economically inefficient and morally corrupt part of the United States Tax Code is the section on oil. Mr. McIntyre describes oil taxation as the greasy situation it is. I would like to enter portions of his excellent statement at this point in the RECORD.

A look at the annual reports to stockholders of some of the publicly held independent producers provides fascinating, concrete insights into the benefits they have gained from their political investments. The nine randomly chosen companies in the accompanying chart, for example, earned a total of \$476 million in 1982, but only three of them paid any federal income taxes at all. As a group, they received a net tax refund of \$17.5 million. Of the nine, five paid no federal income taxes in 1981, and four of these paid nothing in 1980.

These companies are not likely to be paying taxes in the future either. Many of them note that they are carrying excess deductions and credits forward for use in later years. For example, Mesa Petroleum says it has \$129 million in "loss" carryforwards and \$29 million in investment tax credit carryforwards; Inexco has \$164 million in excess deductions and \$9 million in excess credits. Some of the companies took advantage of "tax leasing" last year to make use of the overflow of tax concessions. For example, Mesa sold tax breaks for \$19 million in 1982; Lear Petroleum sold an unspecified amount. Last year's Treasury report on leasing found that, through the end of 1981, crude oil producers had sold tax breaks for \$164 million (and this figure does not include another \$138 million in sales by petroleum refiners).

Last December, at the request of Representatives Pease and Dorgan, the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation took a look at the 1981 taxes of five large crude oil producers. The companies studied were Occidental Petroleum, MAPCO, Superior Oil, Natomas, and Louisiana Land & Exploration, which together earned \$3.9 billion world-wide before-tax in 1981, and about \$1 billion in the United States. Overall, the staff found a federal income tax rate on domestic income of 3.1 percent, including, apparently, Occidental's zero rate and Louisiana Land's 10 percent rate.

1982 FEDERAL INCOME TAXES (OR REFUNDS) FOR NINE
RANDOMLY SELECTED INDEPENDENT OIL PRODUCERS

Company	Pretax income (millions)	Federal income tax (millions)	Effective tax rate (percent)
Mesa Petroleum Corp. ¹	\$195.5	0	0
Louisiana Land & Exploration Co.	111.3	(\$19.7)	-17.7
Apache Corp.	44.4	2	.4
Adobe Oil & Gas Co. ¹	37.4	1.9	5.0
Inexco Oil Co. ¹	26.7	0	0
Felmont Oil Corp.	22.7	3.0	13.3
Dyco Petroleum Corp.	21.7	(2.9)	-13.2
Damson Oil Corp. ¹	10.0	0	0
Lear Petroleum Corp. ¹	6.3	0	0
Total	476.0	(17.5)	-3.7

¹ Zero Federal tax in 1981.

Note: Pretax income refers to net income before Federal income taxes (but after deducting any State or foreign taxes paid). Federal income tax refers to taxes actually paid, that is, "current" Federal taxes (and does not include so-called deferred taxes, which are taxes not paid due to various shelters.

Source: 1982 annual reports.

Currently, the federal government faces a fiscal crisis. Huge deficits as far as the eye

can see threaten to keep long-term interest rates high and abort whatever recovery we experience this year. Much of the blame for those deficits rests on the special-interest politics that dominated tax writing in much of the 1970s and especially in 1981. Corporate "tax expenditures," which were only \$7 billion in 1970, are estimated to total \$56 billion this year, and \$83 billion by 1986. In fiscal 1983, the federal government will provide \$1.60 in corporate loopholes for every dollar it collects in corporate income taxes, up from 60 cents on the dollar in 1979 and only 20 cents on the dollar in 1970. At the same time that the business tax base has been eroded, "bracket creep" and rising social security taxes have pushed up taxes on average Americans, most of whom will continue to pay a higher share of their income in taxes than they did in 1980 despite the so-called "across-the-board" tax reductions of 1981.

Many members of Congress are now searching for ways to increase federal revenues that make the tax system more rather than less fair. That is, they would like to raise money, while avoiding further increases in the tax burdens on middle- and lower-income Americans.

As the 1982 tax act proved, such a result can be achieved, but only by targeting tax hikes on those taxpayers who currently are failing to contribute adequately to the support of the government. These hearings, therefore, come at an auspicious time, since one industry that we know is not paying its fair share of income taxes is the independent oil producers.

The stated purpose of these hearings is to evaluate whether continued tax breaks for oil income make sense in the current environment (or indeed if they ever made any sense). In light of the pressing need to raise revenues and to improve tax fairness, the burden should be on the proponents of these tax loopholes to justify their retention.

What do defenders of oil loopholes offer to support the special tax concessions? Typically, they have three things to say: First, they argue that exploring for oil is a risky business. Second, they say that independent oil producers are fine examples of American entrepreneurship. And, third, they maintain that tax shelters are essential to attract sufficient capital to the oil business.

What these arguments boil down to is just one assertion: that the marketplace on its own provides insufficient return to encourage drilling for oil. Or, put another way, the bottom-line defense of oil tax breaks is apparently that a dollar's worth of oil is worth more than a dollar.

Economist Arnold Harberger once calculated that the various oil tax breaks made it profitable to spend \$1.95 to drill \$1 worth of oil. A 1968 Treasury study found that the depletion allowance at that time was costing average taxpayers more than \$9 for every dollar in added oil reserves. A recent Congressional Research Service study (April 13, 1983) found that effective tax rates on independent oil producers are still "negative," that is, profits are higher after-tax than before-tax (a fact reflected in the chart above).

One need not be a hide-bound free-market capitalist to wonder why it makes sense to encourage spending more money to drill for oil than the oil is worth. Such activities are usually called "waste."

1. For a fuller examination of the tax-shift policies of the past several years, and how they have hurt both tax fairness and

the economy, we recommend CTJ's new book, *Inequity & Decline*, just published by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

What waste means in these circumstances is that the tax laws encourage the diversion of capital funds toward oil and away from other investments. It's easy to understand why U.S. Steel prefers to buy Marathon Oil rather than invest in modern steel plants, but it's not so easy to understand why the federal government wants to provide incentives for such activity.

A closer look at the two major oil-specific tax breaks—percentage depletion and the expensing of intangible drilling costs—raises further questions. For example, without expensing for IDCs, risky exploratory drilling would be encouraged, since dry holes would be entitled to an immediate write-off in any case. By extending the same treatment to successful wells, the tax laws discourage exploratory drilling in favor of punching new holes in old fields. Percentage depletion, which is only available for successful wells, has a similar impact.

Some have suggested that now might be a bad time to raise oil taxes, since falling oil prices have created difficulties for some producers. This is a false argument. Added income taxes will not affect those producers which have no income. What we are talking about is requiring those companies which are profitable to contribute a fair share of their income to help support the federal government. This does not seem too much to ask.

These hearings could help give the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress an opportunity to close or narrow oil tax loopholes that for years have proven to be both extremely expensive and economically counterproductive. Scaling back or phasing out percentage depletion, requiring intangible drilling costs to be amortized over the useful life of productive wells, extending the depreciation period for oil refineries to 10 years (instead of the current five years), tightening the rules on oil foreign tax credits further, and so on are the kind of steps we suggest. They could contribute to a 1983 tax bill that protects middle- and lower-income Americans from further increases in their tax burdens, while at the same time moving back toward federal fiscal responsibility.●

TERESA HEFFERNAN IS HONORED AT MATER DEI HIGH SCHOOL

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in commending a constituent of mine who has been a major positive influence in the lives of many students at Mater Dei High School.

Teresa Heffernan is being honored on May 26, 1983 for her 25 years of dedicated service to Mater Dei High School. Mrs. Heffernan has contributed greatly to the home economics department by her pioneering spirit in the dissemination of education through the various forms of media and by demonstrating her patience

and challenging spirit in opening this field to the young men at Mater Dei.

Mrs. Heffernan has exemplified the spirit of Mater Dei to both faculty and students by her continued loyalty, support, and service. She has shown great concern for each individual student's growth, interests, and values as deemed necessary to shape their educational goals. Mrs. Heffernan's dedicated efforts on behalf of the youth of Mater Dei have earned her the highest respect from all of those who have had the pleasure of working with her.

For her outstanding dedication on behalf of both the students and fellow teachers of Mater Dei High School, Teresa Heffernan is to be commended. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I ask my colleagues to join me and my community in honoring Teresa Heffernan for her 25 years of dedicated service.●

WATSONVILLE'S DEBT TO BILL JOHNSTON

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute today to Bill Johnston, who is retiring after a distinguished tenure as mayor of Watsonville, Calif.

Bill Johnston has served the citizens of Watsonville in various capacities for over 30 years. First as a member and leader in various community service groups; then as a city councilman; and finally elected mayor by wide margins for three 4-year terms, Bill has contributed enormously to Watsonville's development, to its growth and its progress. Watsonville's residents have taken a new pride in their city under his leadership, because he has always understood and relied on the basic qualities that make Watsonville what it is—energetic, hard working, and independent.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Johnston exemplifies the best traditions of public service. He has dedicated himself to the interests of the Watsonville community, and the community and its citizens have prospered as a result. His contribution will be felt for a long time to come, and his record will continue to serve as a model and an inspiration for all of us.

I would like to take this opportunity to wish Bill the greatest success and happiness in all his future endeavors, and to hope as well that we will continue to benefit from his wisdom, his experience, and his guidance.●

PROFESSOR WILLIAM J. QUIRK
TESTIFIES ON IMF BEFORE
HOUSE BANKING SUBCOMMITTEE

HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, William J. Quirk, professor of law at the University of South Carolina, testified before the Subcommittee on International Trade, Investment and Monetary Policy of the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. I believe his remarks make very interesting reading, and I would like to take this opportunity to share his statement with my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM J. QUIRK, PROFESSOR OF LAW, SCHOOL OF LAW, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I am honored to accept your invitation to appear before you today.

Over the past 10 years the West has given away its wealth to Reds, Arabs and Third Worlders in the greatest transfer of capital in the history of the world. We have given away some \$800 billion of accumulated wealth and all the figures are not in.

To be sure, they were not called gifts when they were made—no Congress appropriated the foreign aid—they were called loans and they were made by international bankers. The bankers had figured out a way to profit from brokering away the West's wealth.

They had two cover stories—called "Détente" and "Recycling." What was "Détente"? The American public was highly skeptical about détente; but, since Congress never appropriated any money or passed any laws, and since there was no apparent cost, the opposition had nothing to grab onto. To the Russians it was not vague at all—it had a very clear and concrete purpose. In the late 1960s, after 50 years of Party rule, the Soviet economy was bust. In 1968 the Red tanks rolled into Prague to snuff out the beginnings of freedom. The Reds knew that economic freedom had to lead to political freedom and, ultimately, the overthrow of the Party. At the same time, they had to raise standards of living and increase military spending. The solution was "détente"—the importation of Western technology and credit—at no cost, since they were not going to pay back the loans; and at no risk to Party rule, since the new technology was simply grafted onto the centrally planned economy. Lenin said the capitalists would sell him the rope with which he would hang them. Brezhnev wanted the rope on easy credit.

It could not be done constitutionally—no Congress could vote funds to give welfare to Russia, but David Rockefeller thought it could be arranged. With the bankers providing the money, the Comecon debt to Western bankers rolled from \$8 billion in 1973 to \$80 billion in 1981. David Rockefeller, in 1979, explained his theory: "Just because a country is technically called Communist doesn't mean a capitalist institution such as the Chase bank can't deal with them on a mutually beneficial basis; and, indeed, we do deal with most of the so-called Communist

countries of the world on a basis that has worked out very well, I think, for both of us."

The bankers' money financed the Soviet armaments build-up. Any dollar you give your enemy frees up his other resources and permits him to spend more on missiles. In some cases, the military aid has been direct. Chase loaned \$150 million dollars to construct the Kama Ford truck plant. The world watched these trucks move the Red Army into Afghanistan. The multi-billion dollar Hula Katowice steel works in Poland is served by one railroad—the railroad heads straight East. Mr. Thomas Theobald, head of Citibank's international division, puts the issue simply: "Who knows which political system works? The only thing we care about is: can they pay their bills?" Taking a page from Mr. Theobald's book and putting things simply—the simple phrase that comes to mind is economic treason.

Then there was OPEC and "Recycling." Again the public was in the dark and the Congress was by-passed. In 1973, the Arabs decided to go out of the oil business and into the tax collection business. They sought to extend their corner on oil to all of the West's capital and real wealth. The bankers financed the tax collection. Poor countries couldn't pay their tax, so the banks loaned money to Zaire so it could pay its tax to the Arabs, who then deposited their tax collections back in the banks. That set up a classic debt merry-go-round or Ponzi scheme. Each year the banks had to lend Zaire more for that year's tax collection, plus interest on the old principal. Every Ponzi scheme depends on new money, and new money in accelerating amounts as the debt snowballs. The figures show we are now in the last stages. In 1978 the total volume of international debt of developing nations was \$340 billion; in 1982 it was \$640 billion. Already we hear the IMF appropriation will not be enough. Third Worlders say the only insurance company that would be enough is the U.S. treasury.

In 1972, the Arabs received \$24 billion from the rest of the world; in 1982, they received \$230 billion. The Saudis—with a lifting cost of 50 cents a barrel—were collecting \$40 a barrel. Since all oil prices followed OPEC up in the United States, the cost of oil went from \$20.3 billion in 1972 to \$225 billion in 1981. The extra cost came to \$820 per person or \$3,300 for a family of four. An incredible foreign tax imposed upon Americans and financed by the banks (the price of oil bases on the 1952-60 standard—adjusted for CPC—is \$6.46 per barrel). The extra-territorial tax was imposed upon us not only by OPEC, but by non-OPEC producers who followed the cartel price—the Mexicans, the British, the Russians. The United States, which in 1972 had the world's highest standard of living, was tied with France for tenth in 1982.

Recycling and Détente are closely related. Recycling, essentially, is a price support system for oil. The banks guaranteed that OPEC would receive the cartel price. The main beneficiary is the world's largest producer of oil—the Soviet Union. In 1982 the Soviet's received \$16 billion in oil revenues; in essence, a Russian tax on the west. Oil provided 60 percent of Moscow's hard currency reserves. A drop in the price of oil to market levels would be a severe blow to the Reds. The Administration, however, does not grasp the opportunity. Instead, it is engaged in a coordinated effort to keep the price of oil up. One example is the IMF appropriation before you which will provide

funds so the poor countries can continue to pay the cartel price for oil. The IMF even provides direct support to the OPEC cartel. Venezuela, the Wall Street Journal reports, will soon apply for funds; Ecuador already has an IMF agreement. Nigeria may soon appear. The absurdity of providing funds to OPEC countries to tide them over a bad time should be clear to any reasonable person. U.S. policy, instead of financing the cartel, should be aimed at destroying it, which would give American business a strong boost without inflation. If Venezuela has a debt problem, let them sell some oil at market prices; same for Nigeria.

By financing the OPEC oil tax beginning in 1973-74, the bankers killed U.S. business with a double blow—first the oil tax itself and then to finance it, they shipped the money overseas—creating a shortage of money at home and driving interest rates up. In 1972, the rate on prime commercial paper was 4.7 percent and mortgages were 8 percent.

At the same time the bankers were rolling over Poland, Romania, Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Argentina, they—in 1982 alone—drove 50,000 American businesses into bankruptcy. The owners of established businesses could not make them go at 20 percent interest and \$40 a barrel oil. The results were devastating: in the 1970s American labor lost 30-40 million private sector jobs; 70 percent of private sector jobs existing in 1970 were gone by 1980. The bankers turned down meritorious domestic borrowers with the simple, unanswerable question: "Why should I lend money to you when I can make so much more lending to Mexico."

The United States has undergone "deindustrialization," which means that low-capital service industries—like McDonalds—boom (service is now two-thirds of GNP). On the other hand, capital intensive industry can't make it; a basic one, steel, is dead; and another, autos, is dying. Clearly, you cannot have a serious country without a steel industry. Economists said that American management and labor could not compete with foreign competition and that was it.

Businessmen, such as W. P. Tippet, chairman of American Motors, said it was not a straight deal; you could not "compete against government-subsidized foreign competition." Which was true enough, but Mr. Tippet missed the real irony—that we were giving the foreigners the money to subsidize the competition against us; we provided the subsidy used against ourselves. The recipients of the banker's largesse, say Brazil, has zero capital cost because there was never any payback.

Back to the debt merry-go-round—with interest piling upon interest, and the tremendous increase in rates, in a short time the figures were outlandish. Mexico owes \$250 million a week in interest alone. Brazil the same. Those figures should be remembered when the Administration tells us that an economic recovery will solve the debt problem. The bankers always have a theory about how the debt will be repaid. One theory was that sovereign governments never default. Another was the famous umbrella theory under which the Soviet Union would pay off any debt of the satellites. Now we hear the economic recovery will save the day.

The debt rolled on, in June 1982, according to Secretary Regan, the poor countries owed the bankers \$265 billion. Counting in loans from Western governments and international agencies, by the Regan figures, the

poor countries owe \$500 billion. The American Express private capital model projects developing country debt at \$1 trillion in 1986; it projects debt service payments due the banks in 1986 at \$345 billion. Last year, of \$140 billion bank payments due, about a third, \$45 billion, was not paid. In 1983, bank payments of over \$220 billion are due. In 1983, Mexico alone has \$43 billion due.

Both the Reds and the Third Worlders expect more in the future; the Reds have budgeted in a new \$70 billion from the West for Comecon by 1986. The Russians don't care how the West pays—it can use the IMF as a front to funnel money to Rumania, Yugoslavia, Hungary and, probably soon, Poland—but it has to pay.

The first real issue now is the future payments. The outstanding debt is largely gone; the money is not coming home. The policy decision now is do we give away more money to our enemies? The continuing erosion of Western wealth to keep in power Communist governments who threaten our liberties is suicidal.

The second real issue is who will bear the losses from the existing bad loans. The bankers—who made them—are desperately trying to "socialize" the loss by shifting it from themselves to the American taxpayer. The Administration has signed on to this effort to take yet another bite out of the middle class American. The banks made a simple business mistake—they took a gigantic short position against the dollar as we headed into disinflation and a strong dollar. They placed a large bet on inflation and lost. Now they want some partners. The whole scheme was set up to evade constitutional procedures and congressional approval, but now it has gone bad the taxpayer should pay for it. Capitalism, of course, does not work if bad management is unrestrained.

The banks made mistakes in the hundreds of billions and now say we're too big, if we go down we bring the house down; you've got to bail us out. In selling to us the IMF appropriation, the Administration has followed the old Roman precept, "If reason will not persuade, let fear compel." Trade will collapse, grass will grow in the streets. All because the bankers will have to own up to their losses. The loans are bad now and yet they continue to balance the books. Major financial institutions cannot be based on fictitious assets. The banks, like the Emperor in the Hans Christian Andersen story, are highly vulnerable to any small boy in the crowd.

It is not in the national interest to give away any more money. The banks have been holding up the oil prices and interest rates. If they recognize their losses, we may end up with 6 percent interest and \$6 a barrel oil. There's nothing wrong with American business and labor that would not be cured by 6 percent interest and \$6 a barrel oil. An end to over-expensive oil is what the West's idling factories have needed for 10 years. Between 1948 and 1973 the gross world produce quadrupled. Since 1973 we have been on a slow walk.

The Administration offers more of the same—more bankruptcies, more unemployment and more zero growth. They say, let's keep the same people in charge who've gotten us this far—the big banks, Volcker's Fed, the IMF—give them a little more money, let them manage it.

The Administration offers the IMF solution—which starts with a first payment of \$8.4 billion. A main thrust of the Administration is that this is a jobs bill. American

workers, they say, will benefit. This is accurate only in a very peculiar way—if you believe that it makes sense to give poor countries money so they can buy goods from you. If that is reasonable it should be done domestically rather than internationally. The insincerity of this argument is also plain since the IMF, who is supposed to lead us out of the wilderness, premises its programs for poor countries on cutting back imports and increasing exports.

It is bad morality to pretend that institutions and countries which are bankrupt are not bankrupt. Obviously, loaning more money to overburdened debtors is not a solution. The Schumer Plan is, I think, a thoughtful approach to the problem. It is similar to what is already required under Financial Accounting Standards Rule 15 (FASB) for Troubled Debt Restructurings. It would not require an immediate write off, but would affect future earnings. A major problem with the IMF approach is that, once funded with taxpayers' money, the IMF is beyond congressional control. I would recommend adding to the Schumer Plan a requirement that, if the IMF intends to make any loan to a Communist or OPEC country, it must first secure congressional approval.

In conclusion, the banks have been acting adversely to the interests of the United States and continue to do so. If they are candid with this committee, they must admit that the bad loans can be made good only by a major reinflation. Only then can the banks float off the rocks on a rising tide of a debased currency—a tide which may drown the rest of us. Inflation would, of course, shift the loss from the banks to the holders of money and other liabilities issued by the banks and government. High inflation and high oil prices will aid the banks, but they will be disastrous for the United States and the West. The country should not be dragged into the hole the bankers have dug for themselves. Thank you for your consideration. ●

SOME HARD TRUTHS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article by Seweryn Bialer, one of the country's preeminent specialists on the Soviet Union.

To have a sincere devotion to arms control and peace without a practical understanding of the grim realities of world politics is as dangerous as having a one-sided emphasis on military power. This is a fault of many in the freeze movement and was exposed in our lengthy, vigorous debate on the freeze.

I ask my colleagues to note Dr. Bialer's comment that massive nuclear power is really all the Soviet Union has, and that, consequently, meaningful arms control will be very difficult to achieve.

[From the Washington Post, May 8, 1983]

THE SOVIETS REALLY NEED THEIR NUKES

(By Seweryn Bialer)

In the great debate over nuclear weapons and how to control them, one key fact gets too little attention: The Soviet Union depends on its nuclear arsenal not only to protect itself and to threaten others, but for its very status as a great power. Without nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union would not be a superpower.

Perhaps we shy away from this fact because its implications are so depressing. Obviously, if the Soviet leaders believe that they depend on nuclear weapons for their international status, they are unlikely to consider giving them up. This state of affairs cannot be wished away.

More depressing still, the nuclear revolution that has transformed international politics gives the Soviet Union considerable advantages over the West in the competition for global influence. The very "unusability" of nuclear weapons makes them more useful to the Soviets than they can ever be to us.

Nuclear weapons are much more than weapons. They are the overriding political and psychological factor in Soviet-American relations, and in today's global politics generally. The fact that nuclear weapons exist has created an international situation without precedent in history.

The existence of nuclear weapons has also given the United States and the Soviet Union a set of compelling common interests, beginning, of course, with their mutual need to avoid a nuclear war. But common interests are far from either superpower's only interests.

If avoiding a nuclear war and the confrontations that could lead to one was both superpowers' fundamental goal, their chances for success would be very high.

Even if the nuclear arms race continues indefinitely, one can argue—however ironically—that both sides believe they are accumulating new weapons to avoid the sort of strategic imbalance that could tempt one superpower to attack the other.

But the prevention of a nuclear holocaust and the survival of humanity is not the only fundamental goal of either America or of Russia. Both have other international ambitions, and the Soviet Union has an unsatisfied hunger for global influence that pushes it toward a highly activist foreign policy.

It's no use shying away from this uncomfortable fact. Soviet nationalism and pride, history and ideology, its military might combined with the docility of its population, its late arrival on the superpower stage all encourage this activism. The Soviet Union is still in the ascending stage of its international ambitions.

In this stage the Soviet leadership is hoping it will be able to turn Western Europe away from its alliance with the United States. The Soviets are committed to support radical changes in the Third World, even if this involves direct and indirect Soviet military engagement. While the overriding Soviet goal is to protect its own Russian-Soviet system and its "internal" and "external" multinational empire, its key tactical aims as a latecomer to the "game" of global politics are offensive.

For the United States, this is clearly the descending stage of political, economic and military ambitions. America now views the international system with the attitudes of a status-quo power. Its long-term policy direction is best expressed in "containment"—a

concept with basically defensive connotations.

American key goals are the preservation of the independent industrial democracies, which requires a balance of at least strategic parity with the Soviet Union; the defense of vital economic and strategic American and allied interests in such areas as the Persian Gulf, which requires the preservation or creation of a conventional Soviet-American balance in some regions of the world; and finally, the preservation—at best—of the existing configuration of forces in the Third World. Where change cannot be avoided, the U.S. wants gradual evolution, not revolutionary upheavals.

This is a dangerous situation. Although each superpower wants to achieve its goals without using nuclear weapons—that is, in the rational way—this may not prove to be so easy. The asymmetry of goals which each superpower pursues and the fact that one is still ascendant while the other is retrenching increases the perils of an unintended escalation of their conflict to the threshold of nuclear war.

To put it simply, the nuclear revolution in weaponry and warfare and its military, political and psychological consequences give the Soviet Union a better opportunity than the United States to achieve its international goals without a nuclear war. This is true for four reasons:

First, nuclear weapons act as a great equalizer of the actual, conventional military potential of the Western and Soviet alliances, and therefore are a guarantor of the security of the Soviet Union. Far from being an equal, the Soviet Union and its bloc are far behind the Western alliance in conventional military potential.

At the beginning of the 1980s the combined gross national product (GNP) of the industrial democracies was more than three times larger than the combined GNP of the Warsaw Pact countries. (This is about the same relationship that existed between the West European and Soviet economic military potential on the eve of World War II, and is only marginally different than the comparative potential of NATO and the Warsaw Pact in the 1950s). Technologically, recent studies have shown that the lopsided superiority of the West is at least as great today as it was in 1953, the year when Stalin died.

But nuclear weapons—strategic, theater, and tactical—act as a great equalizer of the military potential and actual strength of the competing blocs, who without them are not equal at all. Once strategic parity has been achieved, it provides a degree of security to the Soviet Union that it never enjoyed in the past.

And of course, nuclear weapons enhance the psychological-political effectiveness of any threat from Soviet conventional forces on Soviet borders or in remote corners of the globe.

Second, the nuclear revolution led to the once-justified but now pernicious concept of an American nuclear umbrella over Western Europe, and the "bigger bang for the buck" military policy of the United States. The idea of an American umbrella led to much lower levels of conventional military spending by the industrial democracies than at any time in their 20th-century history. The idea of "more bang," and the attendant American preoccupation with the nuclear balance, led to a deterioration of conventional U.S. forces and to the dissipation of the American military-industrial base. And of course, these changes occurred

at a time when Soviet conventional forces were growing steadily. The resulting superiority of mobilized conventional strength gave the Soviets freedom of military action below the level of nuclear war.

Third, the Soviet leadership is able to exploit the balance of terror more effectively than the United States can because of the nature of the Soviet political system. Soviet leaders do not feel great pressure from public opinion in formulating their military and foreign policies and calibrating their use of military threats towards their opponents. At the same time, Soviet leaders can manipulate the legitimate fear of nuclear weapons in the populations of the industrial democracies. This asymmetry lets the Soviet leadership reap the political rewards of nuclear parity and leaves them freer to employ military threat or actual military forces.

Fourth, the nature of Third world conflicts and of popular aspirations in the developing countries favors military conflicts and revolutions—best suited to Soviet purposes—rather than gradualism and the evolution of democratic institutions that America would prefer. When nuclear parity eliminates the danger of retribution to their own homeland and empire, the Soviets can engage in low-risk and low-cost adventures to help accelerate the "historical process" in the Third World.

On the other hand, any American attempts to intervene to preserve the status quo are likely to require large-scale involvement at a high cost. The unpopularity of such interventions, the difficulties of making them work, and the danger of their escalation into confrontations with the Soviet Union makes them extremely difficult for the United States to undertake.

So nuclear weapons give the Soviets clear advantages. Of course the present balance of nuclear terror also presents the Soviet Union with terrible dangers. But it would be foolish to ignore the fact that the same balance of terror also gives the Soviet leaders opportunities for global assertiveness that are unprecedented in the entire history of the Soviet Union.

On the other hand, the advantages created for the Soviet Union by the nuclear revolution do not assure the success of Soviet policies. Those advantages may well be balanced by the Soviets' problems: internal weaknesses, difficulties inside the East European empire, and the Soviets' inability to match their military capabilities with the political, economic and cultural power that could produce practical advantages for the U.S.S.R. around the world. The restoration of an effective American-West European alliance could also help frustrate Soviet ambitions.

In the area of strategic weapons, the Soviet leadership's oft-proclaimed desire for arms control and stability is at least as sincere as President Reagan's repeated statements of interest in nuclear arms reduction. But if nuclear weapons were ever abolished or decisively reduced in number, it is the Soviet Union that would really suffer—militarily, politically and psychologically. This is an important reason why the total elimination of nuclear weapons is an unattainable goal, and why even their substantial reduction will be very difficult to achieve, though we must strive to achieve it.●

THE SITUATION IN GUATEMALA—PART I

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, recent news about Central America has focused on El Salvador and Nicaragua. But Guatemala is another key country in that troubled region and it is important that we understand the developments taking place there as we debate U.S. policy toward Central America.

In March 1982, a military coup brought the Rios Montt government to power. At first there was hope that the new government would be an improvement over the previous brutal regime, but that hope was short lived.

While killings and disappearances seemed to recede in the cities, reports of official violence against civilians and massacres in the countryside began to appear frequently. Throughout 1982 and the first part of this year, respected organizations such as Amnesty International, the U.S. Catholic Conference, and Americas Watch, among others, have been describing the terror and death carried out by Guatemalan forces against Indians and peasant farmers, including men, women, and children.

Unfortunately the administration decided to play down these reports and increased support for a government making war on its own people. It increased U.S. foreign aid to the Rios Montt regime, including \$10 million in nondevelopment economic aid, and allowed the Guatemalan Government to purchase military equipment for the first time since 1977. In late 1982, President Reagan met with Rios Montt in Central America and said that the Guatemalan President was getting a "bum rap" from human rights critics. Several months later, however, the Reagan administration itself had to protest to the Guatemalan Government the death of a USAID worker and friends at the hands of Guatemala's security forces. The reality of the regime's brutality had finally hit home.

I would like to place in the RECORD at this time summaries of several reports describing the situation in Guatemala.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL REPORTS MASSACRES IN NEW GUATEMALAN SECURITY DRIVE

Guatemalan forces massacred more than 2,600 Indians and peasant farmers in a new counterinsurgency program launched after General Efraim Rios Montt came to power in March this year, Amnesty International said today (Monday, October 11, 1982).

Military and newly formed "civil defense" units destroyed entire villages, tortured and mutilated local people and carried out mass executions in at least 112 separate incidents

between March and July, the worldwide human rights movement said.

Reports still coming in show the pattern has continued in more recent months. Amnesty International said exact details of all the incidents were hard to establish but it believed the death toll was probably higher than the figures reported to it so far.

In one Indian village in Quiché province on April 5 troops were reported to have forced all the inhabitants into the courthouse, raped the women and beheaded the men, and then battered the children to death against rocks in a nearby river. Raids elsewhere on the same day left some 100 people dead in the village of Mangal and 35 at Covadonga.

In other localities, people were burned alive in their huts, hacked to death by machete and machine-gunned. Amnesty International said information about other atrocities was still coming in.

Government forces have cleared all local people from several areas where insurgents were reported, killing many and driving others away.

Guatemalan officials maintain that the dead are guerrillas who died in clashes with government forces or civilians killed by guerrillas. But Amnesty International said its information repeatedly pointed to government responsibility for a program of mass killing of unarmed civilians in rural areas.

Amnesty International previously reported the existence of a government-run assassination program under former President Romero Lucas García in which "death squads" eliminated suspected opponents of the government, many of them in Guatemala's cities. "Now," said an Amnesty International official today, "wholesale massacres are reported from the countryside."

The victims have included pregnant women, small children and the elderly. In a house-to-house operation in Quiché province in May, armed agents killed 25 children between the ages of 4 months and 14 years, 15 women and 3 men.

The Amnesty International statement coincides with the movement's annual "Prisoners of Conscience Week" whose theme this year is human rights violations in rural areas around the world.

BISHOPS' PRESIDENT URGES ADMINISTRATION TO WITHHOLD MILITARY AID TO GUATEMALA

WASHINGTON.—The President of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops has urged the Administration to withhold military assistance to Guatemala until "substantial and verifiable" proof is given that the pattern of violent repression of human rights in that country has ended.

Archbishop John R. Roach of St. Paul and Minneapolis said Church sources and other reliable witnesses in Guatemala have stated that human rights abuses, especially campaigns of intimidation and displacement directed against the Indian population, have increased dramatically in the last six months.

This contradicts statements by Administration sources suggesting that Guatemala's human rights record is improving.

"Our impression is entirely different," Archbishop Roach stated.

"It is not our role either to judge the intentions of the present Guatemalan government or to assess its true ability to control events throughout the country," the Archbishop said, "But we must insist that the extensive data available to us suggest that the

previous pattern of violations has altered in recent months only by becoming worse.

"We respectfully urge the Administration, therefore, to withhold any further military assistance to Guatemala until substantial and verifiable proof is given that the pattern has been truly broken."

The present Administration has indicated its desire to renew U.S. military aid to Guatemala, which ended in 1977. A military training program has been requested for fiscal year 1983, and considerable military aid for Guatemala was included in the proposal for the Caribbean Basin Initiative.

The bishops of the United States reiterated their longstanding opposition to military aid to Guatemala in a Statement on Central America issued in November, 1981. The statement said U.S. diplomacy in Guatemala should be directed towards enhancing the protection of human rights and assisting the meeting of basic human needs.

During the past year they have made statements of solidarity with the Catholic Bishops of Guatemala, who said last May that the level of assassinations in their country has reached the level of genocide.

AN AMERICAS WATCH REPORT

SUMMARY AND FINDINGS

It is the view of the Americas Watch, based on direct testimony and other relevant information that we have gathered, that the human rights situation in Guatemala has not improved, but, if anything, has deteriorated since November, 1982. We arrive at this conclusion for the following reasons:

1. The Guatemalan Government's counterinsurgency program, begun in early 1982, has been continued and expanded by the Rios Montt government and remains in effect at this time.

2. A principal feature of this campaign is the systematic murder of Indian noncombatants (men, women and children) of any village, farm or cooperative, that the army regards as possibly supportive of the guerrilla insurgents or that otherwise resists army directives.

3. Although civilian men of all ages have been shot in large numbers by the Guatemalan army, women and children are particular victims; women are routinely raped before being killed; children are smashed against walls, choked, burned alive or murdered by machete or bayonet.

4. There is growing evidence that civilian males, including teenagers are being conscripted, under threat of death into "civil patrols," which are controlled by local army commanders. A principal function of the civil patrols is to kill other civilians suspected of being "subversive" or otherwise objectionable to local army commanders.

5. Incidental to its murder of civilians, the army frequently destroys churches, schools, livestock, crops, food supplies and seeds belonging to suspect villages, cooperatives or private farms. An apparent purpose, and clear effect is to deprive entire villages and farm communities of food necessary for survival.

6. Unable to live in their villages or on their farms, or to survive in the mountains to which they flee, an increasing number of Guatemalan Indians (estimated at between 70,000 and 100,000) have sought refuge in southern Mexico. The Guatemalan army has created a free-fire zone along its border

with Mexico and routinely pursues and tries to kill many refugees to prevent them from reaching Mexico.

7. Through the period of our visit to southern Mexico in March, 1983, Guatemalan ground and air forces have repeatedly crossed into Mexican territory to intimidate refugees and to carry out surveillance of refugee camps. During our delegation's visit, one armed Guatemalan force crossed several kilometers over the border near the Chajul refugee camp and another force opened fire at refugees at the Puerto Rico refugee camp.

8. The Guatemalan armed forces make extensive and conspicuous use of helicopters, mortars and incendiary bombs in attacking rural villages in destroying and burning crops, and in harassing refugees seeking to escape, and routinely use helicopters for surveillance of refugee camps in Mexico.

9. The Guatemalan government continues to execute prisoners (11 men since January 1, 1983) tried in secret by special courts whose procedures and composition *prima facie* violate its international treaty obligations.

10. It is widely known within the refugee community, and among displaced Indians in Guatemala, that the principal supplier of such helicopters—and the principal supporter of the Rios Montt government—is the United States.

RECOMMENDATION

These findings indicate that the Rios Montt government continues to engage in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights. Accordingly, as U.S. law prohibits military assistance to such governments, Americas Watch calls for the immediate suspension of all existing military sales and the withholding of requested military assistance to the Guatemalan government. Continued U.S. military and diplomatic support for the Rios Montt government will lead, and in fact, is already leading the Guatemalan people to view the United States as an accomplice to the massive and unspeakable human rights violations that are being committed by the Rios Montt government. ●

FLORIDA ATTORNEY GENERAL URGES ACTION ON LEGISLATION TO DEAUTHORIZE THE CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

HON. BUDDY MacKAY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. MacKAY. Mr. Speaker, on April 21, 1983, I introduced H.R. 2695, a bill to deauthorize the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

This bill is supported by the Governor of Florida, as well as the elected cabinet of Florida. As the Congress begins to consider this legislation, I wanted to share with my colleagues the text of a letter I have received from the Honorable Jim Smith, attorney general of Florida, which outlines the legal situation in which the State of Florida currently finds itself with

regard to the canal. In his letter, he points out the need for swift action on this bill.

I insert the text of this letter at this point in the RECORD and strongly urge my colleagues to review it. I believe it very succinctly outlines the legal reasons for passing H.R. 2695.

DEPARTMENT OF LEGAL AFFAIRS,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Tallahassee, Fla., May 3, 1983.

Hon. BUDDY MACKEY,
U.S. Congressman,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MACKEY: I am aware that bills have been introduced in both houses of Congress which would deauthorize the Cross-Florida Barge Canal Project. There are several matters which need to be considered in relation to this proposed legislation. Therefore, this letter is being sent to each member of Florida's Congressional delegation.

As you know, in 1971 President Nixon ordered a halt to construction of the canal project. After extensive studies, which included consideration of an alternative completion route, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in 1977 recommended against completion of the canal because of an unfavorable cost benefit analysis. That same year the Governor and Cabinet of Florida, sitting as the head of the Florida Department of Natural Resources, adopted a resolution recommending that Congress deauthorize the canal.

In 1979, in anticipation of deauthorization, the Florida Legislature enacted Chapter 79-167, Laws of Florida. This law will become effective only if the canal is deauthorized. Some of the salient features of the 1979 legislation are:

It requires preparation of a land management plan which will decide future uses of lands now owned by the Canal Authority (a state agency composed of the Governor and Cabinet which owns most of the lands acquired for the canal project).

It provides for sale to the federal government of a large area which includes most of Lake Ocklawaha (Rodman Pool) and lands along the Oklawaha River which were to have become Eureka Pool. These lands are to be sold at fair market value for inclusion in an expanded Ocala National Forest. Their use must be consistent with the land management plan for that area.

The Florida Department of Natural Resources is empowered to acquire by purchase, exchange or eminent domain the fee simple interest in lands to be included in the Ocala National Forest where the Canal Authority originally acquired less than the fee.

Lands determined to be surplus by the management plan are to be offered for sale at fair market value—first to the original owner, then to the county, then to the public at auction.

The six counties of the Cross Florida Canal Navigation District—Duval, Clay, Putnam, Marion, Levy and Citrus—are to be refunded with interest the ad valorem tax revenues contributed to the Canal Authority for land acquisition. (The principal amount of the counties' contribution was \$9,340,720.94. Principal and interest now total some \$32 million and is accumulating at the rate of 8 per cent per year.)

The primary mechanism for repaying the six counties is the sale of surplus Canal Authority lands.

As a result of recent circuit court decisions in Florida, this orderly plan for disposition of Canal Authority lands, and even the possibility of completion should Congress choose that, are threatened by further delay. In May, 1982, the circuit court in Marion County held in suits filed by eleven former land owners that the canal project has been effectively abandoned and that the former owners of land should be revested with title. Appeals of those judgments are now pending before the Fifth District Court of Appeal in Daytona Beach. Although we firmly believe that legal precedent is against the circuit court's rulings, one cannot discount the possibility that the judgments may be affirmed. However, we do not anticipate having a decision from the Fifth District Court of Appeal for at least several months.

Since those cases were tried, Florida Power and Light Company has filed suit in Marion County seeking to recover title to over nine thousand acres of land the Canal Authority owns in fee simple. Of this, 3,248 acres are under or around Lake Ocklawaha, and 5,900 acres border the Oklawaha River in the proposed Eureka Pool area. All of this land is environmentally sensitive and is part of the area proposed for inclusion in the Ocala National Forest. Unfortunately, we expect the circuit court will follow its previous rulings at the trial of this case which is now scheduled for June 24, 1983.

The implications of the courts' decisions in these cases are serious. First, if all or most of the Canal Authority lands are returned to private ownership, the protection of sensitive ecological resources contemplated by the 1979 legislation, or any degree of restoration, will be vastly complicated if not made impossible. Present and future recreational uses may also be thwarted. Further, should Congress decide to complete the Canal, it is obvious enormous duplicative expenditures would be necessary if the land reverts to private ownership.

The circuit court also decided that the former land owners were entitled to the land upon their repayment of the 1960s purchase price, not current fair market value. The effect of this may well be to deprive the six counties of the navigation district—Duval, Clay, Putnam, Marion, Levy and Citrus—of some portion of the amount they are to be paid under the 1979 legislation. Although the land management plans are not complete, there appears to be just sufficient land available for sale at fair market value to repay the interest. It is doubtful however that these lands are appreciating at the rate of eight percent per year. Thus, the longer deauthorization is delayed the more difficult it will be to repay the counties. If the land should revert to previous owners for the 1960s prices, full repayment to the six counties and their taxpayers will not be possible.

I trust you will find this helpful in your decision regarding the canal. I believe that delay in resolving the fate of the canal will further complicate an already complex situation. Therefore, your prompt action on this bill is highly desirable. If I may provide you any more information, please call on me.

Sincerely,

JIM SMITH
Attorney General.●

PRESIDENT REAGAN PAYS TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF JOHN M. ASHBROOK

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a stirring eulogy to the memory of John M. Ashbrook given by President Reagan on May 9, 1983, at Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio.

Though the first anniversary of John's untimely death has just passed, his memory and his commitment to Ashland College and quality education throughout this country endure.

The President also used this occasion to give the Nation an update on his economic program.

The text of the President's speech follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE JOHN M. ASHBROOK MEMORIAL DINNER

THE PRESIDENT. Thank you. [Applause]. Thank you, Fred, Dr. Schultz, Jean Ashbrook, and distinguished guests, we are here this evening to honor a man who, though he died at a tragically young age, garnered himself a remarkable record of public service as a state assemblyman, a distinguished congressman, a candidate for the United States Senate and, for a brief time, a candidate for the presidency of the United States.

There is sadness and surprise in recounting these titles of office either held or sought by John Ashbrook. Sadness, of course, because a man who made such an enormous contribution to American political life is now gone. Surprise, because all of us who followed closely the career of John Ashbrook remember him for his youthful and vigorous advocacy of traditional American principles. When he entered the state legislature, he was 28, the second youngest member at that time of that body. When he went to Congress, he was 32, the second youngest member of that body. And when he died, a candidate for the United States Senate, he was only 53.

It was never quite possible to say of John Ashbrook that he was typical—even though he was very much one of a breed of midwestern congressmen, those who over the course of several decades fought a long, hard, and frequently losing battle against the encroachments and intrusions of big government. As early as 1960, John Ashbrook warned against "unbridled national power with a resultant loss of individual freedom and local autonomy." He warned against "the state planners, the economy wreckers, the spenders and the destroyers of local government." He was a founder and chairman of distinguished conservative organizations including the American Conservative Union. In standing up for these views, he was remarkably consistent—his lifetime voting record garnered him a 97 out of a possible 100 percent on the conservative voting scale.

Yes, John Ashbrook was one of those honored few, those officeholders in the fifties and sixties who warned against the current trends and fashions, who predicted that someday the massive spending schemes and

higher and higher taxes of the federal government would stall and depress the American economy, immobilize state and local government and endanger personal freedom.

But if John Ashbrook was a rock solid conservative he was also a conservative who broke the mold. He hardly fit the image of the stuffy or parochial reactionary some tried to attach to him. A graduate of Harvard, an adept and effective public speaker, the concise eloquence he brought to his views made the liberal establishment take notice. And, most important, he was willing to take the kind of chances that few older and more traditional members of his party would ever have dared. He even challenged an incumbent President of his own party when he felt that President needed to be reminded of his original mandate.

In John Ashbrook's youth, his erudition, and his willingness to challenge long-established political precedents, we saw a new kind of Republican, a new kind of conservative. It was in this sense that he was ahead of his time, a forerunner of many conservative officeholders to come.

And the voters of Ohio, even those who didn't agree with him on every point, saw in him a man to be trusted, a leader who had clearly charted out the future and knew the direction he wanted it to go. Even those who view the world from a different political perspective can honor this man's utter devotion to principle, and his understanding of the essence of political leadership. John Ashbrook knew that the first duty of public life is to responsibly speak the truth—even if the moment's fashion is against the truth. For it's through such consistency and coherence, such constant attention to principle, that the public trust is eventually won and a political consensus mobilized.

In many ways, John Ashbrook symbolized the beginnings of a new conservative movement in America. As he grew in prominence, so did the movement he helped to lead. In the 50's and 60's, it was labeled a lost cause, in the 70's it was thought of as another pressure group, and in the 80's many could argue it was the dominant force in American political and intellectual life. [Applause].

We mourn John Ashbrook's loss to this movement and to his country. But as his longtime friend and fellow activist in that movement, William Rusher reminded us: Surely our highest consolation is knowing that John Ashbrook did live to see his political principles victorious and his public career vindicated. [Applause].

Yet we do this memory and ourselves a disservice if we too exclusively identify John Ashbrook's political principles with one man, one party, or one political movement. Through all of his writings and speeches, it was John Ashbrook's insistent claim that opposition to the cult of state power—the cult that has so badly infected our century—was deeply and irrevocably part of America's past and that the principles of limited government was America's greatest contribution to constitutional and political history.

He spoke movingly of America's traditional values and how too often in recent years we as a nation had drifted from those values. At the beginning of his second term in 1963, John was one of the senior members of a special five-man committee investigating the Ku Klux Klan and its involvement in the murder of civil rights workers in the South.

"The minute I walk into those hearings," he said, "it is like entering another world

where all of the values which are meaningful to me, law and order, respect for your fellow human being, justice go out the window—(where) traditional values are scoffed at."

It was a long-standing American consensus based on these traditional values that John Ashbrook struggled to reinstitute in this country, a struggle we continue today.

And in searching for the solution of our social or economic problems today, we can speak of a matrix, a formula that unlocks the solutions to many different problems. And I believe it is in the political wisdom and the social consensus that began this country, the consensus that still abides here in the heartland of America and was so evident in the career of a John Ashbrook, it is this consensus that holds the key to our modern dilemmas.

From their own harsh experience with intrusive, overbearing government, the Founding Fathers made a great breakthrough in political understanding: They understood that it is the excesses of government, the will to power of one man over another, that has been a principal source of injustice and human suffering through the ages. The Founding Fathers understood that only by making government the servant, not the master, only by positing sovereignty in the people and not the state can we hope to protect freedom and see the political commonwealth prosper.

In 1776, the source of government excess was the crown's abuse of power and its attempt to suffocate the colonists with its overbearing demands. In our own day, the danger of too much state power has taken a subtler but no less dangerous form. Out of the best of intentions, government has intervened in areas where it is neither competent nor needed nor wanted by the mass of Americans. [Applause].

There is no better example of the wisdom of limited government and the price paid by societies that forgot that wisdom than the economic problems we've encountered in recent years. The notion that government planners could fine-tune the economy from Washington led to a vicious cycle of boom and bust, periods of high inflation followed by periods of high unemployment.

Ohio has suffered from the practice of Washington-based meddling more than almost any other state. Today, because of this vicious cycle and following decades of growth in government, there are 13 percent unemployed in your state. And in states like Canton, the rate is as high as 17.5 percent and in Youngstown, 20.1 percent.

These are not just statistics. They represent human hardship and suffering, they stand for unhappy families with lifetime savings eaten up and dreams for the future destroyed.

Now all of us hope, of course, that the unemployment situation will ease much more quickly than current predictions suggest. But if past recessions were the rule, unemployment will remain a lagging indicator in an otherwise brightening economy so the unemployed will be among the last to feel the benefits of the recovery.

But those who have for so long preached the benefits of bigger government should be asked to acknowledge that the economic conditions that led to recession and unemployment were created by years of growth in government and the climate of government expansion and interference. When this administration took office, federal

spending had tripled in the preceding 10 years and taxes had doubled in the preceding five years. The national debt was hitting a trillion dollars—social spending had quadrupled in one decade. The budget for the Department of Health and Human Services became the third largest entity in the world, just behind the national budgets of the United States and the Soviet Union. One social program, food stamps, had grown from a \$70 million experimental program in 1965 to an \$11.25 billion program in 1981—an incredible 16,000 percent increase.

The government was draining off America's productivity and placing an enormous drag on the economy. Higher and higher taxes and inflation were discouraging work, risk, and the willingness of business and labor to invest time or money in economic expansion.

Now this tremendous slowdown in the economy was more than a statistical event. It hurt those who could least afford to be hurt. Particularly hard hit were those traditionally lower income groups that make up such a high percentage of the unemployed. Minimum wage laws—with no allocation made or allowance made for young people doing marginal work—kept many young people from gaining the entry level positions that mean invaluable job training and eventually fulltime careers.

Or take the slowdown in economic progress made by those with low incomes. As pointed out in a recent article by Charles Murray in *The Public Interest* magazine, the great expansion of government programs that took place under the aegis of the Great Society coincided with an end to economic progress for America's poor people. From 1949 until just before the Great Society got underway in 1964, the percentage of American families in poverty fell dramatically—from nearly 33 percent to only 18 percent. But by 1980, with the full impact of the Great Society's programs being felt, the trend had reversed itself and there was an even higher proportion of people living in poverty than in 1969.

The simple truth is that low inflation and economic expansion in the years prior to the Great Society meant enormous social and economic progress for the poor of America. But after the gigantic increases in government spending and taxation, that economic progress slowed dramatically. If we had maintained the economic progress made from 1950 through 1965, black family income in 1980 would have been nearly \$3,000 higher than it was.

The great social spending schemes failed for the vast majority of poor Americans. They remain trapped in economic conditions no better than those of a decade-and-a-half ago. The poverty programs failed precisely because they grew without regard for the burden they and other social programs were imposing on the overall economy. As social spending multiplied, economic growth slowed, and the economy became less and less able to generate the jobs and incomes needed to lift the poor out of poverty. Not to mention the fact that inflation stimulated by government growth hit the poor the hardest—the hardest especially by devaluing the payments of those on welfare.

The growth of government programs did little for the poor, they were sometimes even counterproductive. From 1965 to '74 for example, the Federal Urban Renewal Program spent more than \$7 billion and ended a total failure, destroying more housing units than it replaced. The federal regulations and grants of the Model Cities Pro-

¹ Cities.

gram in the late 1960's spent more than \$2.5 billion and didn't halt urban decay. But all of these programs—while they did fund jobs for an army of federal bureaucrats and consultants, put a huge burden on the productive sector of the American society. It was the working people who had to pay the taxes, carry the burden of inflation and get thrown out of work when the inevitable economic slowdown occurred.

Today because of our attempts to restrict and cut back on government expansion and to retarget aid toward those most in need, and away from those who can manage without federal help, the working people of America are directly benefiting. We have brought inflation down from double—I can't get that out—double-digit—[laughter]—I stumble over inflation all the time. [Laughter, applause]. But it was double-digit levels. And now for the last six months, it has been less than one-half of one percent. [Applause]. I have less trouble saying that. [Laughter]. For a family on a fixed income of \$20,000, the improvement in inflation has meant about \$1,700 more in purchasing power. And because of our tax program a median-income family of four in 1983 will pay \$700 less in federal income taxes. And if they try to do anything about that third tax cut, I sleep with a veto pen under my pillow. [Applause].

But beyond all this, however, cutting back on government intrusions into the marketplace and its drain on the economy has meant the beginning of a solid recovery.

Auto production is up 40 percent in the first quarter over the same time a year ago. And in March, new home sales were up over 50 percent, building permits were up more than 70 percent and building starts were up by 75 percent over the same time last year. [Applause]. Consumer confidence has had its best monthly gain in nine years, all the way to 77 percent as measured by the Conference Board. We now have the lowest prime interest rate in 4½ years, inflation is better than the double-digit figures of a few years ago and the stock market is healthy again.

And this need not be a temporary recovery. If we can continue to cut the growth in spending, if we can continue to hold the line on taxes, consumer and business confidence will remain high and the recovery will be sustained over a long period of time. Once again, America's working people will know that hard work, saving and sound investment will pay off for them and their children in the future. And this will mean far more to the lower income groups that have been so badly hit by unemployment and inflation than all the government programs of the past. It will mean economic growth and expanding opportunity over a long period of time. Instead of having government trying to redistribute a shrinking economic pie, that pie will be expanding and everyone will have a chance at a larger share.

But if we are to continue this progress, we must resist that well-intentioned statism of those who urge even more spending and higher taxes. The British political philosopher, Michael Oakeshott, has warned us about the dangers of government that tries to do too much: "To some people, government appears as a vast reservoir of power which inspires them to dream of what use might be made of it. They have favorite projects of various dimensions which they sincerely believe are for the benefit of mankind. They are thus disposed to recognize government—an instrument of passion, the art of politics to enflame and direct desire."

Well, here I would submit is the central political error of our time. Instead of seeing the people and their free institutions as the principle means of social and economic progress, our political opposition has looked at government and bureaucracy as the primary vehicle of social change. And this marked the on-slaught of special interest politics, the notion that every noble social goal is the business of government, that every pressure group has its claim on the tax dollars of working people, that national legislation means brokering and bartering with the largest share going to the most powerful of the noisiest political constituency.

This is the antithesis of fair government, of democratic rule and orderly government. As Mr. Oakeshott has observed, it is the conjunction of utopian dreaming and government power that degenerates into tyranny. Even beyond the raids on the national treasury, the huge deficits, the high inflation and taxation—the very abuses that brought down so many empires and nations in the past—this trend toward well-intentioned but overwhelming government also diminishes personal freedom and the autonomy of those branches of government closest to the people.

Even two centuries ago, the founding fathers understood this. They anticipated the danger. John Adams wrote that government tends to run every contingency into an excuse for enhancing power in government. And Thomas Jefferson put it more directly when he predicted happiness for America but only "if we can prevent the government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of taking care of them . . ."

Now, some, of course, mistake this to mean the negation of government. Far to the contrary, it is by clearly restricting the duties of government that we make government efficient and responsive. By preventing government from overextending itself we stop it from disturbing that intricate but orderly pattern of private transactions among various institutions and individuals who have different social and economic goals. In short, like the founding fathers, we recognize the people as sovereign and the source of our social progress. We recognize government's role in that progress but only under sharply defined and limited conditions. We remain aware of government's urge to seek more power, to disturb the social ecology and disrupt the bonds of cooperation and interchange among private individuals and institutions through unnecessary intrusion or expansion.

When new management takes over a failing business or a coach tries to revitalize a sports team, both will frequently find that the key to success is cutting out the extraneous or extravagant, while returning to basics and emphasizing those resources that have been traditionally successful.

Well, this is precisely what we're trying to do to the bloated federal government today: Remove it from interfering in areas where it doesn't belong, but at the same time strengthen its ability to perform its constitutional and legitimate functions. In the area of public order and law enforcement, for example, we're reversing a dangerous trend of the last decade. While crime was steadily increasing, the federal commitment in terms of personnel was steadily shrinking. This administration has reversed this trend by adding more than 1,000 new investigators and prosecutors to law enforcement rolls and we have redirected our resources

for a frontal assault on drugs and organized crime. Or take our federalism proposals: We want to cut back on federal intrusions to local and state governments, and so those local and state governments can be more responsive to the people.

Or take the national security area, where we're trying to make up for years of neglect when spending declined from 40 percent of the budget in 1970 to less than 24 percent in 1980. And let me take a moment here for an important aside. During the past 10 years, the Soviet Union has improved, developed and deployed more than a dozen large new ICBM systems while the United States has been thinking about developing one, much smaller Intercontinental Ballistic Missile.

The debate over a new ICBM and our entire strategic triad has cost the country millions of man hours and billions of dollars and it still hasn't been decided.

I wanted to get some answers, once and for all. So I created a blue-ribbon, bipartisan commission this past January to study the strategic forces of the United States. The commission conferred with over 200 experts and consulted closely with the Congress and produced a thorough report that made three basic recommendations. First, that we continue with our strategic modernization program; second, that we build and deploy the MX missile and develop a single—simple, single-warhead missile; and, third, that we continue ambitious arms control negotiations that promote nuclear arms stability and reduction of nuclear arms. [Applause].

Eighteen senior officials from the three previous administrations, including six former Secretaries of State and Defense, agree that all three parts of this commission's recommendations are essential to the future security of our country. The National Security Council agrees. The Joint Chiefs of Staff agree. And I agree.

But I more than agree. I believe with every fiber of my being that these steps are essential to ensuring arms control progress and our nation's future safety and security. Only when the Soviets are convinced that we mean business will arms control agreements become a reality. We're not building missiles to fight a war; we're building missiles to preserve the peace. [Applause].

And that's why the Congress must act soon on these recommendations, especially the MX. If the Congress rejects these proposals it will have dealt a blow to our national security that no foreign power would ever have been able to accomplish. I call on the Congress to support this bipartisan program, a program that combines vigorous arms control with the modernization of our strategic forces.

Now, discussion of Justice Department personnel or economic statistics may seem a long way from the insights of Michael Oakeshott or the lofty thoughts of the founding fathers. But I would argue that John Ashbrook would never have found it so. For him, conservatism was not so much a political pressure group as it was a modern reflection of the insights and wisdom that began the American Republic.

His career as a public servant is testimony to this kind of enlightened conservatism. John Ashbrook believed in study and thought. He was close to Ashland College, he did all in his power to encourage the growth of conservative think tanks and policy groups.

But he was a practical man as well. In the face of redistricting and an unfavorable political climate for conservative candidates,

he won 11 consecutive terms in the House of Representatives. He believed in political action—he was among those select few who began the Draft Goldwater movement in 1963 and stunned the political world by succeeding a year later.

I first came to John's district at a dinner here with Bill Buckley the spring after that election. He was not discouraged. John looked at the Goldwater campaign as a first step toward the eventual triumph of his political principles. Those principles are in the ascendancy today in large part due to his efforts. [Applause.]

We owe it to him, to ourselves, to our children to stand by those principles, to persevere until—as it was said that night in 1964 in San Francisco by the presidential candidate John Ashbrook had worked so hard to nominate—"until our cause has won the day, inspired the world, and shown the way to a tomorrow worthy of all our yesterdays."

Thank you all and God bless you. [Applause].

STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD
BY REP. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to provide for the addition of about 20 acres to the Sandia Mountain Wilderness within the Cibola National Forest of New Mexico.

This legislation is similar to a bill which I introduced in the 97th Congress, and was opposed by the Department of Agriculture because of misinformation about a proposed flood control project in the designated wilderness area.

When the Endangered American Wilderness Act of 1978 was being considered and subsequently enacted by Congress, approximately 20 acres of the then proposed Sandia Mountain Wilderness were excluded to provide for ultimate construction and maintenance of a flood control project immediately above the city limits of Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Since that time the city of Albuquerque, on close study after citizen groups questioned its basis and value, discarded the proposed flood control project. Because the project will not now be built, there is no longer any reason for excluding this acreage from the wilderness area.

The area proposed for wilderness designation is referred to as Sunset Canyon, which lies literally in the backyard of many residents of Albuquerque.

At the present time a structure called a diversion dam exists in the canyon. It was built in 1964 for flood control and has been maintained only once since then. Further maintenance work is now in the process of being approved by the Forest Service regional

office in Albuquerque, but this consists mainly of silt removal in order to keep the channel open. Such maintenance would in no way interfere with a wilderness designation.

This proposed wilderness area is directly behind an area known as the Glenwood Hills subdivision in Albuquerque. The homes in the area back up to the area I am proposing for the wilderness area.

The flood control requirement came about because of the housing development, which was built in the 1960's. In 1974 a bond issue was passed for flood control, but none of the money was specifically allocated to enlarging this dam. Then in 1976 the Glenwood Hills Homeowners Association was informed by the Forest Service that the city planned to build a new dam in Sunset Canyon. It was to have been about 30 feet high at grade level and 50 feet from the basin floor. The catch basin was to be ripped and a road built high on the hillside to go over the top of the dam structure.

This planned action was protested and the Forest Service requested the city to reconsider its plans. In March 1980 the city council passed a resolution whereby the city's policy is to upgrade the existing structure and line the North Glenwood Hills Arroyo channel with concrete.

My bill will insure that no greater action is taken by the city. It will preserve the existing character of the area and prevent destruction of the canyon. I will work for early passage of this bill and I will be requesting hearings shortly.

COUNTRY OVEN BAKERY
NAMED SMALL EMPLOYER OF
THE YEAR FOR 1983

HON. BEVERLY BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Appalachian Center and Country Oven Bakery of Oakland, Md., for being named the Small Employer of the Year for 1983 through the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

The Country Oven Bakery began operating in 1980 with the assistance of a HUD block grant. Since then, the bakery has become virtually self-sufficient, and has established an excellent reputation in the Garrett County community.

Of the nine employees, seven are handicapped. The bakery has given them an outlet for their energy and enthusiasm, and also an opportunity to succeed in business and to contribute to the community. The Country Oven Bakery is a tribute to their de-

termination, dedication, and talent, and I am sure that there is even more success in its future.

Executive director Charlotte Griffith, bakery supervisor Maureen Sweitzer, and employees Helen Ravenscroft, Teri Roy, Trina Bray, Margie Bell, Mildred Crone, Paul Miller, Rich Buckingham, and Mary Lucas are all to be commended for this outstanding achievement. I hope that their fine example will inspire other handicapped individuals throughout the country.

ETHIOPIA IN NEED OF FOOD
AID

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, Ethiopia is experiencing its most severe drought since 1973. An estimated 3 million people, in the Gondar, Tigray, Welo, and Eritrea regions, are in separate need of emergency food relief.

During the 1972-73 drought, 200,000 people and millions of livestock perished. This year, 90 people and nearly 200,000 cattle have already died in the Gondar region alone. With the government's treasury strained, emergency stockpiles nearly depleted, logistical headaches, and attendant health problems, Ethiopia has been forced to turn to the world community for assistance.

The Agency for International Development has already granted food requests from Catholic Relief Services and the World Food Program, both of which have been operating in the impacted areas. Another request is still pending and more supplies may be requested in the future.

I urge my colleagues to read the following article from the Baltimore Sun which provides a useful overview of the crisis. For those who wish to further involve themselves in this unfolding tragedy, I would suggest a letter to the Director of the Agency for International Development in support of humanitarian and food relief requests.

[From The Sun, May 2, 1983]

ETHIOPIA, IN GRIPS OF SEVERE DROUGHT, HAS
"CRITICAL" NEED OF FOOD, SUPPLIES

(By Ian Steele)

EBINAT, ETHIOPIA.—From the air, the country is the color of scorched parchment stretching as far as the eye can see beyond the Simien mountains. A vast network of slate-gray riverbeds testifies to prospects for irrigation and bountiful harvests, but on the ground this year is nothing.

Drought has robbed the northern provinces of their crops and watering places and hundreds of square miles of cornfields and rangelands have merged into a virtual desert stretching from the Sudan to the Red Sea.

Tens of thousands of people have become totally dependent on foreign food aid deliv-

ered to relief stations and refugee camps. Help for uncounted thousands more, who live beyond the nation's airstrips and roads, is nowhere in sight. An estimated 3 million people are said to be in serious need of food and, in some places, water.

For most of the northern country the rains came too early, too late or not at all last year, and the little corn that did break ground failed to mature. Even before the harvest, which is due about now, thousands of families have abandoned their fields and pegged their survival to towns and refugee camps.

The World Food Program has estimated a 250,000-ton national grain deficit for 1983, but says American satellite projections of a 2 million-ton shortfall are probably more accurate.

The government has declared a state of emergency, and Trevor Page, head of the program's emergency service in Geneva, and other foreign observers believe the drought to be worse than the one in 1972-73, when about 200,000 people and millions of livestock perished.

"We just know the situation is critical, but we just don't know how critical," said Martin Moch, the program's senior adviser in Addis Ababa, the Ethiopian capital. Mr. Moch says that the country's limited transportation system had defied efforts to reach the most distant northern settlements, and says estimates of casualties and needs were based conservatively on an outdated population count of 31 million people.

Here on the flat, dusty outskirts of Ebinat in the southeastern Gondar region, a relief station set up for a few hundred refugees last October has become a permanent settlement for 10,000.

People have walked for up to a week to get here, carrying a few personal possessions and their youngest children on their backs. They have stripped the landscape of vegetation, and gathered every rock within the radius of a mile to build low stone corals and brush shelters against the sun and dust. No one knows when they will be able to leave.

In their brown, tattered robes, they move across the landscape in grim camouflage with their surroundings, collecting firewood for cooking and foraging for a few goats and donkeys. As the camp has grown older, larger and more demanding on the environment, the daily trek for these basics has grown from a few hundred yards to a round trip of several miles.

The Ebinat River, which has been the camp's only source of water, is so polluted from overuse that government relief officials have restricted access for drinking only.

There have been no medicines or medical personnel at Ebinat since it opened, and every second child appears to have an eye infection, sores or respiratory problems. There is little movement in the camp. Families conserve their energy huddled beneath their shelters, and apart from the low, constant whimper of small children, a visitor is struck by the eerie silence of the place.

The maximum food ration in camps like this across the north this year is 66 pounds of grain and 11 pounds of milk and soys meal for a family of five. That is the equivalent of about 360 grams of protein a person per day, against the 400-gram minimum United Nations agencies say is necessary for survival in drought conditions. The ration ignores the fact that a family of 5 is only average in Ethiopia and that the allowance must sometimes be shared among 9 or 10.

There are said to be 450,000 severely drought-affected people in the Gondar region, and government officials say they have counted 600,000 people in similar circumstances in Tigray, 566,000 in Welo and more than 530,000 in Eritrea, where the situation is complicated by continued fighting between government and rebel forces.

A drought report and letter requesting emergency food aid that was distributed to foreign embassies in Addis Ababa last October has drawn a limited response, and the nation's current emergency food reserve in the capital stands at about 15,000 tons of grain provided through the World Food Program and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

However, the emergency in Gondar alone could swallow the nation's emergency stockpile, and Adane Mumuye, chief of the government's Relief and Rehabilitation Commission in Gondar, has requested 15,000 tons of wheat and 3,700 tons of powdered supplements and vegetable oils to carry his 450,000 people for the next six months alone. He says that even if he receives his quota, he will only be able to reach 60 to 70 percent of those in need.

"We don't have the trucks and we can only supply those who come to the relief stations," he said. "Those people have to travel two to four days on foot, and the weak cannot make it."

The death toll directly attributable to drought in Gondar so far this year is about 90 people and 177,000 cattle. By Mr. Adane's projection, between 135,000 and 180,000 people could perish in Gondar this year if food is not forthcoming.

Shimelis Adugna, the Relief Commissioner in Addis Ababa, said that the Communist states that supported the overthrow of Emperor Haile Selassie in 1974 have given next to nothing in the way of assistance. He said the military government of Mengistu Haile Mariam was hopeful that the United States would forget differences and help fill the food gap.

He said he was certain that Western governments would have responded more generously if Ethiopia were not a socialist state. Since the revolution, he said, the nation had averaged only \$8 per head of population in foreign aid, compared with a \$22 average for other developing countries with similar problems.

U.S. aid and humanitarian assistance to Ethiopia slowed to a trickle when the revolutionaries seized American property in 1974 and refused to pay compensation. The Dutch, who also have a strong record of foreign aid to developing countries, have similar claims outstanding, and Italy's contribution this year has been facilitated only by the settlement of its claims by a National Compensation Commission that was established recently in Addis Ababa.

Ethiopia's treasury is feeling the pinch of a military budget that according to the U.S. State Department drains 27.8 percent of its annual gross national product for arms against Somalia in the Ogaden region and rebel armies in Eritrea.

HIGH SCHOOL HONORING STUDENTS' ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENTS

HON. ALAN WHEAT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow Hickman Mills High School is honoring the outstanding academic achievements of its students. At a ceremony at the school the students will receive awards ranging from scholastic scholarships to perfect attendance. I would like to take this opportunity to commend those students. These young men and women have not been content with the mediocre, but have demonstrated perseverance and dedication in the pursuit of excellence. The awards are the culmination of their excellent achievement.

But the meaning of excellence is found not in its accomplishment, but in its pursuit. Excellence is a quality acquired not at the end of the race and not at the starting line. Excellence is attained in slow degree that requires fierce dedication, persistence, and determination. I know that these exemplary students learned that valuable lesson.

It is true that American public education faces constant criticism, sometimes deservedly so. But it is also true that American public schools have undertaken a unique challenge—to educate all Americans and to give every student the opportunity to pursue excellence. I am encouraged to see that these students at Hickman Mills have made the most of that opportunity. I would also like to commend the efforts of Principal Douglas M. Lawrence and the school's faculty.

The awards issued will remind each and every student of the rewards of the dogged pursuit of excellence. I am proud to acknowledge their achievements and I wish them the best of luck in their future endeavors.

AT LAST A NUCLEAR FREEZE

HON. THOMAS J. RIDGE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. RIDGE. In 1945, the United States led mankind into the atomic and nuclear age. The United States is the only country that has ever used such weapons. The United States has a special responsibility, a moral imperative, to do whatever it can to put that destructive genie back in the bottle.

During the course of the debate on the House floor, a debate consuming several weeks, I monitored practically every minute of dialog, talked to sever-

al experts, read numerous studies and reports, and attempted to answer one basic question: Does the United States in May 1983 have a credible nuclear deterrent capability? In other words, if the Russians and the United States entered into a complete bilateral freeze on production and deployment of nuclear weapons, would this country find itself at a strategic and military disadvantage during the course of subsequent arms reduction talks?

I conclude that the answer is "No." Each country has an identifiable advantage with various elements of its nuclear capability. Neither country has a superior position overall. It is my belief that deterrent does not mean parity. We have sufficient nuclear capability to deter the Soviet Union from initiating a nuclear conflict and will be able to maintain that capability during the next several years.

From time to time Congress will be called upon to review different weapons and delivery systems in order to insure that such deterrent is not lost simply through the passage of time. We cannot wait indefinitely for bilateral agreements freezing and/or reducing nuclear weapons, but we can be assured that our efforts to do so in the next few years can be done from a position of real strength.

Working together, a bipartisan group of Congressmen—Republicans and Democrats alike—succeeded in writing specific language into the freeze resolution to do two critically important things:

First, to state explicitly that is a bilateral, not a unilateral freeze, that is, we do not freeze unless and until the Russians do; and,

Second, to guarantee our right to on-site inspections within the Soviet Union to see for ourselves that they are doing all that any agreement requires them to do.

Critics of the freeze also argued that such a resolution would tie the hands of the President and his negotiators. That criticism is unjustified, in my view, because I do not know of a single Member of Congress—whether for or against the freeze—who believes that the United States should be represented at a bargaining table by 435 negotiators. And that is what we would be doing if we were to lock our negotiators into specific positions ahead of time as a result of individual votes taken in the House.

The nuclear freeze is intended as a statement—as a symbol—of the U.S. willingness and desire to call a halt to the nuclear arms race. It is not a treaty—the Senate, not the House, approves treaties. It is not a diplomatic instruction—those come from the White House or the State Department. No, the nuclear freeze does not tie the hands of the President or his negotiators. In my view, in fact, it strengthens their hands by sending

them to the bargaining table with pretty persuasive evidence of how strongly the American people and their elected representatives feel about reducing the danger of nuclear war.

Finally, some observers have suggested that the freeze resolution was weakened during the long congressional debate by the many amendments the House added to it. On the contrary, I do not believe those amendments weakened the freeze, I think they strengthened it. I think it was important to clear up some of the many ambiguities in the documents as it was originally drafted.

During the first day or two of the debate, even the chief sponsors of the freeze resolution admitted that in many ways they themselves could not agree on how the freeze would work, or which weapons systems they mean for it to apply to in actual practice.

All too often, I think, Congress is too vague about what it really intends in the legislation it passes. So the bipartisan effort to make the freeze resolution a bit more precise was, in my view, a critically important effort to strengthen it.

Above all, however, the most important thing about this whole debate is that here in America, in May 1983, we have taken the first step toward reducing—and hopefully removing—the threat of nuclear war from the face of the Earth.●

NO DISCRIMINATION AGAINST NONWORKING SPOUSE

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. LUJAN. I am today introducing legislation which would increase from the current level of \$250 to \$2,000 the amount of nonworking spouse can invest in an individual retirement account.

In my legislation, the married couple can invest up to \$4,000 in an IRA, \$2,000 for each partner. It would encourage savings and provide an incentive for an additional \$1,750 in tax deductions from income. There is no reason to discriminate against the nonworking spouse by limiting the amount of money that can be invested. The only condition in this bill is that the working spouse must earn at least the amount being invested in the IRA. As an example, if the working spouse earns only \$3,500 in a taxable year, that is the maximum that can be invested in the IRA by both partners. It is my belief that the IRA is a very important tool in assisting a person in providing for the future. With the state of various retirement systems, this would insure the investor of a

comfortable future with funds he or she invested earlier in life.●

DEFENSE SPENDING: I

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, May 11, 1983, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Futuristic talk of particle beams and other exotic weapons has animated debate on the year's most controversial issue, defense. However, the main argument centers on money.

The present defense buildup really began when the Carter administration initiated a program to address the post-Vietnam neglect of our military. A firm consensus emerged in the Nation on the need to strengthen our Armed Forces. The growth of Soviet military power and the increasing military demands on the United States in the world combined to pose the central question for our defense policy today: not whether we should toughen up our defenses, but how much we should spend on a buildup and what we should buy.

President Reagan's answer has been to expand and accelerate the spending plans formulated by President Carter. For the period from 1984 to 1988, President Reagan has requested more than \$1,800 billion in defense budget authority. If approved, this will result in a real rise of 50 percent in defense spending over the previous 5 years.

The cost of the President's defense plan is attributable in part to a new definition of the American military's role in the world. His basic strategy envisions simultaneous military action on several fronts, including a major war against the Soviets in Europe and a simultaneous conflict with them in the Persian Gulf. Such a strategy means more spending for larger conventional forces. Furthermore, the Reagan administration wants strategic modernization. Both these policies have helped swell the percentage of the Pentagon's budget going to procure military hardware. Ambitious procurement programs will modernize our Army divisions, supply four new tactical Air Force wings, and provide a 600-ship Navy and several new strategic systems by the end of the decade.

In 1981, President Reagan's defense proposals sailed through Congress. In 1982, he pushed through another big increase in defense spending. As the economy languished in recession, however, the consensus behind the buildup began to erode. Stagnant business activity and high unemployment have reduced tax revenues and raised Federal outlays for jobless benefits. There

have been fears that large deficits could prevent sustained economic recovery. Experts wonder if the defense budget has been thoroughly reviewed or if the economy can absorb the buildup in so short a time.

The defense buildup probably will not have adverse effects as long as our economy is not recovering from the recession. If the economy recovers strongly, however, the civilian sector could begin to take up capacity and credit. This competition for capacity and credit could lead to shortages of capital, manpower, and materials. Some crowding out of private investment is likely, and cost increases in the defense sector may spill into the larger economy and cause a resurgence of inflation.

The defense budget has always frustrated Congress, and indications are that the frustration will last. In practice, Congress has been able to exert only limited influence on defense policy. Members of Congress are seldom privy to the kind of information required to evaluate a weapon system. Much of Congress action on the defense budget takes place after the military has already decided that a weapon system should be built.

One problem making consistent funding of defense difficult for Congress is the volatility of public opinion. Congress tends to fund defense in roller-coaster fashion—big increases in some years and drastic declines in others—depending on public thinking at the time. This problem may arise again in connection with the Reagan defense program. Americans now seem to be more concerned about the economy and rising Federal deficits, and they want Congress to cut the defense request.

This public opinion is reflected in changes that the Pentagon constructed defense budgets too hastily and that almost all of the weapon plans conceived during the past three administrations were included despite their ineffectiveness. To the extent that these charges are believed, Mr. Reagan will find it hard to convince the public that his defense programs make sense.

Another problem Congress constantly faces is explosive growth in the cost of defense systems. Waste in some programs and cost overruns due to delays and steeply rising prices are aspects of the problem. The Reagan administration tried to contain this cost growth, but the most recent report on its procurement initiatives is not encouraging. The defense sector is so inflationary that cost increases are beginning to stymie the progress we have made in strengthening our conventional forces. Also, many weapon systems that should be canceled because of cost survive because of the jobs they create. The effect of these jobs should not be underestimated. By nature,

Congress likes to spread defense contracts around to as many places as possible. After it approves a weapon system, management, labor, and the system's friends in government fight to keep the program alive. During the 1970's, Congress chose to kill few weapon systems.

The search for defense savings leads Congress into another problem: an old, established pattern of cutting first and most the funding for spare parts, fuel, ammunition, depot repair, and other elements of the operations and maintenance accounts—items affecting military readiness. Cutting these items yields the biggest near-term budget savings, but these items are essential to fighting a sustained conventional war. Thus, readiness suffers and our forces are not as prepared as they should be.

Congress will face a new problem as procurement and modernization take a larger share of the defense budget. It will be hard for Congress to cut the readiness-related accounts, as it has in the past, since these moneys will be needed to maintain the new weapon systems being delivered. We approach what many experts call an outyear dilemma in which Congress either must cut ongoing procurement programs or must face a very serious erosion of military readiness. ●

REV. LEON SULLIVAN SAYS IT IS TIME FOR A MANDATORY FAIR EMPLOYMENT CODE FOR AMERICAN FIRMS OPERATING IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, since 1977, the Reverend Leon H. Sullivan, pastor of the Zion Baptist Church in Philadelphia has led a valiant and tireless campaign to encourage American firms operating in South Africa to voluntarily adopt a fair employment code that would eliminate discriminatory, racist, and unjust practices toward their black employees. But for some time Reverend Sullivan has been saying, to all who would hear, that it is now time to mandate a fair employment code for U.S. firms operating in South Africa and to impose heavy penalties on firms which would continue to discriminate or exploit their black workers.

Yesterday in the Washington Post, Reverend Sullivan published an Op-Ed piece eloquently explaining why he now favored the adoption of a mandatory code and why he supports legislation that I had introduced—H.R. 1693—which is cosponsored by 44 of my colleagues.

In testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee last year, Reverend Sullivan urged quick action on a mandatory code. He expressed dismay that while some 146 companies has signed the Sullivan code, another 142 U.S. firms operating in South Africa had not. In addition, over one-third of the signatory companies had failed to make any progress in implementing the six principles of the code:

Nonsegregation of the races in All Eating, Comfort, Locker Rooms, and Work Facilities

Equal and Fair Employment Practices for All Employees

Equal Pay for All Employees Doing Equal or Comparable Work for the Same Period of Time

Initiation and Development of Training Programs that Will Prepare Blacks, Coloreds, and Asians in Substantial Numbers for Supervisory, Administrative, Clerical, and Technical Jobs

Increasing the Number of Blacks, Coloreds, and Asians in Management and Supervisory Positions

Improving the Quality of Employees' Lives Outside the Work Environment in Such Areas as Housing, Transportation, Schooling, Recreation, and Health Facilities.

Mr. Speaker, since many of my colleagues are deeply concerned about the plight of South Africa's blacks who suffer under the most systematic, legally enshrined system of discrimination, known as apartheid, I ask that Reverend Sullivan's article be reprinted in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would also like to take this opportunity to say that this Nation owes a debt of gratitude to Reverend Sullivan and his supporters for the tremendous work that they have done over the years to improve the condition of South Africa's 24 million black inhabitants.

May I also urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H.R. 1693 and in working for the passage of legislation in this House which would indicate to the world that the United States is willing to act against the day-to-day horrors of the apartheid system.

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 1983]

IT'S TIME TO STEP UP THE PRESSURE ON SOUTH AFRICA

(By Leon H. Sullivan)

The so-called Sullivan principles that I initiated six years ago were intended to bring the actions and influences of American companies in South Africa to bear against the racist practices and apartheid laws of that country. It was my hope that the principles would initiate similar efforts by multinational companies from other parts of the world, thereby creating a global multinational campaign in South Africa against the racial injustices that have existed there for 300 years. It was also my intent that the principles would serve as a catalyst to help change segregation practices in other private and public places throughout the country.

I have attempted to make it clear from the beginning that the principles are not

the total solution to the South African problem, and that even if they were implemented to the optimum, the principles alone could not end apartheid. Apartheid is a ruthless, inhumane system of practices and laws deeply embedded in the world's most racist society, and in order for apartheid to be completely eradicated, it requires the combined efforts of many forces, including governments, companies, churches, unions, the United Nations, those who believe in justice within the country, and world public opinion. But it is my firm opinion that the multinational corporations have a major role to play. In the past they have been the main beneficiaries of cheap labor and profits from this evil and unjust system and among its main supporters. It should be the responsibility of these companies to help change that system. Otherwise, they have no moral justification for remaining in South Africa, and should be compelled to leave the country.

The principles were never intended to be a camouflage for corporations to hide behind, but were meant, along with other thrusts, to help end race discrimination and apartheid in South Africa. It was hoped this could be done by peaceful means, without the need for devastating war and the loss of millions of lives and the predictable involvement of most of the rest of the world, particularly the superpowers, that could lead to an atomic confrontation.

Though progress is still limited in comparison to the enormous size of the problems, the principles are beginning to work. Starting from where we began six years ago at a near "zero" base where blacks were not even legally considered "employees" in that country, some significant changes are occurring:

Throughout South Africa, plants are being desegregated in spite of the laws.

Blacks and other nonwhites are being upgraded, for the first time, to administrative and supervisory jobs.

Blacks are supervising whites, for the first time, in South Africa.

Blacks and nonwhites are being trained for skilled jobs in ever increasing numbers.

Black representative registered and unregistered trade unions are now beginning to be recognized.

Technical schools training blacks and other nonwhites are being built.

Black businesses, in increasing numbers, are being initiated.

Equal pay for equal work is beginning to be instituted.

Companies are beginning to improve the quality of life for blacks and other nonwhites outside the workplace: in housing, health care, and education.

For the first time, some company executives are beginning to lobby for an end to all racial discriminatory laws and the apartheid system.

Also, the principles have led the way in the initiation of similar codes of conduct for companies operating in South Africa from around the world, including a group of South African companies that employ nearly 1 million workers, most of them black.

In conjunction with the principles, the Arthur D. Little Co. has formulated the most stringent and comprehensive measurement requirements for fair employment and social responsibility practices ever developed for multinational corporations operating in a foreign country.

As a result of the principles, the last six years have marked the beginning of a revo-

lution in industrial race relations in South Africa.

Unfortunately, even considering these beginnings, the vast changes necessary are not happening fast enough. The necessity for greater changes—visible, broad, effective and quick—is imperative. No one is more aware than I that the principles and other codes must be pushed harder for greater and faster results. It is my view that if the principles and codes of other nations are enforced and vigorously implemented and monitored, they can work for change, but in order to bring this about, more pressure is needed on the companies for fuller and swifter compliance.

In my opinion, the voluntary support of the principles has been effective, but is not getting the desired results quickly enough. More enforcement is needed. As I have testified before congressional committees on several occasions: "the full compliance with the principles of all American companies with operations in the Republic of South Africa should be made mandatory by the United States government, and backed up with embargoes, tax penalties, sanctions, loss of government contracts and any other effective means."

There are 150 American companies operating in South Africa that have not as yet signed the Sullivan principles, and against those companies there should be immediate divestment actions by stockholders, institutions, pension funds, government bodies and other fiduciaries. These companies represent 20 percent of the investments of American companies in South Africa.

Of the remaining 150 companies that have signed the principles, one-third are receiving "failing grades" in compliance, according to the annual Arthur D. Little report. These companies should be contacted by stockholders and fiduciaries and asked for written assurances they will do better in the coming year, accompanied by a plan for doing so. Otherwise there should be targeted divestment actions against those companies. Companies receiving "passing grades" according to the Little Report should be urged by stockholders to remain in their top categories, or face divestment.

American companies employ less than 1 percent of the workers in South Africa. For these efforts on the part of multinational companies to be broadly visible and effective, participation will have to be global. I have traveled abroad and have urged divestment actions against foreign companies in South African subsidiaries that are not living up to their codes. I have appealed for strong government action by the nations and their parliaments as pressure against company noncompliance.

Foremost, I see the necessity for the recognition of the rights of association for black workers, and the recognition of their representative registered and unregistered trade unions, thereby empowering black workers to speak out for their rights on the job, as they will one day speak out for their rights in society. The growing strength of the black worker is one of the greatest hopes for peaceful change in South Africa.

It is clear that the main problem in South Africa is not just fair employment practices, or equal opportunity, or better schools, as important as all these needs are. The main problem is freedom, including the end to influx control, an end to the incredible homeland policy, and full political equality for the black population. Therefore, beyond the principles, it is my position that until apartheid ends and full equality is achieved

for blacks, there should be no new expansion in South Africa by American companies, no new bank loans to the South African government, and no sales to the South African police or military.

Perhaps the Sullivan principles and the other codes in the world will only do so much, and only go so far. Perhaps the only way South Africa can be fundamentally changed is by massive conflict and a devastating war. But I believe that attempts must be made to find peaceful means for change if it is still possible.

If these world multinational company efforts are aggressively initiated, and broadly and effectively applied and closely monitored, they will have to make a difference.

None of us can be sure the total goals of the principles will ultimately be attained; but things are beginning to happen in South Africa as a result of the principles. They are a catalyst for social change in South Africa.

In this endeavor, powerful support will be needed beyond the companies, including unrelenting and much clearer commitments to racial justice in South Africa from the president of the United States, Congress and other government leaders and nations. But I have faith that with God's help, and with all the forces for human justice—within and without South Africa—aggressively pursuing their aims, there is still hope for a non-violent solution to the elimination of apartheid. Considering the awesome consequences and magnitude of death and destruction and international upheaval should these efforts fail, somehow we must succeed. ●

MEDICARE REFORM BILL INTRODUCTION

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Medicare Reform Act of 1983, which seeks to extend coverage under the medicare program. I am pleased to be the sponsor of this bill, which is aimed at providing more services to senior citizens and designed to reduce the cost of the program by including some preventive measures. I hope that my colleagues in the House will give this legislation serious and thoughtful consideration. In the past, I have introduced and seen passed provisions of my bill extending coverage. This bill is a continued effort to enact reforms in our system.

I realize that many of us here today are concerned about the Federal budget and are trying to balance fiscal restraint with adequate funding levels for social services and health care. I feel, however, that health care for seniors is not an area in which we are spending unnecessarily. Our seniors are a resource and, as their numbers grow with our demographic changes, are an active and important part of our Nation. Because their health is vital to them and to their participation in all sectors of society, I think it

is important for us to aid seniors in paying for health care. They, more than any other sector of our population, utilize health care services more frequently and extensively. The cost of this health care is fast becoming prohibitive. My bill would include coverage under the program for the fitting, prescribing, and cost of eyeglasses, hearing aids, and dentures. It also provides coverage for dental work, annual physical examinations, and routine foot care. It liberalizes the requirement for reimbursement for home health care and includes "routine chore services" as part of a home health program, as well as eliminating the \$60 deductible under part B of the program and authorizing reimbursement for orthopedic shoes.

Over the long term, many of my proposals would decrease costs for the program by decreasing the need for hospitalization. For instance, if the medicare program covered annual physical exams, beneficiaries would be more likely to go have the exam, which would result in inexpensive early detection and treatment of a problem instead of requiring more serious and extensive treatment later. We would keep the program from institutionalizing people who do not have the capacity to live totally independently but who do not need the 24-hour care of a costly institution by liberalizing home health requirements. Coverage for routine foot care and orthopedic shoes could, again, reduce costs over the long run by preventing the occurrence of problems which have the potential to become more serious later in life and, in the end, put more financial strain on the system.

I do feel that this is an area in which we have a responsibility to provide support, and I am hopeful that we shall give some time to discussing this issue during the 98th Congress.●

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOUTH PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, today I want to commend the students and Alumni of South Philadelphia High School on this the 75th anniversary of the school.

Few schools in this Nation, let alone in this city, have contributed more to every sector of our society. This list of graduates who have made their marks on the canvas of America's landscape is awesome, to say the least.

The arts, government, science, medicine, business, the field of education and the field of sports—all have been profoundly influenced by the sons and

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

daughters of South Philadelphia High School.

As they gather on May 11, 1983, to celebrate those 75 years of glory and triumph, we can only hope that the next 75 years are as generous to the Philadelphia area and to America as were the previous 75.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations.●

THREE CELEBRATE 25 YEARS IN PRIESTHOOD

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I recognize three dedicated Catholic priests in the First District of Maryland, all of whom will be celebrating the 25th anniversary of their ordination to the priesthood on May 31, 1983.

A native Washingtonian, Father Paul F. Liston attended St. Paul's (now Mackin) High School, Catholic University, and Christ the King Seminary in St. Bonaventure, N.Y. He was ordained to the priesthood by Cardinal Patrick A. O'Boyle on May 31, 1958, at St. Matthew's Cathedral.

Following ordination he was assigned to St. Hugh's Parish, Greenbelt, and was transferred to Blessed Sacrament in 1962. He was on the faculty of Cathedral Latin School from 1964 until 1971 when he was appointed a chaplain in the campus ministry at American University, with residence at Annunciation Parish.

After a year of sabbatical study from 1979 to 1980, Father Liston was assigned to St. Francis Xavier Parish, Washington, as associate pastor. He was appointed pastor of Holy Face Parish, Great Mills, in 1981.

Father Richard J. Smola, a native of Cleveland, Ohio, attended John Carroll University there and St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore. He was ordained to the priesthood by Cardinal Patrick A. O'Boyle on May 31, 1958, at St. Matthew's Cathedral.

Father Smola's first assignment was to St. Ignatius Parish, Oxon Hill; and he has also served as an associate pastor at St. Peter's, Washington; St. Mark's, Hyattsville; Holy Angels, Avenue; St. Ambrose, Cheverly; and Holy Redeemer, Kensington.

In 1974 he was assigned as pastor to Holy Face Parish, Great Mills, and in 1976 was appointed the vicar for St. Mary's County. In 1981 he became pastor of St. Aloysius Parish, Leonardtown, and dean of St. Mary's County.

Father Francis J. Murphy was born in Jersey City, N.J., and attended schools in New York City and St. Pius X College, Saranac Lake, N.Y. He received his seminary training at Regina

Cleri Seminary, Saskatchewan, and was ordained by Cardinal O'Boyle on May 31, 1958, at St. Matthew's Cathedral.

He was an associate pastor at St. Anthony's Parish for 3 years following ordination, then joined the faculty of Cathedral Latin School, where he was chairman of the religious education department. He remained there until 1967, and from 1963 until 1967 was also assistant director of the Archdiocesan Confraternity of Christian Doctrine Office.

From 1970 until 1973 Father Murphy was on the faculty of the University of San Francisco, and on returning to the Washington Archdiocese was appointed director of the Archdiocesan Office of Education, a post he held for 3 years. In 1975 he was appointed director of the Archdiocesan Office for Research, Planning and Development, and in 1977 was named assistant to Bishop Eugene Marino on the Archdiocesan Evangelization Coordinating Committee.

In 1978 he accepted a 1-year appointment as a visiting professor at the University of San Francisco, and in 1980 he became administrative assistant to the president of the National Catholic Educational Association.

Following an appointment as associate pastor of Blessed Sacrament Parish in 1979, Father Murphy was named administrator pro tem of St. Mary's, Bryantown. Since June of 1982 he has been on the faculty of Holy Name College, Oakland, Calif.

Each of these priests has devoted 25 selfless years to the church, and it is with deep appreciation that I congratulate them on their long record of service to humanity.●

BILATERAL FOREIGN AID: THE CHINESE LESSON

HON. JACK KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, it is always gratifying to have other nations follow our example of generosity. Unfortunately, in the field of foreign aid there appears to have been a problem in translation.

The People's Republic of China, a vast and underdeveloped Communist economy has initiated a bilateral foreign aid program. On the eve of his visit to Yugoslavia, Communist Party Secretary Hu Yaobang has announced a foreign aid package of \$120 million to that nation. The Financial Times reports that the aid package is being used as a foreign policy tool to "pave the way for a cordial reception." While this is normally one of the aims of foreign aid, I question the financing mechanism being used by the PRC.

Many of our colleagues will recall that the PRC has recently begun borrowing substantial amounts from the World Bank, including the interest-free, 50-year loans disbursed by the International Development Association. In 1983, this lending will amount to \$260 million, with about half in the interest-free category. In other words, the PRC will borrow, free of interest with 50 years to repay, exactly the funds which it is using to "pave the way" for Mr. Hu.

It may surprise many of our colleagues to know that they are financing the PRC's foreign aid program. It may further surprise them to know that their generosity is about to increase. The supplemental appropriation bill reported out of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee includes an extra \$245 million for IDA. This is in addition to the \$700 million already provided for fiscal year 1983.

Of course, not all of these additional IDA funds will be provided for relending in foreign aid programs. The World Bank's Monthly Operational Summary for March indicates that funds will be made available for improving facilities for mining, petroleum production and petrochemicals, all of which are owned by nationalized industries and compete directly with our domestic, privately owned industries.

So that my colleagues may review the lessons to be drawn, I ask that the Financial Times article be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Finance Times, May 10, 1983]

CHINA LENDS YUGOSLAVIA \$120 MILLION ON EVE OF HU VISIT TO BELGRADE

(By Aleksander Lebl in Belgrade and David Buchan in London)

China has taken the unusual step of making Yugoslavia a short-term hard currency loan of \$120m, thereby helping pave the way for a cordial reception in Belgrade today of Hu Yaobang, its top party leader, on the second leg of his East European tour.

Hu's first trip abroad in his new capacity as general secretary of the Chinese Communist Party is clearly designed to reward non-aligned Yugoslavia and maverick Romania for maintaining friendly ties with Peking, even during the worst of Sino-Soviet hostilities. It also seems aimed at sounding out reaction to current reconciliation moves between China and the Soviet Union.

The Chinese official is confining his trip to Yugoslavia and Romania, where he held weekend talks with President Nicolae Ceausescu. But senior members of his entourage are due to go on to the other five East European countries that are close allies of Moscow.

China has now joined 15 Nato and neutral governments in the West, as well as Kuwait, in giving Yugoslavia financial loans and trade credit extensions worth \$1.3bn to help it overcome its debt servicing crisis. Peking, like the rest apparently judges Yugoslavia to be a valuable buffer between Nato and the Warsaw Pact.

Unlike the Western countries, whose aid to Yugoslavia is in the form of government agreements, the Chinese loan is a short-term deposit with the Yugoslav national bank.

This move follows on a trade protocol signed by Mr. Mijat Sukovic, the Yugoslav Vice-Premier, in Peking in March. This calls for a substantial increase in two-way trade, from only \$50m last year to a surprising \$1.2bn in 1984. Yugoslavia has also agreed to reconstruct Chinese factories in Tientsin, in return for oil which China is owed in barter deals from the Middle East and Africa.

Cutting Yugoslavia's oil import bill settled in hard currency is a Government priority. On his trip to Belgrade in March, Mr. Nikolai Tikhonov, the Soviet Prime Minister, promised a 20 per cent increase this year in Soviet oil shipments under the bilateral clearing arrangement between the two countries.

In fanning out across Eastern Europe, Chinese officials are also giving their version of remaining obstacles to Sino-Soviet rapprochement. At a Bucharest dinner in his honour late last week, Hu made only an oblique reference to past hostilities with the Soviet Union by thanking Romania for invaluable support in China's defence of "just norms of international relations and of relations between Communist parties."

In an interview with Tanjug, the Yugoslav news agency, however, Hu said that Indochina, where Moscow and Peking are backing rival claimants for power in Kampuchea, was "obviously" the main obstacle. He also criticised the "military occupation of one socialist country by another," an apparent reference to the Red Army's presence in Afghanistan.

RABBI LANDSBERG—FIFTEEN YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE

HON. BERNARD J. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege to call to the attention of my colleagues the many achievements of Rabbi Alfred B. Landsberg who is celebrating his 15th anniversary at Temple Emanu-El in Edison, N.J.

Rabbi Landsberg is a humanitarian in the truest sense of the word. He has made a vast contribution not only to the synagogue, but to our community as well.

He has served twice as president of our local clergy association and has also presided over the Rabbinic Association of Middlesex County, N.J.

Among his special interests is his work as chaplain of the Woodbridge State School where his example and guidance have enhanced student life.

At Temple Emanu-El, he is a most caring and responsive rabbi, serving his congregation with a sense of purpose and compassion for people that is truly inspiring.

Our community is celebrating Rabbi Landsberg's 15 years of dedicated service and showing our appreciation through "A Gala Evening of Song," a most fitting tribute to a man whose unselfish efforts and spiritual guidance have been a gift to us all.●

SACRAMENTO'S LARRY WREYFORD

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to Larry Wreyford, an Air Logistics Command management specialist at McClellan Air Force Base. I am pleased to announce that Mr. Wreyford has recently been honored with the Department of Defense Individual Value Engineering Award for fiscal year 1982. This award honors a valued engineering proposal that will save the Air Force nearly \$110 million in equipment and fuel costs over a 2-year period. The plan proposes switching support generators, now used to generate power for bomber and cargo aircraft on the ground, to the same use for fighter aircraft. These generators burn 38 gallons of fuel an hour, but Wreyford found that generators burning 7 gallons per hour would produce adequate power for the bomber and cargo aircraft. The fighter aircraft, which have greater power demands, will make more efficient use of these generators, and new fuel efficient generators can be purchased for the bomber and cargo aircraft.

Congress is now engaged in a crucial debate over the adequacy of our Nation's defense capabilities, a debate that is often overwhelmed with discussions of weapons research and development, and the procurement of billion dollar weapons systems. This timely recognition of Larry Wreyford serves to illustrate the important role that our people in operations and maintenance play in securing our Nation's defense. We can look with pride on the contribution of Larry Wreyford in insuring that the funds appropriated by Congress are used to build a defense that is second to none in strength and efficiency.

Mr. Wreyford has compiled a distinguished record of service to his country, beginning in World War II as a B-17 pilot and continuing for 21 years in the logistics field, before retiring in 1963. Mr. Wreyford began a second career in 1964 at McClellan Air Force Base, where he has advanced steadily to his present position of program manager for aircraft ground support generators and other equipment. Larry Wreyford has set a high standard of cost consciousness in Government service for his colleagues and all Federal employees to emulate.●

"YOU'RE LOOKING GOOD CHAPPIE" WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N.Y., DEMOCRATS HONOR "CHAPPIE" POSILLIPO

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues the distinguished career of Anthony "Chappie" Posillipo, who is retiring after 15 consecutive years as supervisor of the town of Rye, N.Y. I am proud to be among those who will honor Chappie at the annual Westchester County Democratic dinner on May 21 at the Rye Hilton in New York.

During his administration, Chappie always satisfied both the desires and needs of his constituents. Under Chappie's 30 years of leadership, the town of Rye has grown and matured, yet has maintained the personal and orderly character of a small New England village. With Chappie's guidance, the town of Rye has become the home of sophisticated shopping centers, the beautiful Rye Town Hilton, and most recently, the new world headquarters for the General Foods Corp. He has brought prosperity and pride to the people of Rye.

When Chappie Posillipo picked up the gavel of town supervisor, he laid aside the mason tools he had used for more than 30 years. At the age of 11, he had to abandon his plans to enter the priesthood and assume the head of a household of six sisters and one brother. His father was a master stonemason and Chappie followed in his footsteps by apprenticing to his father's union local 48.

In a few years, Chappie was an adroit mason. Having grown up attending mass in a small one-room basement chapel, Chappie supervised the construction of the Corpus Christi Church, which stands today as a monument to Chappie's dedication to helping his fellow citizens and his skills in planning and masonry.

Steadily, Chappie moved up the leadership of his union and at 18 years of age was elected corresponding secretary of the local in 1926. In 1937 he was elected as the union's full-time business agent and financial secretary and held these positions until his election as town supervisor in November 1953. He then resigned the position of business agent, but has continued to this day as the financial secretary of local 48. Many times, Chappie has used his mediating abilities and knowledge of industrial relations to resolve difficult labor problems in Westchester County.

Yet, for all his time devoted to work, Chappie found time in his youth to be both athlete and sports manager. In

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the early 1930's his management of the Corpus Christi Church teams built them into a semi-pro club that had a working arrangement with the New York Yankees as a farm club. So successful were their games that Chappie agreed to design a 2,000-seat ball park with an advanced night lighting system.

Any tribute to Chappie suffers from the fault of leaving out so many of his accomplishments. In Westchester County, Chappie's work on behalf of others and his popularity are legend. I can only conclude by saying, as Chappie has always been fond of saying to the legions of people whose lives he has touched, that you, Chappie, are indeed "looking good."●

WORKING TOGETHER FOR EQUALITY

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to take the time to recognize recent actions of the Human Rights Commission of Howard County condemning hate groups and their activities. As a representative of a portion of Howard County, I would like to commend the commission for its important work and voice my strong opposition to activities of hate groups across the country. This resurfacing of racial and ethnic hatred surely represents the baser side of humanity. A side of mankind we cannot afford to ignore and just hope it will go away.

I feel we in the State of Maryland are taking some positive steps toward reducing the incidence of hate group activities. The Maryland General Assembly has increased the penalties for certain hate group activities and made many of them felonies. The commission in its resolution also offered several constructive ideas as to how the Howard County government can reduce the activities of hate groups. For instance, the resolution calls upon the county executive and county council to enact legislation that prohibits distribution of hate group literature on county-owned or supported property and makes such actions grounds for dismissal for county employees.

I encourage the county executive and county council to take the necessary steps to insure that this legislation is passed. In addition, I would encourage other Members of this body to work with local elected officials and concerned citizens to combat the repulsive acts perpetrated by these vicious hate groups.●

VICTOR POPOVSKY

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and obligated to raise my voice on behalf of a family denied the right to emigrate freely from the Soviet Union, contrary to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Soviets are a signatory to this and the Final Act of the Helsinki Accords, which guarantees expeditious handling of requests to emigrate. Their behavior in the case of Victor Popovsky and his family of Sukhumi, Georgia, contravenes this international agreement.

Almost 8 years have passed since the Popovskys and their six children first applied for visas to leave the country. This request was unjustly denied. The reason was that Mr. Popovsky's passport stated his nationality as "Russian," despite the fact that his birth certificate shows his mother is of Jewish origin. Regardless of this national classification, Mr. Popovsky and his family should be allowed to live in the country of their choice. Bureaucratic subterfuge is being used to deny the Popovskys this internationally recognized human right.

I extend my hand toward Victor Popovsky and his family. May the Soviet Union abide by the treaties it has signed and allow them to emigrate.●

ANTI-SEMITISM IN NICARAGUA

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, as the House continues to deliberate our policy in Central America, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a little known but nonetheless disturbing element in the increasingly restive situation in Nicaragua. To those who consider the Sandinistas a group of gentle agrarian reformers interested in social justice, their treatment of the populace exposes them for what they are—totalitarians, replete with repression every bit as bad as any other totalitarian state behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Speaker, the Sandinistas' persecution of minorities and denial of religious freedom should be as disturbing to our liberal, elitist friends in this country as to freedom-lovers. In a zeal to hold to account the Government of El Salvador, which at this very moment is battling an assault on democracy mounted from the capital of

Nicaragua, many individuals seem to have lost their perspective.

I have just received, and would like to insert in the RECORD at this point, a profoundly disturbing report which contains the following statement by Rabi Morton Rosenthal, Latin American director for the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, concerning the overtly antisemitic aspects of the Sandinista takeover in Nicaragua:

Nicaraguan Jews say that the main reason for their flight is the fact that they were treated in a discriminatory manner by the revolutionary government. They claim that their properties were among the first to be confiscated; Jews who owned factories and stores were summarily ejected from the homes and places of business and the properties turned over to workers. Many accusations were made against them, without proof. Often, their individual safety was threatened.

After the earthquake, the Jewish community built a synagogue to replace that which had been destroyed. In September 1978, the doors of the synagogue were torched by Sandinista supporters while the congregation was worshipping. Now, the synagogue is a Sandinist building with propaganda posters covering the religious symbols at the front entrance and anti-Zionist posters on the walls.

To any student of history, this development should come as no surprise. Collectivist-statist totalitarians of every stripe, be they Fascist, Nazi, or Communist, have consistently persecuted Jews and other minorities. The Sandinistas clearly fall into the same category as all the memorable thugs in history who taught them everything they know when it comes to the commission of crimes against humanity. ●

TRIBUTE TO MR. STEVE OWENS

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1983

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the Members' attention the distinguished service given to the community of Mission Hills, Calif., by Mr. Steve Owens. Mr. Owens has given freely of his time and energy in the last year as president of the Mission Hills Chamber of Commerce.

During his term as president, Steve Owens has brought a greater sense of political knowledge and awareness to the Mission Hills Chamber of Commerce. Members have had opportunities to become more familiar with the issues of utility rate increases, immigration, gun control, and crime through his efforts. Steve Owens has also worked to create a closer relationship between the chamber and local schools and community groups. He helped to organize area cleanup efforts, and assisted in the refurbishment of a building in nearby Pacoima. And, of some note in this time of aus-

terity, he guided the chamber through 1982 with a balanced budget.

Steve Owens' commitment to the community does not stop there, however. He serves as a member of the board of directors of the United Chambers of Commerce, as the advisory group legislative chairman of the North Valley Occupational Center, and on the Police Athletic League Association, the San Fernando Valley Board of Realtors, the Valleywide Committee Executive Board, the San Fernando Valley Business and Professional Association, the Parent and Teachers Association, and the Holy Cross Hospital Century Club.

Steve Owens has been honored by the San Fernando Valley Board of Realtors, and, in 1977, was named Man of the Year by the Mission Hills Chamber of Commerce. He has served as a director, as vice president and as secretary before becoming president of the chamber in 1982.

It is a pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to join with the members of the Mission Hills Chamber of Commerce in commending Steve Owens for his outstanding year of service as president. I would like to take this opportunity to extend to him my personal congratulations, and best wishes in all of his future endeavors. ●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 12, 1983, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 13

9:30 a.m.
Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 137, to permit the continued issuance of mortgage

revenue bonds after December 31, 1983, and S. 1061, to revise certain IRS provisions relating to the tax treatment of bonds guaranteed by certain Federal agencies.

SD-215

* Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to mark up S. 772, proposed Smoking Prevention Health and Education Act, S. 1129, proposed Community Volunteer Service Act, S. 564, proposed U.S. Academy of Peace Act, Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to implementing the objectives of the United States Decade of Disabled Persons (1983-92), an original bill authorizing funds for fiscal years 1984, 1985, and 1986 for the Education for the Handicapped Act, and an original bill authorizing funds for fiscal years 1984, 1985, and 1986 for the Rehabilitation Act.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

MAY 16

9:00 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on the substance of S. 66, proposed Cable Telecommunications Act.

SD-226

9:30 a.m.
Finance
Health Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the administration's budget proposals for fiscal year 1984 to revise beneficiary cost-sharing requirements under the medicare and medicaid programs.

SD-215

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings to examine the effects of coal slurry pipelines on the rail industry, shippers, and consumers.

SD-253

Labor and Human Resources
Aging Subcommittee
To hold hearings to discuss the progress made in the treatment of Alzheimer's disease.

SD-430

MAY 17

9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the International Monetary Fund's gold reserves.

SD-538

Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands and Reserved Water Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 285, to designate certain lands in New Mexico as the Bisti Badlands Wilderness, S. 626, to designate certain lands in Arizona as the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness, S. 862, revising certain provisions of the Omitted Lands Act of 1962 with respect to omitted lands along the Snake River in Idaho, and S. 1042, to convey certain lands in Lane County, Oreg.

SD-366

Rules and Administration

To hold hearings on S. 85, to provide for public financing of U.S. Senate general election campaigns, S. 151, to limit contributions to U.S. Senate campaigns by certain multicandidate political committees, S. 732, to increase individual and party participation, to provide for the adjustment of contribution limits, and to allow candidates to control expenditures made on their behalf, S. 810, to provide for certain adjustments in campaign contribution limits, and other pending legislation.

SR-301

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings on the water resources provisions of S. 267, to facilitate the development of interstate coal pipeline distribution systems by granting the Federal power of eminent domain to those interstate pipelines which are determined to be in the national interest.

SD-406

Judiciary

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Select on Intelligence

Closed briefing on intelligence matters. S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Environment and Public Works

Water Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposals to provide for the operation, maintenance, and construction of national waterways, including S. 196, S. 207, S. 433, S. 455, S. 456, S. 635, S. 674, S. 812, S. 850, S. 878, S. 912, S. 987, S. 1028, S. 1073, S. 1075, S. 1112, and S. 1131.

SD-406

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nomination of David F. Emery, of Maine, to be Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

SD-419

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on the nomination of Stephen F. Eilperin, to be an associate judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

SD-342

3:00 p.m.

Judiciary

Separation of Powers Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up S. 462, to clarify certain provisions of the Hobbs Act relating to Federal jurisdiction over labor extortion matters.

SD-226

MAY 18

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Governmental Efficiency and the District of Columbia Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the status of emergency preparedness in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area.

SD-562

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine credit and debit card fraud and its impact on the cost and availability of consumer credit.

SD-538

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

Foreign Relations

To resume hearings on Senate Resolution 43 and Senate Joint Resolution 28, resolutions calling for negotiations prohibiting the testing, deployment, production or use of all weapons based in space.

SD-419

Judiciary

Criminal Law Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 829, to strengthen law enforcement in the area of violent crime and drug trafficking.

SD-226

Veterans' Affairs

To hold oversight hearings to review adverse health effects from exposure to agent orange, and other related matters.

SD-628

1:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nominations of Myles R. R. Frechette, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the United Republic of Cameroon, and Robert E. Keating, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Madagascar and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Federal and Islamic Republic of the Comoros.

SD-419

2:00 p.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings on pending nominations.

SD-226

Veterans' Affairs

To continue oversight hearings to review adverse health effects from exposure to agent orange, and other related matters.

SD-628

MAY 19

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To resume hearings on S. 372, to promote interstate commerce by prohibiting discrimination in the writing and selling of insurance contracts.

SR-253

Governmental Affairs

To resume oversight hearings on the management policies of the Department of Defense, focusing on the implementation of cost accounting standards.

SD-342

Judiciary

Criminal Law Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 829, to strengthen law enforcement in the area of violent crime and drug trafficking.

SD-226

Judiciary

Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1201, to provide copyright protection for the semiconductor chip industry.

SD-562

Joint Economic

To hold hearings to review the administration's future position on farm policy.

SD-124

9:45 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on health care cost.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Environmental Pollution Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 696, to provide for the ratification of the Memorandum of Agreement between the U.S. Department of the Interior and the State of Texas for the Management of the Matagorda Island State Park and Wildlife Management Area A Unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System in Calhoun County, Tex.

SD-406

Foreign Relations

Arms Control, Oceans, International Operations, and Environment Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the growing trend within various international organizations to produce draft international guidelines and regulations which restrict or impede U.S. exports.

SD-419

Judiciary

Courts Subcommittee

To hold hearings to discuss bankruptcy matters relating to the Manville Corp. in Denver, Colo.

SR-418

10:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold oversight hearings on the geopolitics of strategic and critical minerals

SD-366

2:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nomination of Curtin Winsor, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to Costa Rica.

SD-419

MAY 20

9:30 p.m.

Finance

Oversight of the International Revenue Service Subcommittee

To hold hearings on efforts to reduce taxpayer burdens.

SD-215

10:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nomination of Richard B. Stone, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador at Large.

SD-419

Judiciary

To resume oversight hearings on organized crime in the United States.

SD-226

Judiciary

Constitution Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the constitutionality of private lobbying with public funds.

SD-628

MAY 23

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Criminal Law Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 829, to strengthen law enforcement in the area of violent crime and drug trafficking.

SD-562

- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
SD-124
- Judiciary
To resume hearings on S. 610, to encourage college student-athletes to complete their undergraduate education before becoming professional athletes.
SD-226
- 1:30 p.m.
Finance
Energy and Agricultural Taxation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 237, to allow surface mine operators to establish a reserve for mining land reclamation costs and to deduct additions to such reserve, and S. 1006, to repeal the 15-percent reduction in percentage depletion for iron ore and coal.
SD-215
- 2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Subcommittee
To hold hearings on patent term restoration.
SD-226
- MAY 24
- 9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on certain provisions of the proposed Mortgage Retirement Account Act.
SD-538
- Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA).
SD-430
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
SD-124
- Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366
- Governmental Affairs
Permanent subcommittee on Investigations
To resume hearings to investigate the use of offshore banks, trusts, and companies to facilitate criminal activity in the United States.
SD-342
- Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-226
- MAY 25
- 9:00 a.m.
Office of Technology Assessment
To meet to consider pending Board matters.
EF-100, Capitol
- 9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Securities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1174, proposed Public Utility Holding Company Act Amendments.
SD-538
- Judiciary
Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the problem of parental kidnaping.
SD-226
- Labor and Human Resources
To continue hearings on health care cost.
SD-430
- 10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366
- Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To continue hearings to investigate the use of offshore banks, trusts, and companies to facilitate criminal activity in the United States.
SD-342
- Governmental Affairs
Energy, Nuclear proliferation and Government Processes Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to review Federal debt collection policy.
Room to be announced
- Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.
S-407, Capitol
- Joint Economic
Agriculture and Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review farm policy in the post-PIK era.
SD-124
- 10:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Separation of Powers Subcommittee
To resume hearings to explore certain Federal court procedures relating to the exclusionary rule, habeas corpus, and related matters.
SD-628
- 2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SD-226
- Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor on consolidation of student loans, focusing on findings of GAO studies mandated under Public Law 97-301, Sallie Mae Technical Amendments Act of 1982.
2175 Rayburn Building
- MAY 26
- 9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Securities Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1174, proposed Public Utility Holding Company Act Amendments.
SD-538
- Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To hold hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 10, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States
- relative to equal rights for women and men, and on related measures.
SD-628
- 10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366
- Judiciary
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee
To hold hearings on title XIII, relating to Federal Tort Claims Act amendments, of S. 829, proposed Comprehensive Crime Control Act.
SD-226
- Joint Economic
Agriculture and Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the future direction in farm policy.
SD-124
- 2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on plea bargaining matters.
SD-226
- MAY 27
- 9:00 a.m.
Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on miscellaneous tax measures, including S. 654, S. 738, S. 1147, S. 1194, and S. 1195.
SD-215
- 9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 81 and S. 141, bills to revise current law relating to civil actions for the deprivation of rights.
SD-562
- 10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Separation of Powers Subcommittee
To resume hearings to explore certain Federal court procedures relating to the exclusionary rule, habeas corpus, and related matters.
SD-226
- JUNE 6
- 9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the proposed Single-Employer Pension Plan Termination Insurance Improvements Act.
SD-430
- JUNE 7
- 10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-226
- JUNE 8
- 9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on food safety.
SD-430
- 10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on S. 915, proposed Taxpayer Antitrust Enforcement Act.
SD-226

May 11, 1983

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

12049

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation providing for certain veterans' compensation.
SR-418

JUNE 9

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To continue hearings on food safety.
SD-430

JUNE 10

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To continue hearings on food safety.
SD-430

10:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Separation of Powers Subcommittee
To resume hearings to explore certain Federal court procedures relating to the exclusionary rule, habeas corpus, and related matters.
SD-226

JUNE 13

9:30 a.m.
Finance
To hold hearings to examine the tax structure applicable to property and casualty insurance companies.
SD-215

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on home health care services.
SD-430

JUNE 14

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation revising certain provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act (Landrum-Griffin Act).
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on airline deregulation.
SR-253

JUNE 15

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on activities of the Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce.
SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on airline deregulation.
SR-253

Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to review certain health care and other services provided Vietnam veterans.
SR-418

10:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on the nominations of Ford B. Ford, of California, to be Under Secretary of Labor, and Made-

leine C. Will, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.
SD-430

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SD-226

JUNE 16

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the deinstitutionalization of certain status offenders.
SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation revision certain provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act (Landrum-Griffin Act).
SD-430

JUNE 20

9:30 a.m.
Finance
To hold hearings on S. 19 and S. 888, bills to revise current Federal pension law with respect to the rights and benefits of working and nonworking women.
SD-215

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for refugee programs.
SD-226

JUNE 21

9:30 a.m.
Finance
To continue hearings on S. 19 and S. 888, bills to revise current Federal pension law with respect to the rights and benefits of working and nonworking women.
SD-215

JUNE 22

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 737, proposed Joint Research and Development Ventures Act.
SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on the breakdown of the traditional family unit, focusing on causes and remedies.
SD-430

Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on certain health care services for veterans.
SR-418

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SD-226

JUNE 23

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on the breakdown of the traditional family unit, focusing on the role of Federal policy.
SD-430

JUNE 27

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed authorizations for refugee programs.
SD-226

JUNE 28

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1173, proposed Federal Mine Safety and Health Amendments.
SD-430

JUNE 29

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Subcommittee
To hold hearings on Federal Government patent policy.
SD-226

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation providing for certain veterans' compensation.
SR-418

JUNE 30

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
to hold hearings on juvenile offenders of serious and violent crimes.
SD-226

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Office of Administrative Law Judges, Department of Agriculture.
SD-562

JULY 6

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

JULY 13

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

JULY 20

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

12050

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

May 11, 1983

JULY 27

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending
calendar business. SD-430

SEPTEMBER 20

11:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to receive legislative
recommendations for fiscal year 1984
from the American Legion. SR-325

CANCELLATIONS

MAY 12

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
To hold hearings on certain tragedies in-
volving children. SD-226

MAY 13

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings to examine fire safety
matters. SD-430

MAY 19

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcom-
mittee
To consult with administration officials
on the midyear refugee numbers. SD-226

MAY 20

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on the effects of chem-
otherapy in the treatment of cancer. SD-430

JUNE 15

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcom-
mittee
To hold hearings on the proposed Alien
Education Assistance Act. SD-430

JUNE 20

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on activities
of the Equal Employment Opportuni-
ty Commission. SD-430