

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ARMS RACE RESOLUTION

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, this past week I received—as did all my congressional colleagues—a most powerful and compelling resolution on the many dimensions of the arms race. It comes from the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. The assembly is the highest governing body of the church which has a membership of over 3 million. It is a representative judiciary composed of an equal number of ministers and lay officers—known as elders—elected by the 195 presbyteries of the denomination.

What I found compelling in the resolution was not only the support for a nuclear freeze but the thoughtful and responsible manner by which the assembly dealt with the many aspects and dimensions of the worldwide arms race. It calls for renewed efforts toward a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It urges the Government not to deploy new missile systems in Europe. It addresses other dimensions of the arms race: The growing international arms trade and the increased levels of violence that are the result of that trade; the distorted national priorities that are reflected in the energies of our scientists devoted to military research and development; and the growing emphasis on military use of space. It not only spotlights these areas of concerns but suggests several innovative solutions to reverse these dangerous trends.

I urge all Members to give careful consideration to the following resolution.

THE ARMS RACE: CONTINUING DYNAMICS

Approved by the 195th General Assembly (1983), Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), June 1983

STATEMENT OF CONCERN

We are Christ's people. We live by faith in the God who is the source of life, the Lord of all nations and peoples, the judge of history and the giver of grace experienced by us as Shalom—peace. In responding to God's grace, the church seeks to bear witness to Christ, the Prince of Peace, by nourishing the moral life of the nation for the sake of peace. The times call for a faithful and obedient people. We are called to be faithful stewards of God in the created order. We are called to be reconcilers in a world divided by historic, political, ideological, racial, and cultural barriers. We are called to work for justice in a world where the patterns of violence and human depravi-

ty are often more visible than signs of hope. We are called to see beyond our own limited horizons, to view the world through the eyes of Christ.

When, as Christ's people, we see the burden of the arms race on the creation, on nations, and on all peoples, we are compelled to renew our commitment to achieving disarmament in ways that will guarantee the peace, security, and integrity of all peoples.

Numerous aspects of the arms race, with far-reaching implications for our own society and the whole world, challenge us in this witness. There are factors that disturb the stability of societies, that alter the physical environments in which we live, that deplete limited economic and natural resources, that heighten the risks and broaden the parameters of potential conflict.

The church in its witness must help to nurture change in public attitudes, raise public consciousness about the issues, and examine the values that shape the decision-making forces in our society. To this end the United Presbyterian Church addresses several of these matters as it renews its commitment to witness for peace.

THE DYNAMICS

A. Nuclear Armaments

The primary global threat comes from the escalating and accelerating nuclear arms race and has been addressed by the church on numerous occasions. Despite the attention given the nuclear arms race at the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament (1982), the professed commitment of the United States administration to reach meaningful arms agreements involving substantial reductions in nuclear strategic and theatre weapons, and the ongoing multilateral and bilateral negotiations in Geneva, the evidence is clear that the nuclear arms race will be with us for at least another decade. Clear actions that would give some sign of hope are avoided. The administration opposes an immediate bilateral nuclear freeze and refuses to press for the ratification of Salt II. It has discontinued negotiations on a comprehensive test ban treaty and is pursuing plans that will mean abandoning the Antiballistic Missile Treaty. At the same time that Congress has moved toward the endorsement of a nuclear freeze, it has also approved the financing and development of major weapons systems: the MX Missile, the B-1 Bomber, the Cruise missile, and the Trident submarine. At the same time the Soviet Union has announced plans of their own for matching United States advances.

B. The Arms Trade

While the whole world teeters on the brink of nuclear disaster, various parts of the world have been undergoing their own catastrophes. Local, regional, and civil wars have claimed 25,000,000 lives since World War II. These wars are often fought with weapons supplied by the industrial powers—from both the East and the West. In countless situations the militarization of developing countries is accompanied by extreme repression of the peoples in those countries by their own governments.

Recent studies reveal that during the period from 1978 to 1982 conventional arms transfer agreements between developing countries and the arms suppliers have totaled \$120 billion. The non-Communist world has accounted for \$76 billion of this total, the Communist world \$44 billion. The Soviet Union has sold \$33 billion and the United States, \$30 billion. While sales and agreements vary from year to year, the trend has been ever upward. Each superpower has its preferred clients, depending on its ideological and strategic interest.

For the merchants the arms trade has the deceptively easy appearance of being "good business" because the focus is on the immediate realization of high profits, not on the long-range impact of the arms race on society. Costs (research, development, tooling, etc.) are distributed over a greater quantity when weapons are produced for export and not just for domestic use, thereby reducing the costs per item. This constitutes an advantage particularly beneficial to the initiator of new weapons.

For the selling country, arms sales can be a source of hard currency or a way of redressing balance of payment deficits. Sales also tend to fix seller-buyer relations because they inevitably involve further training, service, and parts agreements.

Buyers often presume they are enhancing the security of their countries because they are conditioned to think of security in military terms. They also tend to assume that modern armaments facilitate the economic modernization of their societies. More frequently, insecurity and economic dislocation occur because expenditures on arms imports can only weaken the domestic economy.

C. Military Research and Development

The relationship between the arms race and technological imperatives has long been debated. Technocrats often argue simply from the logic of development: If new technology makes a new weapon possible, that weapon is then seen as necessary and should be produced. Others argue that weapons technology development always proceeds from the political decision-makers. These arguments do not obscure the obvious.

1. Military research and development are estimated to consume one fourth of the entire world expenditure for research and development for all purposes—in excess of \$35 billion in 1980. They further occupy the talents and energies of over 3 million of the world's scientists and engineers. In the United States this represents 40 percent of our scientific resources.

2. Military research and development increase the sophistication of weapons systems. In addition to the refinement of nuclear systems with enhanced accuracy and faster delivery times, the superpowers are working on weapons utilizing high energy sources, e.g., lasers and particle beams. Chemical and biological weapons, mostly developed in secret, represent unknown destructive potentials. Antipersonnel weapons, e.g., cluster and combustion bombs, seem only to become more diabolical as our inventiveness progresses.

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

3. Military research and development moneys reflect diversion of resources from purposes that could be more constructive and beneficial for the whole human family. The consequences are numerous and profound: In the Third World such a diversion can severely inhibit economic development. For the United States, caught in economic stagnation with slow economic growth, the economic diversion restricts development in the consumer and production sectors of our society.

Militarily, the technological race stimulates the general arms race because it fosters a continuing cycle of competitive development, duplication, and counterdevelopment among the different national contestants. As a consequence, the pattern further depersonalizes the decision-making process, as technology forces us into an ever-increasing reliance on the computer and on other automated responses. We are moving toward a "launch on warning" stage in the nuclear arms race. This dehumanizes people by treating them as expendable or as if they were machines. Both weapons of mass destruction and antipersonnel weapons (e.g., plastic fragmentation bombs resulting in splinters that cannot be detected in the human body), reflect a disregard for human life and an alienation from responsibility for the victims.

D. The Space Race

After several decades of primarily peaceful exploration of space where the military uses of space developments have been essentially passive in nature, i.e., related to intelligence gathering, monitoring, and communications, the United States Government has announced a new space policy emphasizing military operations. Its plans call for increased spending on military operations in space. For example, the military space budget in 1982 (\$6.2 billion) surpassed that of NASA for the first time. The Air Force has also created a new space command, and space shuttle operations may increasingly become military in purpose. Finally, the temptation to place military attack and defense systems in orbit will be great whether these involve antisatellite weapons, nuclear orbital-bombing systems, or laser and particle-beam weapons.

We are on the verge of a new, dangerous, and destabilizing space war race and are therefore faced with a new challenge: Can we stop the race before it begins? We know that ending it, after it has begun, will be next to impossible. The 1967 Outer Space Treaty, ratified by both the United States and the Soviet Union, is known to be inadequate to stop a "space wars" scenario because it does not cover new and emerging technologies. Talks with the Soviet Union on this issue have been suspended since 1979 and as yet no current forum exists for controlling or preventing this next expansion of the arms race.

CONCLUSION

All of these developments in the arms race foster the militarization of American society, weakening the very democratic fabric of our society. Evidences of this should be clear: The requirements of military secrecy in all areas limit the right of the people to know and, thus, to form educated opinions. This denies them the ability to participate adequately in the democratic process either directly or through their representatives. This is also reaffirmed by the courts, which essentially say that the people have no standing to gain access to military information, to challenge the political decisions of

the administration, or even to enjoin the government to adhere to the law on the grounds that the court cannot make political determinations or rule on the foreign policy powers of the President.

Further, the decision-making exigencies of strategic nuclear war often foreclose even congressional participation as constitutionally required in matters related to war.

The military-industrial orientation of our economy, with its heavy social costs, weakens the social structures designed to provide for the general welfare. The military "necessities" take priority over civilian need—particularly when congresspersons are so susceptible to pressures from the military-industrial complex.

Militarism is difficult to sustain in a normally open and democratic society. Therefore, it appears that a climate of fear and distrust is systematically cultivated in order to justify the economic burden. A democratic society cannot long survive without full participation by its constituents, reasonable patterns of accountability, and essential levels of trust.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Confession of 1967 reminds us that "God's redeeming work in Jesus Christ embraces the whole of man's life: social and cultural, economic and political, scientific and technological, individual and corporate"; and makes clear that "God's reconciliation in Jesus Christ is the ground of the peace, justice, and freedom among nations which all powers of government are called to serve and defend"; and that "reconciliation among nations becomes peculiarly urgent as countries develop nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, diverting their manpower and resources from constructive uses and risking the annihilation of mankind" (The Constitution of The United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, Part I, Confession of 1967, Part II, Section A, 4, b; Part III (9.45 and 9.53); and

Whereas Peacemaking: The Believers' Calling reminds us that the church bears witness to Christ when it nourishes the moral life of the nation for the sake of peace in the world; and

Whereas the arms race continues unabated, with its many facets shaping our futures: a continuous buildup in nuclear weaponry and delivery systems at the expense of domestic programs; a burgeoning international arms trade involving the most sophisticated of weapons, with increasing and crippling costs to developing countries; an evermore consuming preoccupation of the scientific and engineering community with specifically military research and development at the expense of humanitarian goals; a conscious shifting of the arms race into space, which was previously reserved for peaceful development; and

Whereas the consequences of these developments appear to be an ever-increasing threat to the democratic values and structures of our society, as well as an ever-growing threat to the peace of the world;

Therefore, the 195th General Assembly (1983) of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, believing that a just peace requires the rejection of militarism as the basis for security and as the organizing force for social order and the rejection of war as an instrument for obtaining national goals, renews its call for an end to the arms race in all of its dimensions.

In so doing, the 195th General Assembly (1983):

1. Renews its efforts to seek an end to the nuclear arms race by:

a. Reaffirming its endorsement of a bilateral verifiable freeze on the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons, missiles, and new aircraft designed primarily to deliver such weapons;

b. Commending those synods, presbyteries, and congregations that have endorsed the Bilateral Nuclear Weapons Freeze and encouraging other governing bodies and congregations to consider prayerfully endorsing and taking additional supporting actions;

c. Calling upon the administration to resume negotiations on a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, to take the place of the existing Limited Test Ban Treaty;

d. Calling upon our government in the absence of a Bilateral freeze to initiate a suspension of nuclear testing for a specific time period, thereby offering a challenge to the Soviets to a reciprocal suspension, while negotiations on a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty are under way;

e. Calling upon the government of the United States not to deploy the first strike Pershing and Cruise missiles in Europe. Any such deployment would escalate the arms race, would be destabilizing, would continue to heighten international tensions, and would be inconsistent with our endorsement of an immediate halt to the arms race;

f. Calling on Congress to place a moratorium on new nuclear weapons development pending the outcome of the START talks in Geneva.

2. Urges the government to work toward the reduction of the international trade and transfer of arms by

a. Placing a strict limit to the global exportation of arms from both public and private sources, pledging not to introduce new arms technologies into regions previously without them.

b. Resuming negotiations on conventional arms transfer agreements with the Soviet Union and initiating them with other supplier countries.

c. Prohibiting "coproduction" and "licensing" agreements with Third World countries for the manufacture of arms.

d. Coupling restrictions on arms transfers to Third World countries with economic development incentives to those countries restricting the arms flow.

3. Urges the government to work toward the reallocation of resources and personnel engaged in military research and development, both public and private:

a. By reordering its own budgetary priorities, shifting from military research and development to research and development related to energy, environmental, health, and agricultural concerns.

b. By planning for conversion on a national level from military production to consumer and capital growth needs, and assisting local communities and industry in similar planning.

4. Recommends that each presbytery peacemaking network undertake out of a concern for persons and their jobs an examination of the conversion issue as it relates to the specific community, involving civic, corporate, labor, and religious leaders.

5. Calls upon the administration to sign and the Congress to ratify the United Nations Convention on Inhumane Weapons and Its Protocols.

6. Calls upon the government to reverse the trend toward the militarization of space by

a. Resuming the negotiations on the anti-satellite treaty and expanding negotiations with the Soviet Union and other countries to prohibit any introduction into space of military hardware other than passive technology.

b. Prohibiting the use of the space shuttle for military operations other than passive in nature.

7. Calls upon Presbyterians to study the multiple issues related to the arms race and to remain active in their public witness for the sake of peace in our world.

8. Directs the Co-States Clerks to convey these concerns to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the members of Congress.

9. Further, the 195th General Assembly (1983) requests the theological institutions of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) and the Presbyterian College Union (or its successor) to report to the 196th General Assembly (1984) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) their consideration of the United Presbyterian Church's military-related investments guidelines.●

ORDINATION OF BISHOP PATAKI IN SCRANTON, PA.

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, August 23, the people of the diocese of Passaic, N.J., and, indeed, all of the people of God rejoiced in the Episcopal ordination of the Most Reverend Andrew Pataki. Bishop Pataki was born in Palmerton, Pa., on August 10, 1927, the son of the late Ignatius Pataki, Sr., and Sophie Dejak. Following graduation from Central Catholic High School in Allentown, Pa., he enrolled in St. Vincent's College at Latrobe. In 1944, he began studies for the priesthood and entered St. Procopius College-Seminary, Lisle, Ill., from which institution he was graduated in 1948. He completed theological studies at the Byzantine Catholic Seminary of SS. Cyril and Methodius, Pittsburgh, and was ordained to the priesthood in the Seminary Chapel by the Most Reverend Daniel Evancho, Exarch of Pittsburgh, on February 24, 1952.

Following extensive pastoral work, the then Father Pataki was assigned to pursue graduate studies in canon law at the Pontifical Institute for Oriental Studies in Rome. He subsequently received both a bachelor and a licentiate degree in canon law from the Gregorian University in Rome.

He was appointed by His Holiness Pope Paul VI as a consultant on the Pontifical Commission for the Revision of the Eastern Code of Canon Law, a project which consumed 5 years, from 1973 to 1978. During that time, on December 21, 1974, he was elevated to the rank of prelate of honor by His Holiness Pope Paul VI.

It is thus after a distinguished career, as a pastor and canon lawyer,

that then Monsignor Pataki was designated by His Holiness Pope John Paul II, as a bishop of the titular see of Tennesse and named auxiliary to the Most Reverend Michael J. Dudick of the Byzantine Catholic Diocese of Passaic on June 14, 1983.

On August 23, the papal mandate was fulfilled with the Episcopal ordination of Bishop Andrew Pataki, J.C.L., in St. Peter's Cathedral, Scranton, Pa.

It is a privilege and an honor for me, Mr. Speaker, to take these few minutes to bring this happy and momentous occasion to the attention of my friends and colleagues in the House and to wish Bishop Andrew Pataki many, many years of joyous and dedicated service to God and man.●

FOUR AREA LEADERS HONORED BY CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

HON. RONNIE G. FLIPPO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Speaker, I want to make special note today of four outstanding leaders from my district who were recently honored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews for their outstanding contributions to brotherhood.

Receiving the organization's national "Brotherhood Award" were Maynard Layman, assistant to the publisher of the Decatur Daily; William H. Mitchell, president of the First National Bank of Florence; Leroy A. Simms, editor and publisher of the Huntsville Times; and Frank S. Wyle of Los Angeles, chairman of the board of Wyle Laboratories.

One could fill 100 CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS with the accomplishments and honors received by this distinguished group. If a hall of fame for civic service is ever established for my district, these four distinguished Americans will certainly be charter members.

However, knowing these men as I do, there is no doubt in my mind that for every public honor and recognition they receive, there are countless thousands of good deeds they do daily for their fellow men which go unreported. That is the way they would want it, because that is the kind of men they are. They seem to have the attitude that if anyone finds out about their good deeds, they do not count.

As long as I can remember, these men have been at the forefront of my district, promoting brotherhood, understanding, justice, and equality. Unfortunately, I was not blessed with knowing Mr. Wyle as well as the others.

A wise man once said, "The more one gives to others, the more he has

for his own." All of these gentlemen are associated with thriving businesses.

I shall not attempt to repeat all of the accomplishments of these men. No mere mortal could do that. Rather, I insert an article from the Huntsville Times by Karen Middleton that sums up some of the highlights of their illustrious lives:

The article follows:

[From the Huntsville Times, Sept. 14, 1983]

FOUR AREA LEADERS HONORED BY NATIONAL ORGANIZATION

(By Karen Middleton)

Four area and national leaders were honored here Tuesday evening by the National Conference of Christians and Jews for their "outstanding contributions to brotherhood."

Receiving the organization's "Brotherhood Award" at its annual North Alabama awards dinner were Maynard Layman, assistant to the publisher of the Decatur Daily; William H. Mitchell, president of the First National Bank of Florence; Leroy A. Simms, editor and publisher of the Huntsville Times, and Frank S. Wyle of Los Angeles, chairman of the board of Wyle Laboratories.

Layman served as a cotton adviser to the secretaries of agriculture in both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations and he was instrumental in cash markets for farm produce, thereby helping to relieve poverty in Alabama. In accepting his award Layman said, "Few have known the strong help of hands that I have known. . . . My heart is filled and happy and grateful."

Mitchell is past president of the Alabama Bankers Association, was chairman of the industrial expansion committee in Florence and has been active in the United Way. Well known for his family's advocacy of interfaith unity in the Florence community, Mitchell said, "I accept this award with humility and gratitude to both our family and friends from whom we happily inherited the tradition of brotherhood so beautifully espoused by this organization."

Simms, whose career in journalism began in the 1920s, joined *The Huntsville Times* as editor in 1961. In the award presentation, he was cited by *Decatur Daily* Publisher Barrett Shelton for having guided the paper to journalistic excellence; for serving as a member of a three-man committee that worked quietly in the 1960s in Huntsville to preserve racial harmony and assure opportunities for employment, education and housing for all citizens; for his work with United Way, and for serving as a prime supporter and fund-raiser for the University of Alabama in Huntsville. Simms said in accepting his award, "This is the greatest night of my life."

Wyle, who was introduced by Patrick W. Richardson, founded Wyle Laboratories in 1949. Richardson said the contributions of the Huntsville operations of Wyle's company to the community and UAH were a significant factor in the city's development as a technical and scientific center. Wyle, who said he was "deeply honored to accept this award," was also cited for his lifelong record of ethical and equitable business practices and for helping to establish a major museum of folk arts and crafts in Los Angeles.

W. F. Sanders Jr. presided at the awards dinner.●

CAMP SPRINGS COMMUNITY
GARDEN PROJECT

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the harvest season, I would like to give credit to the Camp Springs United Presbyterian Church, its members and volunteers, who for the past 5 years have sponsored a program, under the chairmanship of Mr. Calvin Ditrick, which is worth of emulation—the Camp Springs Community Garden Project.

Under the project, people with home gardens donate excess produce to the church. Some of these vegetables and fruits are sold at a produce stand by volunteers. A part of the proceeds of the sales is given to needy families to assist them in starting and maintaining their own gardens. The remainder of the money is distributed to three charitable agencies at the local level. The produce which is reserved from sale is distributed to families identified by clergymen in the community. I want to recognize Mr. Ditrick and his volunteers for this practical approach to helping their fellow man with what could have become wasted surplus food.●

LOCAL 428 CELEBRATES 50TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, together with Congressman NORM MINETA, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the 50th anniversary of local 428 of the United Food & Commercial Workers Union. This fine labor organization's history is entwined with the history and development of Santa Clara County.

Local 428 was originally established as the Retail Clerks Union in 1910, but was wiped out in the 1920's. In the 1930's a group of sales workers again began to organize and the Retail Store Employees Union, Local 428 was re-chartered on October 27, 1933. The union's early activities centered around the struggle to secure the 8-hour day for retail salespersons. Once this goal was achieved, local 428's leadership turned to the problems of working conditions and wages. In the 1950's the union helped to pioneer the first employer paid health and pension plans in the industry. As a result of the merger of the Butcher & Retail Clerks International Unions, local 428 was renamed the United Food & Com-

mercial Workers and has grown to be the largest union in Santa Clara County, representing nearly 8,500 workers.

Local 428's history is one of service to our community. They identify a need, organize, and mobilize their membership to deal with the community problem. For instance, housing for our senior citizens has for many years been a very real problem in Santa Clara Valley. Local 428 sponsored and developed Casa del Pueblo, a 165-unit housing complex for low-income senior citizens. The United Food & Commercial Workers Union was one of the first labor organizations in the United States to be involved in this type of worthy project.

Congressman MINETA and I salute local 428 for its devotion to community service and involvement. A list of the truly outstanding leaders of the local over the years is a sample of the illustrious history of the labor movement in Santa Clara County—Jim McLaughlin, Dave Reiser, and George Soares. Local 428 is to be congratulated on their 50 years of growth and their contributions to all of our citizens.●

U-PICK-IT VEGETABLE FARM

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is during these times of high unemployment that all of us must use some ingenuity in creating new job opportunities. I believe the Sandia Pueblo Indians in my congressional district have done just that with the formation of their U-pick-it vegetable farm.

This new employment opportunity is starting out small but has the potential to strengthen the local economy by creating new jobs in the area; while offering neighbors the chance to buy fresh, low-cost vegetables.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will take the time to read the following editorial and article about this project that recently appeared in the Albuquerque Journal, a daily newspaper in my district:

SANDIA PUEBLO PLANS TO ENTER PRODUCE
BUSINESS

(By Talli Nauman)

Sandia Pueblo officials will open construction bids this afternoon for a new retail vegetable market that will compete with other Albuquerque farm-produce outlets.

The store, Sandia U-Pick-It, is scheduled to open next month, according to Fred Baca, grants coordinator for the project. The market will offer chili, corn, squash, watermelon, tomatoes and a variety of other vegetables—all grown on 20 acres the pueblo began cultivating this year.

Customers will have the option of picking their own vegetables, if they want, to get them at reduced prices.

The store will be about a mile south of Bernalillo on the west side of U.S. 85 in the midst of the pueblo cropland.

Eventually Sandia hopes to enter the wholesale vegetable market and supply Albuquerque stores with fresh produce. Next year, the pueblo plans to expand its farming operation to 50 acres. "There's a lot of potential to go bigger," Baca said.

Eris Wenk, operator of Wenk Farm, an 80-acre South Valley vegetable market, is not disturbed at the prospect of new competition.

"There's a lot of room for competition in the vegetable business. There's not that many people who are willing to put in the seven days a week it takes to do it," he said. "I'm happy to see they want to do that kind of stuff."

To date, the Wenk Farm and a Corrales vegetable farm run by Gus Wagner have been the only major retail outlets for fresh garden produce, and neither one offers a you-pick option.

"There's a big demand for fresh vegetables," Wenk said, "but there's a limit to what one farmer can do. I think it'd be real good for the whole community to have more people do that."

Baca declined to release the dollar value of the investment which the pueblo and the federal Housing and Urban Development Administration have made in the pueblo project, conceived a year ago. It now employs eight people.

The farm is a row-crop operation, drawing irrigation waters from a well and the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District irrigation system. Farm workers are using tractors, a cultivator and a transplanter to till their fields, Baca said.

The pueblo had hoped to open its store this month, but a late frost in May delayed the expected harvest.

The Housing and Urban Development Administration must approve the lowest bid on the construction before the pueblo can sign a contract with the bidder, but Baca said he is hopeful that the contract will be signed by the end of the week.

INDIAN FARM ENTERPRISE

The men of Francisco Vasquez de Coronado's expedition into New Mexico in 1540 spent a winter at a pueblo not far from the present lands of Sandia Pueblo, and undoubtedly borrowed, begged, bought or stole more than a few ears of corn and squash gourds from the friendly local inhabitants.

Pueblo Indians were farmers when the first Europeans arrived, and farming has continued at Sandia Pueblo to the present.

Now, in 1983, the farmers of Sandia Pueblo are making a move to get into the business of providing foodstuffs to non-Indians in a big way, with the building of a farmers' market outlet on pueblo lands just south of Bernalillo.

It appears to be a logical business endeavor for a small pueblo which for years has sought out economic activities that could bring employment to its people within the bounds of the tribal lands.

If the tribe's ambitious marketing plans are successful, Sandia Pueblo farming could become a major employer on the reservation.

And garden-fresh produce from just north of Albuquerque would indeed be fresher than that trucked from Arizona, California, or Mexico.

Other fresh vegetable farmers in the Middle Rio Grande Valley say they welcome

the pueblo's entry into the field, saying there's demand enough for all.

We hope and expect they're right. And the benefits extend beyond the dinner table.

Any economic activity that turns dollars around in the immediate area instead of sending them out of state helps build the strength of the local economy.

Sandia Pueblo's vegetable market could help do just that. ●

MAKE LEBANON STAY INDEFINITE

HON. TOM LEWIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is important that we make it crystal clear to all nations of the United States' resolve in Lebanon since it appears inevitable that the decision will be made for us to maintain a presence there.

I would prefer the establishment of a multinational peacekeeping force under the auspices of the United States. That, of course, is not practical considering there is little doubt the Soviet Union would veto such a proposal on behalf of its client nations such as Syria.

History tells us that tranquility in Lebanon is nonexistent. The strife and turmoil are fueled daily by countless Moslem and Christian splinter sects and the presence of three armies, two police forces, and a multitude of militias and political parties.

Since that commitment cannot be successful if tied to a capricious timetable, I oppose any established time limit.

No nation in the world should be aware of when we intend to withdraw. That only dilutes the effectiveness of our presence. Furthermore, we should not bind ourselves to time constraints if the purpose of our mission in Lebanon is to keep the peace or to be a forthright symbol of legitimacy for the Lebanese Government.

And while our marines remain in Lebanon, they should have the absolute freedom to defend themselves. Their presence there is not to fight, but if their positions are fired upon, then our marines should use any means to protect and defend their positions and their lives. ●

HACIA AL FUTURO (TOWARDS THE FUTURE)

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of National Hispanic Heritage Week gives us an opportunity to reflect on the contribution of Hispanics

to the United States. We in California are particularly proud of the historic Hispanic presence and conscious of the current role of Hispanics in the present and future development of our State.

As a nation whose strength lies in its ethnic diversity, Hispanic culture has been a vital influence on all aspects of American life. Hispanos, however, are just beginning to assume their rightful role in our political life.

I am proud to represent a sizable yet diverse Hispanic community. The latest report of the Census Bureau indicates that almost 14 percent of the population of my congressional district are of Hispanic origin. This is a group whose leadership is rising to meet the tremendous challenges posed to the growing Hispanic community striving for advances in every phase of its life.

The vast potential of Hispanics is fast becoming reality as Hispanics assume critical roles in many business, educational, and professional fields, as well as in the political arena.

I welcome this development, as well as the growing influence of Hispanics in the political process.

My district has seen the recent addition of another able Hispanic in local politics—Mr. Ruben Abrica was recently elected a member of the city council of the newly-incorporated city of East Palo Alto. Mr. Abrica typifies the long-awaited trend toward the involvement of committed Hispanics who are taking their places as leaders in the American political system.

The impact of increased involvement of Hispanics in our political process cannot be overstated. With a nationwide population estimated at 16 million, of whom 64 percent are under the age of 29, the Hispanics clearly will come to play an increasingly important role in our country's future. I am pleased that we can take this occasion to recognize and honor this vital group. ●

GOLAN HEIGHTS AND WEST BANK CRITICAL TO SECURITY

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, from a defensive standpoint, the Golan Heights and the West Bank are essential to the security of Israel. Both make up the high grounds that surround the nation and which are so critical to the military strategy of any country. Without them, Israel becomes an easy target for any of its enemies.

Last week, one of my constituents called my attention to an article on the importance of the Golan Heights and the West Bank to Israel that ap-

peared in the Arizona Republic. The article, which was written by the newspaper's publisher, Darrow Tully, was right on target and the author is to be commended.

I urge my colleagues to read the article.

WEST BANK, GOLAN HEIGHTS INDISPENSABLE TO ISRAELI SECURITY

(By Darrow Tully, Publisher, The Arizona Republic)

JERUSALEM.—The most widely accepted military axiom continues to be, "Take the high ground and hold it."

That is precisely what Israel did by occupying the Golan Heights and part of the West Bank.

The Golan Heights and the West Bank share an important common denominator—they're both indispensable to Israel's security.

The Golan was part of the proposed Jewish state under the original 1948 United Nations partition plan. The area constitutes a plateau about 45 miles long rising from 600 feet high in the south to 9,000 feet in the north where it borders Syria, Lebanon and Jordan.

When Israel was established in 1948, the Syrians invaded and occupied the Golan. After the treaty of 1949, Syria agreed to a demilitarized Golan but then refused to enter into peace negotiations with Israel and repeatedly shelled and terrorized Jewish villages beneath the heights.

The area contiguous to the border was one of unceasing military activity culminating in an attempt to divert the waters of the Baniyas and Hazbani Rivers, principal tributaries of the Jordan River, which flows into the Sea of Galilee and is Israel's main water supply.

On June 5, 1967, Israel launched a pre-emptive military action against Syria, Jordan and Egypt.

It's difficult for people not familiar with the geography to understand the necessity of a pre-emptive strike. Distances are not comparable to anything in the United States.

Consider for example, Phoenix threatening Tempe as Egypt did Israel on May 17, 1967.

Syria already had proclaimed that "the time has come to enter into the battle of liberation."

Distances are measured in thousands of yards or in terms of eight to 10 miles. Reaction time to a surprise attack is nil.

In an incredible military action, Israeli forces scaled highly fortified positions in inaccessible terrain to secure the Golan.

I stayed in a kibbutz just under the former Syrian gun emplacements, and it is inconceivable that Israel could have taken any other action than it did when it annexed the Golan area in 1981.

No conscientious government could put citizens under those emplacements again. No nation could ask sons and daughters to shed blood twice for that hard-won ground.

The West Bank is a different matter. Whatever absurd political expediences that led to the original division of Palestine were and still are unworkable.

Only the Israelis actively supported the creation of a Palestinian state by virtue of support of the United Nations partition resolution.

Here again, we have the specter of hostile forces occupying high ground all around Jerusalem.

Israel captured the West Bank from Jordan during the Six-Day War.

The West Bank was seized by Trans-Jordan during the 1948 war of independence. The Israelis claim with some legal justification that Israel liberated the West Bank and has every right to encourage settlers to emigrate there.

Secretary of State George Shultz has acknowledged that "Israeli settlers had a legal right to live in the occupied West Bank of the Jordan River."

Regardless of whether Shultz is right about the legal status of the settlements, they're there to stay.

Don't think of a settlement as a group of cabins or some backward outpost. Many are small cities complete with all the amenities that make life not only bearable, but pleasant.

You can see most of Jerusalem from a couple of these settlements, and only a fool would turn that ground over to a hostile neighbor.

The real problem facing Israel is under what jurisdiction can Palestinians and Israelis live in peace.

I will explore several alternative in subsequent columns and also share interviews with differing Israeli and Palestinian points of view.●

**REPRESENTATIVE BYRON
BUILDS ON INTERESTS AND
EXPERIENCE**

HON. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent work period, three members of the House Armed Services Special Subcommittee on Arms Control, headed by Maryland's Representative BEVERLY B. BYRON, conducted a 10-day swing through Europe and the Mediterranean area to study various aspects of East-West arms negotiations. In observing her responsibility as chairperson of that special subcommittee, Representative BYRON stated:

Arms control cannot be isolated from an effective U.S. deterrent. Deterrence is not just bluff; it is a perceived capability, coupled with an understood commitment to use our retaliatory forces against key elements of Soviet power.

In this regard, her attention to detail has not only gained the respect of her constituents, but also the military.

Mr. Speaker, the Armed Forces Journal includes a regular column titled "Darts & Laurels." In the September 1983 issue of the above publication, in that column, Representative BYRON is given laurels which are well deserved. At this point, I include the column and call this to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Armed Forces Journal
International, September 1983]

DARTS & LAURELS

To Rep. Beverly B. Byron (D-MD), three-term Member of the House Armed Services

Committee—for going out of her way to get "hands-on" experience with the military equipment which her Committee authorizes each year.

Byron, for example, has flown over 12 major military aircraft since 1979—including the F-15, F-16, B-52, B-1, A-10, F-111A, AH-64, and the UH-60A.

Byron is also the first woman nonpilot to have flown both the F-18 and the Navy's new Hawk trainer. In recent months, she has taken time (her weekends) to fly the A-6 and the F-14. To do that, Byron had to be checked out in water survival training because both flights were catapult shots off the aircraft carrier USS *Kennedy*.

To Reps. Beverly B. Byron (D-MD) and Nicholas Mavroules (D-MA)—for spending their July 4th holiday visiting with the US 24th Marine Amphibious Unit stationed in Lebanon. And, Marines who were there tell us, both asked intelligent, relevant, and important questions throughout their visit.●

**BILINGUAL EDUCATION NEED
NOT BE THREATENED BY NEW
APPROACHES**

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent editorial from the New York Times which eloquently states the current debate surrounding our bilingual education programs.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee and a supporter of bilingual education, I believe that today's bilingual education programs are often hampered by restrictive methods of teaching children English. As the Times points out, proficiency is not always the goal of these programs. In fact, in 1977, I authored an amendment to the reauthorization of the program which required that teachers be proficient in English. Amazingly, it was revealed at that time that not all teachers could read and write proficiently in the very same language that they were supposed to be teaching their students.

I fear that we have not come very far since that time. We continue to hear the same complaints about bilingual education. We continue to face the same opposition from groups which feel that by allowing greater flexibility in the program—we are somehow turning our backs on children that need English-language instruction.

Nothing could be further from the truth. I remain a supporter of the program and hope that the administration's bill as well as all others in this area will receive close consideration by Congress during the reauthorization of the Bilingual Education Act in 1984.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 13, 1983]

SI QUIERE PROMOVER ENGLISH

The trouble with much "bilingual" education is that it isn't bilingual. Too often it's a program to teach children math, social studies and science in their native language without any genuine effort to help them function in English as soon as possible.

That moving children into English instruction is desirable should be beyond debate. Whatever the transitional value of teaching them in a native language, English is the essential skill for anyone expecting opportunity in the United States. "Bilingual" programs are worthy of Federal subsidy only so long as achievement in English is their true aim.

That is the principle that would be reaffirmed by a bill the Reagan Administration has submitted to Congress. It would let local school systems decide how best to achieve the goal. But it would stop requiring that youngsters be taught in their native tongue.

Such native-language training may or may not be helpful to pupils also busily learning English. The available research is inconclusive. But the proposed law would stop denying Federal aid to districts that choose to immerse them in mostly English studies.

Flexibility in approach was the clear intent of Congress 15 years ago when it passed the Bilingual Education Act to support any "new and imaginative" program for non-English speaking students. Only gradually was the statute bent to require teaching in native languages. The Health, Education and Welfare Department's Office of Civil Rights insisted in 1970 on "special assistance" for non-English speakers. The Supreme Court upheld its guidelines and directed schools to create special programs in foreign languages. In 1975, the civil rights office directed that districts had to develop "bilingual" programs; an all-English program no longer qualified for support.

The bilingual programs have probably been useful in many situations. They are thought to have helped many immigrant children adapt to a new culture at their own pace. They ended the often cruel practice, particularly in the Southwest, of letting Mexican-American students move uncomprehendingly through school, falling far behind because they were learning neither English nor the subject matter in Spanish.

But all too often, bilingual programs pay only lip service to the goal of making students proficient in English. Some teachers in the programs are themselves inadequate in English. Students are often kept in non-English classes longer than necessary. The foreign-language teachers and bilingual managers have developed a vested interest in preserving their enrollments. They often exaggerate the difficulty or damage of rushing youngsters along in English.

A study for the Twentieth Century Fund this year went so far as to urge the Federal Government to stop supporting bilingual education. It argued for "immersion" in English language study and special help in other subjects when needed. Most educators seem to consider that the soundest approach to educating children for life in America.

The virtue of the Administration's bill is that it does not even try to resolve this educational argument. Far from eliminating bilingual programs, as its critics charge, the bill would make proficiency in English a primary requirement for bilingual teachers, refine the requirements for evaluating bilingual programs, and let school districts

decide whether their non-English speakers are best served by "immersion" courses or transitional training in native languages.

For those who honestly hope to promote learning in English, that seems the wisest course. ●

LIMITED HEALTH CARE RESOURCES: ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF OUR CHOICES

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most troubling issues our society faces today, and one we will continue to face, is how to allocate our scarce medical resources. Today, we spend over 10 percent of our gross national product on medical and health expenses. It would not be hard, doctors and hospital administrators tell us, to spend 20 percent, 40 percent, or some other astronomical level. The question has to be answered, however, on how much can we afford.

Whether we realize it or not, that question—how much resources do we dedicate to health and medical care—is being answered every day. The answer may come on an ad hoc basis, may be implicit, but it is nonetheless forceful. If we want to be fair to all citizens, if we want to have some control over our expenditures, for health and medical resources, then we must begin to answer the question in a positive manner.

Recently, Daniel Callahan addressed the conference, "Limited Health Care Resources: Ethical Implications of Our Choices," sponsored by the Health Planning Council for Greater Boston on May 17, 1983. Dr. Callahan is director and cofounder of the Hastings Center Institute of Society, Ethics, and the Life Sciences, Hastings-on-the-Hudson, NY. As Dr. Callahan states: "There does not now exist, nor is there ever likely to exist, a simple moral formula that will tell us how to ration resources * * * however * * * we can morally frame the allocation problems in a way that will maximize the possibility of doing the morally best thing."

I submit the first half of the address for your consideration:

LIMITED HEALTH CARE RESOURCES: ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF OUR CHOICES

(By Daniel Callahan, Ph. D.)

The topic of my talk is one of the most difficult of all, I think, in contemporary medicine, and perhaps in contemporary domestic policy. In talking about the allocation of health resources, we are dealing with a historically unique human situation. One can hardly expect to find ready solutions to a problem of that magnitude, or one so new. In fact, it is going to take some decades to work things through. I would like to be able to provide you with some simple solutions, but I cannot do that. What I would like to do, however, is to give you my own sense of

how the subject matter might be understood. First, I want to give you some sense of my interpretation of the historical background of the present set of problems. Second, I want to suggest some general moral guidelines that I think might be helpful in trying to understand the problems. Then, finally, I would like to say something about how one might apply those guidelines to a sample of pressing contemporary policy decisions.

Beginning approximately with the Second World War, mankind made an enormous discovery. If enough research money were spent, and if enough resources were devoted to medical care delivery, the health of human beings could be radically improved. Indeed, human illness, which previous generations had accepted as a matter of fate, was now seen to be under potential human control. I choose the Second World War as dividing line because it marked that point in history when the governments of developed countries, particularly the United States, realized that large economic investment in biomedical research could reap major benefits. Thus in the years shortly after the war the National Institutes of Health in this country was developed as a major research agency, with hundreds of millions of dollars invested each year in support of basic research and of its clinical applications. Once it was realized that such an investment could provide enormous social benefits—that money could make the difference between life and death—it was only a short step to the development of the Medicare and Medicaid programs during the sixties, and to the emergence of a debate over a right to health care and the desirability of national health insurance.

The early decades of that development were marked by hope and optimism. Given enough investment of time, money, and energy, no utopian fantasy seemed too outlandish. The average human lifespan could be significantly extended, the number and quality of children could be controlled, the ill could be made well, pain and suffering could be radically reduced, and what had hitherto seemed out of human control—the body and its limitations—brought within the framework of human choice and manipulation. No sooner had biomedical research conquered one frontier, than another beckoned for attention. The future seemed unlimited in its possibilities.

In the moral realm, those were decades of considerable optimism as well. While our society had always been one dedicated to human rights (even if it did not always live up to that commitment), the decades between the forties and the eighties opened up new vistas for the concept of rights. If a necessary condition for the exercise of all rights is that of life itself (closely followed by that of minimally decent health), then it was only a short step to proposing a whole new range of what came to be called welfare rights, and to include among them a right to health care. Moreover, given the scientific and medical progress, it seemed perfectly feasible to propose such a right. In earlier times, when medicine lacked any decisive power to save lives, when nature seemed beyond human control, it would have made little sense to talk of a right to health care; similarly, before it was clearly understood that many environmental risks are man-made, it would have made equally poor sense to talk of a right to a healthy environment. In sum, not only could health be improved and risks reduced, but human beings could now claim a right to those goods. A

technological and a moral revolution were thus joined.

Unhappily, as we know, the past few years have seen a sharp change in mood. While there still remains considerable zeal and justification for the improvement of health and reduction of risk, a number of important realities have emerged to force a much more complex, and troubled, understanding of our present situation and our future possibilities. Three general factors have emerged to change the perspective and to move the discussion to a different plane. The first factor is economic, the second technological, and the third moral.

The economic factor encompasses a number of elements. Even prior to our present economic troubles there were some nagging worries about the possible financial cost that an all-out effort to guarantee a right to health care might entail. In medicine, it has been reluctantly recognized that the list of human evils that might be brought under medical superintendence is almost unlimited, ranging from the ills of the body through the threats to psychological health posed by life in a complex society. The desire for medical benefits seemed unlimited, not only in terms of dealing with present, obvious ills, but potentially by extending the net of medicine to capture the full range of social ills, as well. It was not impossible to imagine spending the entire gross national product on the improvement of health and unhappiness.

In the sixties and the early part of the seventies, that was an underground worry only, with only a few stray voices being raised to wonder where we were heading. The major political efforts went toward extending the scope of biomedical research and the delivery of medical care. Even so, as the seventies moved along, it became painfully obvious that the national health bill was increasing at a rapid rate, far outstripping that of inflation in general. Moreover, an insight of horrendous proportions was becoming inescapable—that the day of cheap technological fixes for human illness was, with the conquest of infectious diseases, over. Instead, it was becoming obvious that the future promised to deliver rapidly escalating costs with increasingly marginal returns from expenditures. The reason for that is fairly simple. With the conquest of the great killers of the young and otherwise able—influenza, diphtheria, dysentery, yellow fever, smallpox, for example—the remaining diseases, primarily affecting the elderly, came to the fore. Cancer, heart disease, and stroke—chronic disease in general—have proved to be tough foes, and not one of them is likely to be amenable to inexpensive solutions. One may grant that the \$1.8 billion expended each year on 20,000 dialysis patients extends their lives, and grant also that open heart surgery and heart transplants, vastly improved neonatal intensive care units, artificial limbs and joints, all bring notable health benefits. But the bill for those benefits is beginning to look astronomical.

I believe that those problems would have become manifest even if the prosperity of the fifties and sixties had continued unabated. At some point or other, but perhaps later than has turned out to be the case, it would have dawned on everyone that the maximization of health is a highly expensive goal. That the economic times have turned sour, and that those realities have been forced upon us in a dramatic way, only underscores what was an implicit inherent problem in the first place. The problem is

simply that, given the enormous cost of achieving everything that it might be possible to achieve, some scaling down of aspirations, some wiser ways of trying to determine the limits of reasonable expectations, are required. To say this is not to claim that we are already spending too much on health care, or to deny that many basic needs are still being unmet. It is only to say that some limits must be established.

Still another disturbing insight began to emerge as well. The technological developments necessary to improve health and reduce risk carry with them unintended consequences. Medical progress has produced two supreme, and vastly disturbing, ironies. The first is that the rapid reduction of mortality as a consequence of better biological understanding and health care delivery has created a population problem; the moral and effective means of controlling birth have not kept up with means of controlling death. Thus the population of the world, if not necessarily that of developed countries, has developed at a geometrical rate, rapidly increasing the number of those who can be subject to ill health as well as polluting the environment on the way. The second great irony is that, as we have extended the average human lifespan, we have also created an entirely new problem—that of the care of the elderly, who can and will live on for many years beyond the traditional retirement age of 65. The elderly now constitute about 11 percent of the population, some 26 million, and within twenty years it is estimated that there will be 52 million elderly. And for the most part of course the elderly are no longer economically productive. Through their well-deserved relief from work and toil, they are in many cases taking more from the economy at this age than they can put back in.

But that is not the end of it. In response to population pressures and the rising economic costs of raising a family, families have become smaller. Thus an increasingly smaller proportion of young people will be forced to pay for an increasingly larger proportion of elderly people. The social security system is already under considerable pressure, and that at a time when a ratio of workers to beneficiaries is 5.4 to 1. According to the most recent Census Bureau projections, that ratio will be 4.7 to 1 in the year 2000, 3 to 1 in 2025, and 2.6 to 1 in 2050. Needless to say, the burden upon the young to support the elderly will be heavy.

No one would propose that we simply let the elderly die, or that we go back to high infant mortality rates. But it must be recognized that we are beginning to experience a supreme unintended consequence of medical progress, one exceedingly troublesome to anyone who desires to improve the human condition.●

PAYSON LAND CONVEYANCE

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill which would authorize the conveyance of 1.1 acres of national forest land to the town of Payson, AZ, a community within my district.

The town of Payson is tightly surrounded by the Tonto National Forest,

and its history is, therefore, closely tied to the activities of the Forest Service. This bill would authorize the transfer of Payson's first ranger station and residence, built in 1908, and a small amount of land surrounding the facilities, to the town of Payson. The purpose of this conveyance is to allow the town to lease the site to the Northern Gila County Historical Society so that its members can proceed with plans to restore the old buildings and use the property as a museum for the preservation and display of historical materials, including Indian artifacts, old ranger equipment, and pioneer farming equipment used in the area.

A new ranger station and residence have been built to the east of town, and the old facility has not been used by the Forest Service for some time.

Once completed, this museum would be a tremendous asset to the public, serving the citizens of Payson as well as the many tourists who visit this area each year.

This is an important opportunity for the community to work with the Forest Service to achieve a common goal of promoting the rich history of this region, and I urge appropriate consideration of this bill so that efforts to reach this goal may move forward.

H.R. 3940

A bill to authorize a land conveyance from the Department of Agriculture to Payson, Arizona

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to transfer, without consideration, to the town of Payson, Arizona, the following described parcel:

A parcel of land entirely within the south half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter, of section 5, township 10 north, range 10 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Payson, Gila County, Ariz., more particularly described as follows: commencing at the common corner of sections 4, 5, 8, and 9, township 10 north, range 10 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian; thence north 89 degrees 56 minutes west, along the south line of section 5, a distance of 164.47 feet to the true point of beginning; thence continuing north 89 degrees 56 minutes west, along the south line of section 5, a distance of 337.13 feet; thence north 13 degrees 33 minutes 08 seconds east, a distance of 223.16 feet, to a point on the south right-of-way line of West Main Street; thence south 74 degrees 10 minutes 23 seconds east, along the south right-of-way line of West Main Street, a distance of 145.02 feet; thence south 43 degrees 09 minutes east, along the south right-of-way line of West Main Street, a distance of 243.72 feet; thence north 89 degrees 56 minutes west, along the south right-of-way line of West Main Street, a distance of 21.36 feet, to the true point of beginning.

The above described parcel of land contains 1.10 acres, more or less.

Sec. 2. (a) The property described in the first section shall be used for the preserva-

tion and display of articles of historical significance. If the property is not used for historical purposes, title to such property shall revert to the United States.

(b) Subject to the use restrictions provided in subsection (a), the town of Payson, Arizona, may provide for the administration of the property by the Northern Gila County Historical Society.●

WINTER NAVIGATION: THE MICHIGAN STUDY

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, On August 3, the Committee on Public Works and Transportation ordered reported H.R. 3678, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources. In section 1123, the committee authorized the Corps of Engineers to implement a full year extension of the navigation season on the upper Great Lakes and a 10-month extension on the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Traditionally, the navigation season on the upper Great Lakes has ended on December 15 plus or minus 2 weeks. The corps' proposal extends the navigation season through the construction of bidders, icebooms, underwater dams, harbor and channel dredging and widening, and the use of a fleet of new icebreakers. The corps presently estimates the project's initial investment cost to the United States at over \$600 million.

The corps' 1979 draft "Survey Study for Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway Navigation Season Extension" prompted extensive criticism. A series of major studies raised substantial questions about the corps analysis of the project's economic benefits, its real costs, and its potential environmental impact.

The New York State Department of Transportation commissioned a study from the Pennsylvania Transportation Institute at Pennsylvania State University. The Great Lakes Basin Commission published a study entitled, "Economic Review of Navigation Season Extension." LBA Consulting Partners, Ltd., did a study for the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority.

In 1981, the corps own Board of Engineers and its Chief of Engineers declined to recommend the project to Congress for authorization. The project has not received special study since the corps 1981 decision.

The economy of the Great Lakes region, including its key steel and auto industries, has changed substantially since the late 1970's. The House should not have to decide on a major public works project—one which was not even recommended for authorization by the corps itself—on the basis

of studies that may be seriously dated. Yet there may be no alternative.

The Great Lakes Basin Commission study was done at the request of the Governor of Michigan. It reviewed the corps cost-benefit analysis. Just as the New York State study would later conclude—see, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 15, 1983, E4308-09—the Great Lakes Basin Commission found that benefits were significantly overstated and costs may also be seriously understated.

Winter navigation's justification rests, in large part, on projected capacity limitations in the Great Lakes navigation season. Those limitations stem from projected backlogs at the system's key bottlenecks, principally the locks.

By spreading the demand over a longer period of time, winter navigation allows increased shipping despite the capacity limitations. Yet winter navigation is only one solution to the projected constraints. In an important analysis, the Commission also addressed alternatives that address the bottlenecks directly.

The Commission notes proposals that were both less expensive and had substantially better cost-benefit ratios. One was the construction of a new lock at Sault Ste. Marie. Over the short term, the Commission also noted the Canadian proposal to increase the capacity of the Welland Canal through operational changes and the possibility of 24-hour operations on key locks.

Because a new lock independently generates many of the benefits of winter navigation extension, the Commission carefully notes that a new lock substantially reduces the cost-benefit ratio for winter navigation—duplicating perhaps 90 to 95 percent of the benefits. The alternatives are mutually exclusive.

The Commission's conclusion is important because the committee has also moved in section 1149 of H.R. 3678 to accelerate study of a new lock to parallel the existing Poe lock at Sault Ste. Marie. I have included a substantial extract from the Commission's review of alternatives to winter navigation. I urge my colleagues to give it, and the full study, their closest attention.

ECONOMIC REVIEW OF NAVIGATION SEASON EXTENSION

(A review of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' "Survey Study for Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway Navigation Season Extension" conducted by the staff of the Great Lakes Basin Commission, Lee Botts, Chairman, at the request of Governor William G.

Milliken, State of Michigan, prepared by R. Bruce Den Uyl, Charles A. Job, Dean R. Whitehill, Martha W. Deline, under the direction of Dr. Paul E. Nickel.)

ALTERNATIVES TO WINTER NAVIGATION

Introduction

One of the first principles of benefit-cost analysis is that all of the relevant alternatives to the proposed project be considered. The reason is simply that if the same objective can be accomplished in an alternative way which results in greater net benefits than the proposed plan, the nation will be better off. Therefore, even though one alternative may have a benefit-cost ratio greater than one, there may be another alternative with greater discounted net benefits.

The Survey Study considered only alternative lengths of season extension on both the upper four Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway, not other alternatives to the program. Thus, the Survey Study, in analyzing only internal alternatives, assumes a commitment to season extension and considers only how to achieve maximum benefits by this approach. A more comprehensive approach is to consider alternatives to season extension itself.

It is apparent that most of the benefits of season extension come from the attenuation of capacity constraints at the locks throughout the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway system. Assuming an increase in Great Lakes shipping, without the increase in capacity that season extension is expected to achieve, some commodities will have to be diverted to alternative modes of transport, principally rail. Rail transport is generally more expensive than water transport, especially for bulk commodities such as iron ore. Therefore, the expansion of capacity associated with season extension will preclude diversion of commodities to these more expensive modes, with substantial savings to the nation.

There are other alternatives to season extension that could expand capacity of the locks. The most obvious alternative is to build larger locks. The Corps of Engineers has conducted preliminary studies of lock expansion, but such expansion was not considered as an alternative to season extension.

Although some potential alternatives to winter navigation are described here, it was not possible in the time available to identify the most feasible alternatives, if any. Rather, these possible alternatives are discussed here to suggest that they ought to be considered.

It should be reiterated that these alternatives relate only to the lock capacity problem. Season extension achieves other benefits not related to the capacity constraints, such as stockpiling benefits and winter rate savings. If these benefits are great enough, winter navigation might be justified on this basis alone.

Sabin-Davis lock alternative

Nature of the alternative: The Corps of Engineers has prepared a draft feasibility study of replacement of the Sabin or Davis locks at the Soo Locks. The purpose of this replacement is to provide an additional lock

which can accommodate vessels at least 1,000 feet long and with a draft of 25.5 feet. Such a lock would essentially duplicate the Poe lock which can now accommodate vessels of this size. Since this expansion would significantly expand capacity at the Soo Locks, it can be considered an alternative to capacity expansion through season extension.

Analysis: The replacement of the Sabin and/or Davis lock is not a complete alternative to season extension, because it would not provide stockpiling and winter rate savings. However, it would relieve projected capacity constraints at the locks, and it may accomplish this more efficiently than season extension. Season extension only delays capacity constraints at the Soo for approximately 15 years, whereas lock replacement would provide sufficient capacity for a much longer period.

Furthermore, lock replacement is a relatively inexpensive alternative to winter navigation. In the somewhat dated study of lock replacement, the average annual cost of replacing the Sabin lock with another lock that would accommodate ships 1,100 feet in length is estimated to be \$7.1 million. The average annual cost of year-round navigation on only the upper four Great Lakes is \$76 million. Even if the cost of lock replacement has doubled, there is still a wide disparity. The benefit-cost ratio for the lock replacement at the Sabin location is projected to be 12.9.

Effect on winter navigation benefits: Since replacement of the Sabin-Davis locks is an alternative to capacity expansion through season extension, it is of interest to consider how the benefits of winter navigation would change if the local replacement alternative was undertaken. This rough analysis should only be taken as illustrative because adequate data was not available, for a full analysis.

Since lock replacement would prevent capacity constraints at the Soo locks, thus precluding diversion of traffic to alternative modes, winter navigation benefits attributed in the Survey Study to decreased diversion of tonnage would be excluded. Since lock replacement at the Soo would only affect capacity on the upper four Great Lakes, tonnage projections for Proposal 3 (year-round shipping on the upper four Great Lakes) were compared with normal season projections to determine the amount of diverted tonnage that season extension prevents. Some of the diverted tonnage that the Survey Study counts as a benefit might be attributed to winter navigation even with lock replacement, so to be conservative only diverted tons related to coal and iron ore were counted. Since the Study does not indicate the savings per ton for diverted traffic for each commodity, dollar savings could not be calculated. Instead, percentages were calculated that indicate what proportion of the total diverted tons listed in the Survey Study would not be diverted with lock replacement at the Soo. The results are given in the accompanying table. The projections of commodity shipments were taken directly from Table 2 (p. E-20-21) in Appendix E of the Survey Study.

TABLE 4.—PERCENTAGE OF TONS DIVERTED DUE TO CAPACITY CONSTRAINTS THAT WOULD NOT BE DIVERTED WITH LOCK REPLACEMENT AT THE SOO

	[In tons]					
	1900	2000	2010	2020	2030	2040
(1) Normal season:						
Projected shipments:						
Coal.....	34,163	34,628	33,953	32,844	32,213	31,634
Iron ore.....	94,838	97,972	96,304	95,891	95,358	94,704
(2) Proposal 3:						
Projected shipments:						
Coal.....	34,487	39,349	43,513	42,453	41,947	41,493
Iron ore.....	96,376	111,081	123,396	122,942	122,382	121,694
Tons not diverted:						
Coal.....	324	4,721	9,560	9,609	9,734	9,859
Iron ore.....	1,538	13,109	27,092	27,051	27,024	26,990
(3) Total tons not diverted under Proposal 3.....	1,862	17,830	36,652	36,660	36,758	36,849
(4) Total tons not diverted under Proposal 7.....	5,487	22,324	41,434	41,744	42,140	42,562
(3)/(4) (percent).....	33.9	79.9	88.5	87.8	87.2	86.6

Source: The projections of commodity shipments were taken directly from Table 2 (p. E-20-21) in Appendix E of the Survey Study.

The table indicates that most of the diverted tonnage is related to capacity constraints at the Soo Locks. Season extension does not significantly affect capacity at the Welland as most of the commodities moving through the Welland are shipped during the normal season.¹

With lock replacement, overall benefits attributed to season extension would decline. A very conservative estimate is that average annual transportation rate savings would be reduced by 75 percent. For the proposed plan (year-round navigation on the upper four Great Lakes, and an 11-month season on the St. Lawrence Seaway), assuming that all other benefits remain unchanged, the new benefit-cost calculation would be as follows:

Average annual benefits

	Thousands
Transportation rate savings.....	\$65,201
Winter rate savings.....	17,694
Stockpiling savings.....	59,417
Total.....	142,312
Average annual costs.....	101,816
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.40

This calculation is for the incremental average annual benefits, which excludes benefits counted in the Corps' March 1976 Interim Report (for an extension to January 31). If total average annual benefits are used, the benefit-cost ratio increases to 1.54.

The issue paper on stockpiling benefits states that it may not be valid to count all of the stockpiling savings because of capacity constraints would move by rail which is able to ship during the winter. If the lock replacement alternative were undertaken, stockpiling benefits would be retained, since there would be no diverted traffic which could be moved during the winter months.

Conclusion

In concluding this discussion, it should be pointed out that even with the lock replacement alternative, winter navigation could still be an economically feasible program. In fact, if winter navigation is considered desirable after all relevant alternatives are studied, it might be cost efficient to implement the winter navigation program before lock replacement in order to delay the need for lock replacement. However, if lock replacement would be needed shortly anyway, most of the transportation rate savings could not be attributed to winter navigation, thus re-

ducing benefits of the season extension program. What this analysis has shown is that there may be alternatives for resolving the capacity constraint that are more economically desirable than winter navigation, and that the major economic benefit of winter navigation stems from stockpiling and winter rate savings.

Postscript

It should be noted that after the draft report of this economic review was prepared, it was determined that none of the stockpiling benefits could be attributed to season extension. However, a portion of these stockpiling benefits would be transferred to transportation rate savings.² This change will be incorporated in the Survey Study final report. The change means that between 90% and 95% of the benefits of winter navigation are related to capacity constraints at the Soo Locks.

However, nothing in this discussion of alternatives is altered by these changes. It would still be valid to count stockpiling benefits when discussing alternatives. The reason that they are excluded from consideration when discussing NED benefits and costs is because stockpiling is unnecessary when capacity constraints force the diversion of tonnage to alternative modes. However, if a new lock were constructed at the Soo, this diversion would no longer be necessary, and therefore, the only means to eliminate stockpiling during the winter months would be to ship these commodities during the winter. Hence, stockpiling benefits would be a valid consideration in any study of alternatives.●

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM GALLO AND MICHAEL CIPRIANI

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I have been invited to attend ceremonies for the induction of two prominent individuals into the Yonkers Sports Hall of Fame. The city of Yonkers is especially proud of their contributions in enriching and enhancing the world of sports. I refer to William (Bill) Gallo, the eminent sports columnist-cartoonist for the New York Daily News, and

Michael Cipriani, the Nation's outstanding photographer for harness racing. At this time I would like to pay tribute to these two men and share the highlights of their careers with my colleagues:

WILLIAM V. GALLO

William (Bill) Gallo was born in Manhattan on December 28, 1922, the son of Frank and Henrietta Gallo. His father was a newspaperman who died at the young age of 36 when William was 11 years old.

As a youngster Gallo dreamt of following in his father's footsteps. "As long as I can remember, printer's ink was a part of me," he says. He studied art in high school and after graduating he landed a job on the New York Daily News in 1941. He remained there for 7 months until he answered Uncle Sam's call, joined the U.S. Marine Corps, and went off to war.

He served with distinction as a member of the 4th Marine Division for 4 years, seeing action in Roi-Namur (Kwajalein Islands), Saipan, Tinian, and Iwo Jima. Upon war's end he returned to the New York Daily News as a picture clerk in the caption/art department.

It was in 1960, when he was transferred to the sports department, that he began his illustrious career as a sports cartoonist and as a sports columnist. It was here, also, that he was to develop such well-known characters as "Basement Bertha," "Yuchie," and "Penthouse Polly"—familiar personalities to hundreds of thousands of readers.

Bill Gallo's talents and creativity as a cartoonist have earned him many honors, awards, and citations. He is the five-time recipient of the coveted "Reuben," awarded by the National Cartoonist Society for excellence in the sports category. He has won the Page 1 Journalism Award from the New York Newspaper Guild 16 times. Among his other prestigious honors are the Power of Printing Award, the Segar Award, and the Achievement Award for Alumni from the School of Visual Arts. He has also won fame as

¹ Arctec, Inc. "Great Lakes/St. Lawrence Seaway Lock Capacity Analysis," Columbia, MD, Vol. 1 p. 5-34, 1979.

² For a complete discussion of this point see the issue paper on "Stockpiling Benefits."

an authority in boxing and his colleagues have honored him with the James J. Walker Award. He is also the recipient of the Champion Award from the Downtown Athletic Club.

Bill Gallo and his wife Dolores have two sons, Gregory, who is the sports editor of the New York Post, and Bill, Jr., who is the steeplechase racing secretary at the Belmont Racetrack.

Gallo, who is currently marking his 23d year as a cartoonist-columnist for the New York Daily News, moved his family to the city of Yonkers some 25 years ago. His more than 5,000 cartoons and his innumerable sports columns have brought much honor and prestige not only to him and his family, but also to his profession and to the city of Yonkers as well.

MICHAEL CIPRIANI

Michael Cipriani was born in Boomer, W. Va., on September 1, 1914, and raised transient style in Cincinnati, Chicago, Columbus, Ohio, and Harlan County, Ky. In the 1930's the Cipriani family moved to the city of Yonkers and it was there that Michael's love affair with photography began.

Cipriani began his career servicing New York City daily papers with news and feature photos, winning an award in 1955 for his coverage of an auto mishap. In that same year he signed on with the Yonkers Raceway. Since that time he has photographed thousands of races, including every Cane Pace and Yonker's Trot since these two prestigious events were inaugurated the year he joined the track.

"Harness racing has been so good to me," says Cipriani, who related the simple ethic by which he lives—"My father once told me, whatever you do, you've got to be the best. I've always lived to apply that to my photography."

Along with traveling throughout the world to photograph horse races, Cipriani has also covered a variety of other subjects. These include a dozen Miss America pageants, Presidents, movie stars, boxers, musicians, and other famous athletes and celebrities. And, of course, he has always been on hand for any sports event of importance taking place in the city of Yonkers.

Cipriani has earned many awards and honors throughout his distinguished career. Some of these include: The New York Daily News Photo Award, Yonker's Raceway Patrol Force Award, member of the Yonker's Columbus Day Committee, March of Dimes, Yonkers Captains, Heart Fund, Enrico Fermi Educational Foundation, Yonkers Safari, and the Yonkers City Council.

Mike Cohen, publicist, sports information chief for the NBC television network, and well-known public relations counsel, refers to Cipriani as "a great artist. You can tell his work

without a signature. Nobody can equal the quality of Mike's pictures in racing. He's inventive, ahead of his time. He's lengths ahead of anyone else."

Michael and his wife Mary are the proud parents of one son, Ralph, a former member of the FBI, currently an attorney with a statewide reputation. ●

TESTIMONY OF MARGARET E. MAHONEY, THE COMMONWEALTH FUND

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Oversight of the Committee on Ways and Means was fortunate in late June of this year to hear testimony by Miss Margaret E. Mahoney, president of the Commonwealth Fund located in New York City. Miss Mahoney's testimony, concerning the rules governing private foundations, should provide the public with a fine analysis of the issue which is presently before the subcommittee.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the text of Miss Mahoney's testimony into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

TESTIMONY OF MARGARET E. MAHONEY, THE COMMONWEALTH FUND

My name is Margaret E. Mahoney. I am President of The Commonwealth Fund, a private foundation which was chartered in the State of New York in 1918. The Fund is located at One East 75th Street, New York City. At present it has assets of approximately \$185 million and an annual budget of just under \$12 million.

In this testimony, I will focus on the work of The Commonwealth Fund because I know it best, but I believe that its work is broadly representative of the work being carried out by many other foundations around the country. I shall conclude with a statement of support for the proposed legislation, H.R. 3043, designed to improve the regulation of private foundations.

I—THE COMMONWEALTH FUND

The Commonwealth Fund was originally established "to enhance the common good," and in all its activities the Fund retains a deep concern for people and the institutions that serve them.

The Fund's Board of Directors has defined the foundation's core mission to be encouraging more effective health care for all Americans. The Fund supports activities to achieve this goal across the country, but also places particular emphasis on programs and institutions in its own community, New York City.

The Fund's secondary mission is to promote good relations between the United States and the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand through the Harkness Fellowship Program, which allows talented young people from these countries to pursue postgraduate studies in, and become acquainted with, the United States.

A History of Defining and Attacking Problems

Again and again in the last 65 years, the Fund has used the flexibility available to foundations to identify health care problems not receiving adequate attention and to support institutions and individuals with the interest and ability to devise solutions. For example, in the 1920's the Fund grappled with the then poorly recognized problem of juvenile delinquency, and this led to early and very influential support of services and training in child guidance. Model Fund programs in the 20's, 30's and 40's to provide health care to rural areas and to regionalize care were also far ahead of their times. The Fund has also supported the work of many distinguished medical researchers, including three Nobel Prize winners. As other sources of funding have developed for an important undertaking, the Fund has moved on to new activities where foundation support could make a difference.

Today's Challenges and Opportunities

At present, worries about our country's economy and the generally accepted belief that governmental expenditures cannot grow as in the past have created understandable pessimism about the outlook for further improvements in health care. This is a time when many may be too discouraged to search for creative responses to problems. But it is also a time when foundations can be particularly useful if they can show how, working with available resources, individuals and institutions can still pursue, evaluate, and adapt ways of making health care more effective.

The Fund's Present Program

Our present program takes this path. It is designed in part to help health care institutions adapt their missions, programs, and operations so they can continue to fulfill public responsibilities without risking financial disaster.

First, we pay special attention to the quality of health care and of life in general in New York City.

Secondly, and in the tradition of the Fund, we are applying our limited resources to certain carefully selected problems with social and medical implications that need attention: for example, problems of elderly people; of low-income families, especially those headed by women; of members of minorities who wish to work in the health professions; and of lifestyles that affect an individual's health, specifically alcoholism.

Thirdly, we are especially concerned with the nation's more than 100 academic health centers—those multi-institutional federations comprising a medical school, one or more teaching hospitals, and other related institutions. These essential centers educate physicians and other health professionals, advance medical knowledge through their research programs, provide highly specialized care unavailable elsewhere, and frequently fill the general medical care needs of people in their communities, which are often inner cities.

To be more specific about what we are doing in each of these three areas, I offer you the following thumbnail sketches of representative projects the Funding is now supporting.

New York City

Training volunteers to help elderly people continue to live at home: Volunteers are coordinating existing services for about 1,500 frail elderly people so they can avoid going into nursing homes; if this model proves ef-

fective it could be used in many other communities. \$173,206, Laurence G. McFarland, Academy for Gerontological Education and Development, Bronx.

Improving the health and development of children through early preventive care: Harlem Hospital is providing community care for some 400 young pregnant women that includes both medical and educational services, and continuing care for their babies through the first year of life. \$269,921, Margaret Heagarty, M.D., Harlem Hospital.

Long range planning for North General Hospital: The only voluntary hospital in the Harlem area, and the area's largest private employer, is developing a financial aid program plan crucial to its survival. \$100,000, Eugene L. McCabe, North General Hospital, Harlem.

A prepaid medical system for the Bronx: Montefiore Medical Center is developing a medical care system for three financially stressed community health centers that, through prepayment for services, will allow the centers to make better use of resources and to continue serving some 12,000 Medicaid recipients and other poor people not covered by Medicaid. \$232,634, Mo Katz, Montefiore Medical Center, Bronx.

Career explorations: For a second summer, a program for 200 minority high school students is providing paid summer employment, job training, and counseling under the mentorship of Black professional and business men and women; those completing the program are automatically accepted to Hunter College upon graduation. \$150,000 annual budget, Donna E. Shalala, Hunter College and the Coalition of 100 Black Women, Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, and Queens.

Counseling for alcoholics and their families: A city service is guiding alcoholics and their families on the best treatment. \$10,000, Edmona L. Mansell, Freedom Institute, Inc., Manhattan.

Developing a children's zoo for Brooklyn: A new educational zoo for children is being designed to replace the present facilities in Prospect Park; when completed, the new zoo will serve an estimated 2 million visitors a year. \$250,000, William Conway, New York Zoological Society, Brooklyn.

Health-Related Problems the Elderly

Research into the major cause of senile dementia: Researchers at Albert Einstein College of Medicine, New York City, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, and Yale University, New Haven, are searching for the causes of Alzheimer's disease, a form of senile dementia that affects an estimated 1.25 million Americans and fills nursing homes with its victims. \$250,000 to each of the institutions.

Directory of continuing care retirement communities: contracts to assure life-long residence for elderly people in a caring community began to appear in this country some fifteen years ago, largely encouraged by church groups; now close to 300 such communities exist, and interest in developing more is growing. This directory, to be updated annually, will inform those interested in living in such a community. \$24,830, Erik Gjullin, American Association of Homes for the Aging, Washington, D.C.

Meeting the needs of the functionally dependent elderly: What are the options? This study is developing national strategies to deal with the problems of elderly Americans who are both physically frail and needy. \$300,017, Karen Davis, Ph.D., The Johns

Hopkins University, School of Hygiene and Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland.

Developing a social health maintenance organization for older Americans: This experimental program will meet the medical and other daily needs of about 4,000 elderly people, providing nursing home care if necessary, in exchange for an annual fee paid jointly by Medicare and the individual member. \$175,000, William C. McMoran, Senior Care Action Network, Long Beach, California.

Toward the better diagnosis and treatment of urinary incontinence: A debilitating medical and social problem for millions of older Americans, incontinence is thought to be a major reason many older people enter nursing homes. This work will develop better diagnostic and treatment methods. \$450,000, John W. Rowe, M.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Medical Care for Low-Income Families

Examining the effects of Medicaid and Medicare financing and delivery innovations: This study is evaluating innovations in the states of Arizona, California, and New York to determine the effects of Medicaid and Medicare financing on aged, disabled, and poor people, and on the institutions that serve these groups. \$325,000, Stuart H. Altman, Ph.D., Brandeis University Health Policy Consortium, Waltham, Massachusetts, three states listed above, and nationwide.

A prepaid medical care system for community health centers in Tennessee: An association of primary care centers is developing an experimental prepaid system of comprehensive health services for about 5,000 children and parents eligible for Medicaid served by 22 centers. \$234,000, Jay Harrington, Tennessee Association of Primary Health Care Centers, Nashville, Tennessee and statewide.

Helping selected States make decisions about changing their Medicaid programs: A team at Harvard University is working with public officials and hospital directors in California, Georgia, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, and Texas to help them in controlling Medicaid expenditures and monitoring the consequences of these actions. \$309,272, Penny H. Feldman, Ph.D., and Marc J. Roberts, Ph.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts and six states listed above.

Helping States restrain medical expenditures for nursing home care without harming quality or access: This study is examining how different Medicaid reimbursement methods affect nursing home care in California, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, and West Virginia; results will be reported to policy planners. \$345,637, John F. Holahan, Ph.D., The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C. and eight states listed above.

Children and Teenagers

Determining factors affecting economic independence and family stability for teenage mothers: Researchers at The University of Pennsylvania are interviewing 300 low-income women who were teenage mothers about fifteen years ago to determine which women have achieved economic independence for themselves and their children, what factors explain their success, and how this information might be used to help other teenage mothers. \$375,000, Frank F. Furstenberg, Jr., Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Development of a community-based center for troubled adolescents: This center

is providing education, job training, medical care and counseling for youngsters between the ages of 13 and 20 who might otherwise be placed in psychiatric hospitals far from home. \$150,000, Marion Wright Edelman, Children's Defense Fund, Washington, D.C.

Project self-renewal: A group of Black professional women, with other professional and community groups, is designing a program in several cities to help Black teenage mothers and fathers obtain economic independence; the program will provide each young person with a role model/mentor and services such as school guidance, family planning and other health care, pediatric and day care, and job counseling, training, and placement. \$550,000, Jewell J. McCabe, Coalition of 100 Black Women, New York City and several sites to be determined.

Minorities in the Health Professions

The general medical care needs of low-income blacks—are younger black physicians a major source of care?: This study is examining whether young Black physicians are continuing to provide, as their elders have, the majority of health care to low-income Black communities and, if not, what steps are necessary to ensure a steady supply of new physicians for these communities. \$195,525, August G. Swanson, M.D. and Stephen N. Keith, M.D., Association of American Medical Colleges, Washington, D.C. and nationwide.

Developing careers in academic medicine and research: National Medical Fellowships, Inc. is administering a program aimed at guiding 100 academically gifted minority medical students toward careers in academic medicine and biomedical research, thus partly correcting the shortage of minority doctors in these professions. \$260,000, Leon Johnson, Jr., National Medical Fellowships, Inc., New York and nationwide.

Alcoholism

Hospital outpatient treatment of alcoholism: The Bronx Municipal Hospital is testing a self-help approach to treating alcoholism in a large outpatient department of a major hospital; if successful, this less expensive and less disruptive approach could be used in similar facilities elsewhere, which nationwide now treat over 600,000 alcoholics a year. \$202,904, Marc Galanter, M.D., Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx, New York.

Comparison of treatment approaches used in industrial alcoholism programs: Researchers are determining which of three common approaches used by industry to treat alcoholism in workers—simple confrontation, outpatient treatment, or hospitalization—is more effective, with the cost factor included; the study is being carried out in cooperation with selected General Electric Company plants in Massachusetts. \$405,000, Diana Chapman Walsh, Boston University Center for Industry and Health Care, Boston, Massachusetts and statewide.

Strengthening the skills of general physicians in the treatment of alcoholic patients: Harvard doctors are developing and testing programs to prepare general practitioners to better diagnose alcoholism in patients, particularly at the early stage, and to coordinate its treatment. \$446,354, Thomas L. Delbanco, M.D., Harvard Medical Center, Boston, Massachusetts.

Can a law reduce traffic accidents in Maine caused by drunk driving? This study is determining what effect a new and very strict drunk driving law in Maine will have in reducing traffic deaths and injuries. \$268,439, Ralph W. Hingson, Sc.D., Boston

University School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts and Maine.

Use of Medical Technology

Studies at Dartmouth Medical School, the Rand Corporation and the University of Rochester are seeking ways to guide doctors in the use of expensive procedures, encouraging proper use without compromising the quality of care. The Rochester study is paying special attention to severe problems of older people, specifically to the treatment of pneumonia and vascular disease. \$330,000, John E. Wennberg, M.D., and Daniel F. Hanley, M.D., Dartmouth Medical School, Hanover, New Hampshire; \$625,000, Robert H. Brook, M.D., The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California; \$250,000, Paul F. Griner, M.D., University of Rochester Medical Center, Rochester, New York.

Academic Health Centers

Alternative strategies for urban health care and medical education at Downstate Medical Center: Downstate Medical Center, the only academic health center in Brooklyn and a major provider of health care services in that borough, is working out alternative strategies for redeveloping the center so it can better serve the community. \$150,000, Donald J. Scherl, M.D., The State University of New York, Brooklyn, New York.

Better information for academic health center planning in New York City: Work to guide academic health centers in New York City in developing plans to make New York City an important world medical center. \$379,398, Eli Ginzberg, Ph. D., Columbia University, Conservation of Human Resources, New York City.

Strengthening the management capabilities of Meharry Medical College/faculty development at Meharry Medical College: Meharry's concerted effort to improve its management strengths and its academic program is supported by one Fund grant to fill important management positions and develop better financial and management information systems, and a second to provide a fully endowed faculty chair. \$300,000, Richard G. Lester, M.D.; \$1,000,000 over five years, David Satcher, M.D., Ph.D., Meharry Medical College, Nashville, Tennessee.

Developing a comprehensive system of publicly supported health care services for mothers and children in Iowa: The University of Iowa is developing a statewide plan to assure health care for pregnant women, new mothers, and children with rare diseases. The university is the major provider of care to women and children in the state, managing most government funds for these services, and is thus in a central position to carry out such a plan. \$70,000, Samuel Levy, Ph. D. and John W. Colloton, the University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics, Iowa City, Iowa.

Collaborative effort to develop a better medical care system for patients covered by Medicaid: Eight teaching hospitals in Boston are forming, with neighborhood health centers, a private, nonprofit corporation to contract with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to provide all Medicaid-financed services to 75,000 women and children for a predetermined, annual, all-inclusive fee, thus containing costs without denying or reducing coverage. \$300,000, Jerome H. Grossman, M.D., New England Medical Center, Boston, Massachusetts.

I hope this brief account of current work supported by the Commonwealth Fund gives adequate evidence of the breadth and variety of people, institutions, and activities

that foundations like the Fund support. These grants illustrate the deep commitment of the Commonwealth Fund, and other foundations, to invest our funds so as to bring about marked improvements in the way institutions and organizations function and in the lives of the people affected by them.

The Commonwealth Fund and other foundations have accomplished what they have over time largely because of the flexibility they have been accorded in meeting the changing needs of a dynamic society. The importance of this flexibility is reflected in my following remarks on the proposed legislation H.R. 3043, a bill revising the regulation of private foundations.

II—PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO CHANGE REGULATION OF PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS

I believe that H.R. 3043, which has been introduced by Congressman Barber Conable, addresses a number of problems that have hampered private foundations since the 1969 tax reform legislation and therefore deserves support. In brief, the proposed legislation would:

Encourage the establishment of new foundations and the giving during the donor's lifetime of gifts to existing foundations by making lifetime gifts to foundations deductible on the same basis as gifts to other charities. Income tax deduction rules for gifts to private foundations are now less favorable than rules governing gifts to other charities. The reasons for making these rules more restrictive have been removed by subsequent legislation, while the rules continue to contribute to a decline in the formation of new foundations and in lifetime giving to existing private foundations.

Clarify and simplify certain regulations that, as now formulated, place an onerous administrative burden on foundations and limit their flexibility to respond to need. Under the new legislation foundations would be more able to make effective small grants on short notice—for example, to newly organized community programs.

Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier in this testimony, foundations are working today in a complex environment. It is not a climate of expansion, but one of general refinement; and it is not a time in which funding will grow rapidly, but a time to seek more effective ways to use existing resources. However, it is a time when foundations can play a particularly important role in stimulating the exchange of ideas and in searching our fresh approaches that may encourage others in this uncertain climate. The Commonwealth Fund's efforts today reflect the desire to help in the discovery of what works best while further testing yet better ways to do things.

The Fund has issued an annual report each year since its first year of operation, which was 1918-19. We also issue brochures about our various activities, and make available to anyone interested all reports to the Board of Directors on program proposals. It is also a policy of the Fund to seek co-funding for projects where possible.

I submit the evidence above with the strong belief that foundations are a principal part of the private sector of this country. This country is unique in its commitment to private philanthropy for the public good. It is a heritage that should be treasured by us all. But honoring such a heritage does not preclude keeping a watchful eye over the performance of foundations, and the hearings seem an appropriate step to me to review present activities of, as well as unneeded restrictions on, foundations. ●

CHILD SUPPORT: A FORMULA WITH NO FUNDS

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, the administration's economic policies continue to impose hardships on millions of Americans, especially women.

Today, American women are confronted with a barrage of economic adversity, including unemployment, pay discrimination, and occupational segregation from high wage jobs. Not only on the job, but in pension rights, property settlements, and other areas are women being deprived of any economic security. Current projections suggest by the year 2000, almost all the U.S. poor will be female—primarily single mothers and elderly widows.

Considering these projections, I urge my colleagues to examine the administration's proposal to cut child support programs by 20 percent. While the President has proposed to expand efforts of collection on delinquent payments from fathers who have left their families, no additional funding has been proposed to implement the processes.

A recent census report found that 8.4 million women nationwide had custody of their children, yet less than half receive child support. In addition, to those entitled to payments, only 47 percent receive the full amount of \$40 while 28 percent of the mothers receive no child support at all.

When fathers do not pay, their families usually end up on welfare, supported by the taxpayer.

The sources for collecting child support payments from fathers are there. They can come from his wages or income tax returns. Expanding the child support collection enforcement program is fine, but without money the program just will not work.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article for my colleagues' review.

[From the (Cherry Hill, NJ.) Courier Post]

PRESIDENT'S CHILD-SUPPORT GESTURE TO WOMEN MAY BE AN EMPTY ONE

(By Jane Bryant Quinn)

In what was trumpeted as a major victory for women, the Reagan administration agreed to reconsider its budget cuts in a small but vital program: collecting unpaid child support from fathers who have ducked out on their families.

Some victory.

Formerly, the federal government paid 75 percent of the cost of collaring deadbeat dads, while the states paid 25 percent. This year the federal share dropped to 70 percent, and would have dropped to an average of 55 percent next year. Instead—in a friendly salute to women—the administration kindly offered to hold the drop to 60 percent, down 10 percent from the present guarantee.

The President also proposed expanding the collection efforts—which is what makes headlines. But he doesn't propose to spend more money to make stepped-up collections possible.

A recent census report found that 8.4 million women nationwide had custody of their children in 1981, yet fewer than half of them had been awarded child support. Of those entitled to payments, only 47 percent received the full amount—an average of \$40 a week. Another 25 percent got partial payments; 28 percent got nothing at all. The disinclination of many men to help support their children is one of the reasons that more women are falling into poverty.

For bleeding hearts, the growing feminization of poverty is of deep social and humanitarian concern. But it's also important to people who only bleed in the pocketbook. When dads don't pay, their families often end up on public welfare, supported by the taxpayers at large.

The states all have programs to try to collect child-support payments from delinquent fathers if the mother is on welfare. Some also help women who are not on welfare.

Automatic child-support collection is increasingly used if the father is within reach. Child support may be withheld from his wages, his income-tax returns and in some cases from his unemployment benefits.

When a family is on welfare, any child-support money collected from the father is used to reimburse the state and federal treasuries. The money collected for a non-welfare mother goes directly to her, for the benefit of the children. In recent years, Washington has been discouraging child-support collections for non-welfare mothers, because government didn't get anything back for its efforts. The idea has been to use the program for the benefit of the federal treasury, not for the benefit of women and children.

Among several bills now before the House Ways and Means Committee, the major one is the administration's new proposal brought forth in good part through the efforts of Republican women politicians.

The administration now proposes to pay bonuses to the states for improving collections for both welfare and non-welfare mothers—the bonuses making up for the cut in guaranteed funding. It may also seize the federal tax refunds of delinquent fathers of non-welfare families—a change in attitude welcomed by state directors of child-support enforcement.

But Dan Copeland, head of the State Directors Association, worries about the cut in guaranteed funding. State legislators may be willing to replace lost federal money, but many child-support programs depend on county budgets for support. "When the county commissioners see a cut in the federal guarantee, they respond by reducing their own efforts," he says.

Extending the child-support enforcement program to cover more non-welfare mothers is fine, but it's a hollow gesture if Reagan doesn't provide any money to do the job. ●

THE "NEW FEDERALISM"

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have seen a number

of articles and studies on the impact of Reaganomics and the so-called New Federalism. I think it is vitally important that we in Congress be fully aware of the results of these Reagan policies on the people of this country. I would like to recommend to my colleagues, a paper written by my son, Larry, a recent graduate of the University of California at Berkeley.

After carefully evaluating the Reagan proposals, this paper concludes that under New Federalism, many State and local governments would reduce or end support for domestic programs, especially those for low income and disadvantaged persons. Viewed in terms of the administration's broader economic program and ideology, the New Federalism seems to be part of a move to shift national priorities and resources from social programs to military programs, for the poor to the rich, and from the public sector generally to the private sector.

The introduction and a description of the New Federalism ideology follows:

THE "NEW FEDERALISM"

(By Lawrence S. Ottinger)

In his State of the Union Address of January 26, 1982, President Ronald Reagan introduced a proposal for a "New Federalism" that would eliminate the federal government's involvement in a panoply of domestic programs. Specifically, the administration's proposal aims at abolishing the federal grant-in-aid system in which the national government presently provides funding with varying degrees of guidelines for state and locally implemented programs in health, education, welfare, transportation, and other areas. This system for providing federal aid to states and localities grew tremendously during the 1960's as part of the Johnson administration's Great Society initiatives.

The Reagan administration's proposal continues a recent conservative trend to undo the federal grant-in-aid system. This trend began with the Nixon administration's original "New Federalism" which passed into law block grant and revenue sharing programs designed to significantly lessen federal guidelines attached to federal funds. The Reagan administration's "New Federalism" would go much further by eliminating federal funding and federal guidelines for many domestic programs.

The Reagan administration claims that these domestic programs and the needs they address would not be harmed by doing away with federal involvement. Rather, they claim, complete state responsibility for these programs would make them more efficient and effective, while also enhancing decentralized decision-making and local autonomy. At the same time, being freed from involvement in these domestic affairs, the federal government would be able to concentrate its energy and resources on its primary responsibility to national defense and foreign policy.

This paper will evaluate the Reagan administration's proposal in terms of its likely impact on the programs it would completely return to the states. It will also examine the basis for and implications of the proposal's ideological foundations.

It is the contention of this paper that under the "New Federalism" proposal, many state and local governments would reduce or end support for domestic programs, especially those for low income and disadvantaged persons. Without federal funds and political directives, many states and localities would be unable or unwilling to maintain these programs and the needs they address. The "New Federalism" would exacerbate current regional, interstate, and intrastate disparities in provision of these basic public services.

Under the guise of decentralization and local autonomy, the Reagan administration's proposal would reverse the historical development of a national commitment to human welfare and public infrastructure needs. Viewed in terms of the administration's broader economic program and ideology, the "New Federalism" seems to be part of a move to shift national priorities and resources from social programs to military programs, from the poor to the rich, and from the public sector generally to the private sector.

"NEW FEDERALISM" PROPOSAL

The major aspects of the "New Federalism" proposal are outlined in a White House fact sheet released the night of the President's speech.¹

The proposal is separated into two main components. The first involves an "equal swap"² between the states and the federal government of the major public assistance programs for the poor and disadvantaged. The federal government would assume total financial responsibility for Medicaid, while the states would assume complete responsibility for Aid for Families with Dependent Children and Food Stamps, which together are often referred to simply as "welfare."

Currently, the federal government has a large role in providing public assistance to the poor. It totally finances Food Stamps and through the grant-in-aid system it matches state contributions to AFDC and Medicaid.

The second component in broad outline involves the following: Over an eight year transition period, the federal government would eliminate its involvement in forty state and local domestic programs totaling \$30.2 billion. During this same period, the federal government would phase out its collection of certain excise taxes worth \$28 billion allowing the states to then raise revenues through this base.

The states would not have to maintain support for any of the programs after the eight years. They could use revenues from the excise taxes they collect for any purpose. The administration's figures indicate that taken together the states would have enough revenues to support these programs if they chose to do so.

The programs being "turned back" under this second component fall generally under two categories: public assistance programs for poor and disadvantaged persons and public infrastructure programs. The former include Social, Health, and Nutrition Services and Low Income Home Energy Assistance. Along with AFDC and Food Stamps, then, the states would have most of the responsibility for programs aimed at providing a minimum standard of the basic human needs. The latter includes Community Development and Facilities, Local Transportation, and Education and Training programs. These public infrastructure programs provide for the basic facilities and services upon which communities, states and the country

depend. The states would also take responsibility for Occupational Safety Assistance from the federal government.

The excise tax base that would be given to the states to compensate for these increased programmatic responsibilities include taxes on the following: gasoline, tobacco, alcohol, telephone service, and oil. Of the \$28 billion the federal government collected from these excise taxes, the oil windfall profit tax provided the largest revenue by far at \$16.7 billion.

Taken as a whole package, the administration's figures indicate that the states would take on \$50 billion in new programmatic responsibilities that they could make up, if they desire, through excise taxes, Medicaid savings, and increased efficiency.

THE IDEOLOGY

Conservative ideology since the Nixon administration has been very consistent in its attacks on the federal grant-in-aid system, blaming the federal government for taking on too much power and responsibility for program areas that would be handled more effectively and efficiently if left completely to state and local governments. This ideology claims that decentralization of federal responsibilities along the lines of the "New Federalism" proposal would enhance citizen participation in politics, state and local autonomy, and government accountability.

Federal v. State Responsibilities: The Clean Separation

The Reagan administration justifies the "New Federalism's" complete elimination of federal involvement in education, welfare, and the other domestic areas through ideological appeals to classical federalism and eighteenth century America.

The classical definition of federalism states that "the general and regional governments are each, within a sphere, coordinate and independent."¹ By "largely abolishing" the federal grant-in-aid system with its sharing of responsibility between the levels of government, the "New Federalism" would effect a clean separation of programmatic duties. As a result, each level of government would have "independent program responsibilities, independent finances, and full and mutual sovereignty."²

In broad terms, the administration seeks a clean separation of program responsibilities along the following lines: The federal government takes care of national defense and foreign policy, while state and local governments take care of most domestic affairs. In his speech, President Reagan hearkened back to the "constitutional balance envisioned by the Founding Fathers"³ between the federal government and the states. At the time, national defense was indeed the major concern of the newly formed federal government, and each state acted as an autonomous whole in domestic political, economic, and social concerns.

Human welfare and public infrastructure programs would fall under domestic affairs that should be handled completely by the states. In attacking the federal "intrusion" into these domestic concerns, the President quoted a Democratic Governor as saying, "The national Government should be worrying about arms control not potholes."⁴

Needs Addressed More Efficiently and Effectively by States

Without federal interference, the states would provide for human welfare and public infrastructure needs more efficiently and effectively. Because state and local governments are closer to the problem, they also are closer to the solution. In reference to re-

turning AFDC and Food Stamps completely to the states, the President said:

This will make welfare less costly and more responsive to genuine need because it will be designed and administered closer to the grass roots and the people it serves.⁵

Federal guidelines attached to federal funding only serve to "bind the hands of state and local officials."⁶ The federal government fails in providing initiatives because it is too far removed from the particular circumstances. Former President Nixon explains why state and local officials would address these needs better without federal involvement.

Decisions about the development of a local community should reflect local preferences and meet local needs. No group of remote Federal officials—however talented and sincere—can effectively tailor each local program to the wide variety of local conditions which exists in this highly diversified land.⁷

Promotes Democratic Decentralization

After a third of a century of power flowing from the people and the States to Washington it is time for a New Federalism in which power, funds, and responsibility will flow from Washington to the States and to the people.⁸

Former President Nixon thus introduced the original "New Federalism" in front of a national TV audience in 1969. Conservative ideology since then has consistently claimed that the federal role in domestic programs has harmed possibilities for decentralized decision-making and state and local autonomy. Though the federal grant-in-aid system and the Great Society programs of the 1960's are their immediate targets, the roots of their attacks go back to the New Deal programs of the 1930's and the development of the welfare state.

By decentralizing program responsibilities and access to the excise taxes, the "New Federalism" would give the states complete autonomy in handling the turned back domestic concerns. By accomplishing a complete separation of programmatic duties, state and local officials would be completely accountable for any failure to meet these needs. Citizens could not be given the run-around that results from sharing responsibilities between the different levels of government. Thus, President Reagan introduced his "New Federalism" as a proposal that would make government "again the servant of the people."⁹

NOTES

¹ The proposal has been modified since then. It most likely will not reach Congress for a vote by 1984. The original proposal has been chosen as it most clearly indicates the administration's programmatic vision.

² "Transcript of the State of the Union Address," New York Times, 27 Jan. 1982, sec. A, p. 16.

³ Michael D. Reagan and John G. Sanzone, "The New Federalism" (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), p. 7.

⁴ "The President's Federalism Initiative: Basic Framework," (Washington, D.C.: White House, 26 Jan. 1982), p. 17.

⁵ "Transcript of the State of the Union Address," New York Times, 27 Jan. 1982, sec. A, p. 16.

⁶ Ibid., sec. A, p. 16.

⁷ Ibid., sec. A, p. 16.

⁸ "Background and Status Report on Federalism Initiative," (Washington, D.C.: White House, 13 July 1982), p. 1.

⁹ Paul R. Dommel and Associates, "Decentralizing Urban Policy: Case Studies in Community Development," (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1982), p. 25.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 17.

¹¹ "Transcript of the State of the Union Address," New York Times, 27 Jan. 1982, sec. A, p. 16. ●

SINGLE EMPLOYER PENSION PLAN AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1983

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with our colleague, Mr. CLAY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations, in introducing legislation which is needed to help assure the solvency and long-term self-financing nature of the single employer pension plan termination insurance program under title IV of ERISA.

The provisions of the proposed legislation, as described in detail in my colleague's statement, can be seen to represent a modification of the bill which Senator DON NICKLES and I introduced in the 97th Congress. While the new bill contains a number of changes in order to accommodate suggestions made by the various interested parties in hearings over the past several years, the bill by no means can be said to be perfect, nor can it be. As I stated during the debate leading to the enactment of ERISA, the termination insurance program under title IV could only lead to ever escalating costs and, in an effort to contain perceived abuses, ever more restrictive and burdensome regulation of the businesses and plans providing the pension benefits. In line with the inevitable and my earlier warnings, the proposed legislation contains a number of provisions to control costs and continue the self-financing nature of the single employer termination insurance program. While I support the basic thrust of the legislation, the bill contains some provisions which are over-reaching, such as certain restrictions placed on an employer's ability to terminate a single employer plan in a collective-bargaining situation, and will have to be modified if the consensus which is necessary to enact this legislation into law is to be achieved.

Comments and suggestions for change are sought from all affected parties, and in the interest of moving toward an early markup of the legislation, hearings by the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations have been tentatively scheduled to be held on September 28, 1983.

While requiring additional refinement, the proposed legislation does contain the kernel of recommendations made by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation which have been generally supported by an outside panel of experts and several generations of PBGC advisory committees.

First, in order to amortize the single employer program deficit currently estimated at \$384 million, and to help

keep it from growing to unworkable levels in the future, the single employer termination insurance premium is increased from \$2.60 to \$6 per capita.

Second, in order to discourage employers having low net-worth from terminating their underfunded plans and transferring their debts to the other employers supporting the system, the conditions under which a plan is allowed to terminate are tightened up to require that the employer and its control group demonstrate a significant "distress" situation such that without relief the continued viability of the employer and its control group would be threatened. Employers would still be allowed to freeze the accrued benefits under their plans under a standard termination, but the bill would require them to continue to fund their plans until all nonforfeitable benefits have been satisfied.

Third, the law is changed to make contributing sponsors and members of their controlled group liable for up to 5 years—or up to 10 years in select situations involving very large transactions—in the event that the plans for which they were formerly obligated terminate. These provisions are intended to address the situation under present law which allows a controlled group of corporations to spin off a subsidiary and its related pensions liabilities thus removing the controlled group from the reach of the PBGC, in the event the subsidiary terminates its plan. In other cases, the liability to the PBGC can be increased dramatically when a company sells its assets and transfers its pension liabilities to a buyer which is financially weaker than the seller. The proposed legislation contains a number of exceptions to the contingent liability provisions which provide safe harbors in connection with transactions which do not present undue risk to the single employer termination insurance program or its premium payers.

Fourth, in order to protect the PBGC against antiselection the bill contains a provision which gives a plan a lien in the amount of any funding waiver obtained by the plan sponsor prior to plan termination.

Additionally, in order to discourage the termination of underfunded pension plans by ongoing employers, the amount for which an ongoing employer is liable to the PBGC is increased above the present law 30 percent of net worth cap to include a 10-year 10 percent of pretax profits provision. An additional penalty equal to 5 percent of pretax profits for up to 10 years would be payable to a termination trust providing for payment of nonforfeitable benefits above the current level of PBGC guarantees. By discouraging the termination of underfunded pension plans the bill would reduce the administrative costs of the title IV program. Administrative costs would

also be reduced under the proposed legislation by streamlining the procedure for closing out fully funded plans. Since the passage of ERISA, almost 98 percent of all terminated plans have been found to be sufficient. PBGC costs in connection with the termination of such plans would be reduced by allowing plan administrators and enrolled actuaries to certify to the PBGC as to their sufficiency.

These changes represent a major restructuring in the single employer termination insurance program under title IV. Their early enactment is necessary in order to protect the financial stability of the program and to avoid the curtailment of benefit guarantees in the future which will become necessary if the changes are not made. With this in mind I encourage all affected parties to limit their demands and provide our committee with suggestions for change which will make the program more workable and viable over the long term. ●

TRIBUTE TO HON. JAMES H. QUILLEN

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the friends and alumni of Washington College Academy will gather this Friday to pay tribute to our colleague, Congressman JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN. The occasion will mark the establishment of the Quillen Scholarship Fund at the Academy, the oldest institution of learning west of the Alleghenies. This tribute is an indication of the love felt for JIMMY QUILLEN by the people of the First District of Tennessee. Having worked with him throughout my congressional service, and appeared with him in east Tennessee, I have seen the affection and admiration given to Congressman QUILLEN.

As the following biography shows, it is his hard work and drive which have earned JIMMY this respect. I am certainly proud to be his neighbor and colleague. He has worked as hard in the Congress as he did as a boy in Kingsport, struggling to finish high school. These efforts have been paid off with the love of the First District. I believe the following biography will give an insight of the character and determination of this man.

CONGRESSMAN QUILLEN: HIS STORY

Congressman James H. Quillen is a man who had to struggle for his education. It was a struggle he hasn't forgotten, even though his life's successes long ago eclipsed darker days.

Finishing high school at all was no small challenge for Quillen during the depression-marked days of the mid-1930's. Quillen was born in Southwest

Virginia, and the family moved to nearby Kingsport, Tennessee, when he was a child. The young Quillen picked up odd jobs in town, and he worked for free at the local newspaper. It was the latter that he hoped to make his career.

While working his way through Dobyns-Bennett High School, Quillen made \$3 a week by cooking and serving breakfast in a restaurant before classes each day. The job meant he had to rise at 3:30 a.m. and walk three miles to work. On Saturdays, he worked in a grocery store till midnight.

In school, he wrote plays and poetry and earned straight A's.

In 1934, he received his diploma and took the first job he was offered—carrying a paste pail in the bindery of Kingsport Press for 25 cents an hour.

He had been offered an appointment to the United States Military Academy at West Point, but felt he couldn't afford to take the opportunity. So, he stayed with the paste pail, 10 hours a day, six days a week.

Then one day his boss asked him to go to a Rotary Club meeting with him and participate in a debate with the latest debate champion from Dobyns-Bennett High School. Quillen won that debate—and a boost in his self-confidence. Feeling that maybe he could do better than the paste pail, he went back to the newspaper and asked for a paying job—this time selling advertising.

He wrote some news stories on the side, and eventually rose to the lofty salary of \$21 a week. Finally, at the age of 20, Jimmy Quillen's long-felt ambition took flight. With \$42 in his pocket (two weeks' pay), he started his own newspaper.

He wrote his own copy, sold his own advertising, hand-delivered all the bills, collected the payments, kept the books—and made a profit. In the next three years, he sold the Kingsport newspaper, and started another in neighboring Johnson City. He volunteered for the Navy after Pearl Harbor, and finally made it to college—Dartmouth, for a brief indoctrination. He continued publication of his newspaper until he received orders to go overseas, served as an officer on a carrier in the Pacific, and started to learn first-hand about the difficulties of operating a business from halfway around the world.

After his discharge in 1946, he came home. Instinct for identifying the public's desires told him there would be a great demand for new houses. In the post-war era, GI's had come back to the states with the GI Bill in hand, and it looked like supply wouldn't be able to keep up with demand. He bought a couple of lots down the street from the family home, dug the footings himself, and soon sold his first two houses.

Two led to four, four to eight, and eventually the idea of insuring the homes as well as building them. From 1948 to 1954, the businesses seemed to take on a life of their own—so much so that by election time in 1954, Jimmy Quillen was in need of a new challenge.

Friends had been urging him for weeks to run for a seat in the Tennessee legislature. He finally consented to run, but lost the election—at least he thought he did. He had gone to bed election night after hearing a radio report saying he had missed the seat by 67 votes. It wasn't until the next morning that he saw the truth on a newspaper headline: "Quillen Wins By 67 Votes."

Jimmy Quillen has been winning ever since—four terms in the State Legislature, and eleven in the U.S. Congress.

The early struggle to finish high school was worth it—just as Jimmy Quillen always knew it would be. ●

RESOLUTION—CALLING FOR RESTORATION OF DEMOCRACY IN CHILE

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, September 15, I introduced legislation with seven Members of the House as original cosponsors calling upon the U.S. Government to continue to deny military assistance and to deny all future nonhumanitarian economic assistance to Chile until that country returns to democracy.

Joining us in introducing the same resolution in the U.S. Senate were Senators EDWARD KENNEDY, ALAN CRANSTON, and CHRISTOPHER DODD.

The recent upsurge of political protests and the swift and brutal response of the Pinochet regime should prove to the world and to the Reagan administration that little has changed in the past 10 years in Chile. Human rights are still being violated, political imprisonments continue, and torture is still a common practice as a means of intimidating the Chilean people into silence.

But the massive public demonstrations of the past 2 months show that the spirit of freedom and democracy still cries out among the Chilean people.

It is the spirit of the 25,000 Chileans killed, and 100,000 imprisoned, detained, and tortured by Chilean security forces in the first few weeks following the September 1973 coup.

It is the spirit of Victor Jara, the gifted Chilean folksinger and songwriter. Imprisoned in Santiago's National Stadium along with thousands of other Chileans just after the 1973 coup, Jara was brutally beaten by Chilean security forces who used rifle butts to crush his fingers and break his hands. Jara, although his hands had been destroyed, led the crowds of prisoners in singing the national anthem, whereupon he and countless others in the stadium were gunned down.

It is this spirit that defies the administration's conciliatory approach toward Chile.

It is this spirit which shows the world that it is Pinochet's Chile which should serve as the textbook case of a repressive society.

I urge my colleagues to join me and the original cosponsors of this resolution, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr.

MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BARNES, and Mrs. SCHNEIDER, to affirm this spirit of freedom of the Chilean people by calling upon Chile to return to democracy.

A copy of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR THE RESTORATION OF DEMOCRACY IN CHILE

Whereas September 11, 1983, marked the tenth anniversary of the establishment of military rule in Chile;

Whereas on September 11, 1973, a military coup led by General Augusto Pinochet overthrew the constitutionally elected government of Salvador Allende and brought about the collapse of democratic institutions in Chile;

Whereas in the months following the September 1973 coup, up to 25,000 Chileans were killed by the regime of the President Pinochet;

Whereas in the four days of demonstrations from September 8 to 11, 1983, fifteen Chileans have been reported as killed and over 550 arrested, and between June and September 1983 at least 40 persons were killed by the Chilean Air Forces Forces during public demonstrations of opposition to the regime of Augusto Pinochet;

Whereas during the same four month period, thousands more have been arrested in massive round-ups in working class neighborhoods in Chile;

Whereas the Pinochet regime, in response to the nationwide protests of June 14, 1983, targeted Chile's labor movement in particular, as shown by the dismissal of 31 union leaders and 799 copper workers from CO-DELCO, the imprisonment of 15 labor leaders by late June, and the arrest of 5 directors of the Coordinadora Nacional Sindical in the first week of July;

Whereas the Government of Augusto Pinochet has been linked by United States investigators to acts of terrorism and assassination in Argentina, Italy, and the United States, and was found "legally culpable" by a United States Federal District Court judge for the September 21, 1976, murders of former Chilean Ambassador Orlando Letelier and Ronni Karpen Moffitt;

Whereas only a fraction of the over 11,000 Chileans exiled by the Pinochet regime since the 1973 coup have been allowed to return to their country;

Whereas the present Chilean constitution grants executive authority to General Augusto Pinochet until 1989 and allows for delays in popular elections until 1998;

Whereas Amnesty International has noted that in recent years there has been a marked deterioration in the human rights situation in Chile, demonstrated by a consistent pattern of arbitrary detention, political imprisonment and killings, and systematic torture; and

Whereas Amnesty International, the International Commission of Jurists, the United Nations Human Rights Commission Ad Hoc Working Group of Chile, the United Nations General Assembly, and the Organization of American States Commission on Human Rights have stated that the regime of Augusto Pinochet has violated basic human rights and political freedoms in Chile since the military coup of 1973 in that country; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That until Chile returns to its long tradition of democratic procedures and institutions—

(1) the United States should continue to deny any and all military assistance directly

or indirectly to the government of Augusto Pinochet;

(2) the United States should also deny all economic assistance to the government of Chile, including Export-Import Bank and Commodity Credit Corporation guarantees and loans; and

(3) as mandated under section 701(f) of the International Financial Institutions Act of 1977, the United States should oppose all loans and grants to the government of Chile by international financial institutions such as the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Development Association, unless such assistance is directed specifically to programs which serve the basic human needs of the people. ●

INTRODUCTION OF MULTINATIONAL FORCE IN LEBANON RESOLUTION

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1982

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent increasingly dangerous situation in Lebanon has raised serious questions in this Nation and among many Members of Congress as to the precise role of the U.S. Marines in the multinational force, and how that role fits into overall U.S. policy in Lebanon and the Middle East. The death of four U.S. Marines and the wounding of 27 others and the resulting clear applicability of section 4(a)(1) of the war powers resolution to the Lebanese situation demand action by the Congress.

From the outset of the U.S. force deployment in August 1982 it has been my consistent position that those troops have been introduced into hostilities or into a situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, thus triggering section 4(a)(1) of the war powers resolution. As Members know, once the President files a report to Congress under section 4(a)(1)—and only section 4(a)(1)—U.S. troops must be removed within 60-90 days unless Congress authorizes their continued presence.

It has been my hope, expressed in both letters to the President and public statements, that, in the collective, cooperative spirit envisioned by the war powers resolution, the President would have filed a section 4(a)(1) report to afford Congress an opportunity to exercise its judgment on this crucial matter.

Fortunately, the war powers resolution was crafted to enable Congress, as well as the President, to determine when a section 4(a)(1) report should be submitted. Acting on that basis, I am today introducing a joint resolution stating that the section 4(a)(1) reporting requirement became operative on August 29, 1983, and authorizing

the continued presence of U.S. Marines in Lebanon, as required by section 5(b) of the war powers resolution.

My decision to introduce this joint resolution is not based in any way on partisan considerations. Rather, I have done so with the conviction that the future course of action in Lebanon must be one decided by the President and the Congress. The war powers resolution was designed to be and is the best legislative vehicle for making that collective decision in a responsible manner.

I have decided to provide for continued authorization of U.S. Marines in Lebanon because I believe that it is necessary and desirable. With appropriate safeguards for their protection, and a firm understanding of their role in a clearly defined U.S. policy toward Lebanon, this authorization will greatly advance U.S. foreign policy objectives in the Middle East. For that very reason I am confident that a majority of the Members of Congress will support this joint resolution.

The resolution I am introducing is not an authorization for open-ended U.S. military involvement in Lebanon. Nor does it hamstring the President's ability to carry out an effective foreign policy. It has a balance of flexibility and control which includes the following:

A congressional finding that U.S. Armed Forces have been introduced into hostilities requiring congressional authorization and a congressional determination that section 4(a)(1) of the war powers resolution became operative on August 29, 1983;

A limitation on the functions of U.S. Armed Forces in accordance with the September 25, 1982 international agreement between the United States and Lebanon, except that this shall not preclude such protective measures as may be necessary to insure the safety of the multinational force in Lebanon. That agreement limits the Marine contingent to the Beirut area, places a ceiling of 1,200 on that force and allows for self-defense;

A semiannual reporting requirement on the status, scope, and duration of hostilities involving U.S. forces, the activities and present composition of the multinational force, the results of efforts to reduce and eventually eliminate the force, how continued U.S. participation in the force is advancing U.S. foreign policy interests in the Middle East, and what progress has occurred toward national political reconciliation among all Lebanese groups;

A declaration by the Congress that other countries should continue to participate in the multinational force, that the United States should promote continuing discussions to bring about the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Lebanon, and that the United States should discuss with the Security Council of the United Nations, on

an annual basis, the replacement of the multinational force by a UN peace-keeping force;

A stipulation that U.S. participation in the multinational force will cease at the end of an 18-month period (unless the Congress extends such authorization) and that such authorization shall terminate sooner if all foreign forces are withdrawn from Lebanon (unless the President determines and certifies to the Congress that continued U.S. Armed Forces participation is required after such foreign forces withdraw up to the end of the 18-month period in order to establish Lebanese Government control of the Beirut area), or when the United Nations or the Government of Lebanon is able to assume the responsibilities of the force or upon the implementation of other effective security arrangements in the area;

Provides that nothing in the resolution precludes either the President or the Congress from directing the withdrawal of U.S. forces in Lebanon and that the resolution does not modify, limit, or supersede any provision of the war powers resolution or the requirement in the Lebanon Emergency Assistance Act of 1983 for congressional authorization of any substantial expansion in the number or role of U.S. Armed Forces in Lebanon.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware there is great concern over the extension of the U.S. military presence for a period of up to 18 months. That concern must be weighed against the likely alternative of not providing such an extension.

The alternative is withdrawal. And the likely consequences of withdrawal are so detrimental as to make that alternative totally unacceptable.

First, U.S. withdrawal from the multinational force will most certainly lead to French and Italian withdrawal and the collapse of the force. Second, the collapse of the force will lead to complete anarchy, the likely disintegration of the Lebanese central government and, for all practical purposes, the end of Lebanon as a country for the foreseeable future. Third, with the political disappearance of Lebanon, the prospects for the achievement of a comprehensive peace in the Middle East, the primary U.S. foreign policy objective in the region, will have been effectively foreclosed.

In addition to these vital considerations, there are three other sound and valid reasons why the 18-month period was chosen. These reasons are:

1. Eighteen months is likely to be long enough to prevent Syria from questioning United States resolve to maintain troops in Lebanon and wait out the Marine presence and instead force it to negotiate in earnest for a comprehensive settlement in Lebanon.

2. This length of time will carry the authorization for troop involvement

past the 1984 elections, thus insulating the U.S. participation from partisan wrangling and election-year politics.

3. The next administration will have an opportunity to review the situation without time pressure. Continuity will also be demonstrated since the U.S. Marine presence will remain over the course of two different administrations.

I am pleased to say that this joint resolution was crafted with the active and direct participation of the House leadership. I urge my colleagues to support this joint resolution as one that is in keeping with U.S. foreign policy interests and constitutionally mandated congressional prerogatives. ●

STRENGTHENED EXPORT CONTROLS IN THE WAKE OF KAL 007

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, on September 16, 1983, the Republican study committee, of which I am chairman, held hearings on the Soviet destruction of Korean Air Lines flight No. 007. My colleagues and I were fortunate to have as witnesses at the hearing, the following persons:

Hon. Fred Ikle, Undersecretary of Defense for Public Policy;

Hon. Lawrence Brady, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Trade Administration;

Dr. Ray Cline, of the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies;

Mr. John Fisher, president, American Security Council;

Dr. Miles Costick, president, Institute on Strategic Trade;

Mr. Burton Pines, vice president, the Heritage Foundation;

Mr. Paul D. Kamenar, the Washington Legal Foundation;

Capt. Thomas Ashwood, vice president, Air Line Pilots Association; and

Dr. Kyo Ryoan Jhin, representing the League of Korean Americans, who was accompanied by Mr. Hong An, executive director of the League of Korean Americans.

The witnesses proved to be an excellent selection. They were extremely knowledgeable and articulate. They provided an enlightening and sometimes moving explanation of what happened over Sakhalin Island 2 weeks before, why it happened, what the Soviet crime means to the United States and what the United States should do about it.

My colleagues and I, who were present at the hearings, want to share with Members some of the information we were fortunate to receive. I am entering into the RECORD the written

statement of Assistant Secretary Lawrence J. Brady:

I am pleased and honored to have the opportunity to appear at today's special hearing on what an appropriate U.S. response should be to the shooting down of KAL flight 007.

I am honored because I owe a personal debt of gratitude to Congressman Larry McDonald. Back in 1979, when I was forced to resign my post at the Commerce Department, Congressman McDonald was the first member of the House Armed Services Committee to step forward to ask for a full accounting of my charges that NATO security was being needlessly jeopardized by improved technology transfers to the communist world.

Thanks to his crucial support, the Subcommittee on Investigations began a series of hearings which revealed for the first time in many years the true military costs of trading with potential adversaries. The hearings established a record which convinced Congress that same year to pass legislation strengthening considerably the export control system.

Congressman McDonald proved to be an effective and forceful advocate of strengthened controls, and he impressed me as a true patriot, a man who always put loyalty to country ahead of personal ambition or gain. Thanks in great part to his efforts, the new Administration was able to make major gains in placing our trade relations with the Warsaw Pact nations on a more sensible footing.

Congressman McDonald was a stern critic of the notion we should seek to enmesh ourselves in a "web of economic interdependence" with sworn adversaries. He believed our generosity in transferring tens of billions of dollars of credits and advanced technology would be repaid mainly with the coin of aggression—not with hard currency.

He believed the Soviets would take our most advanced equipment and manufacturing techniques, purchased ostensibly for civilian purposes, and apply them whenever feasible to modernizing Warsaw Pact weapons systems so as to tilt the balance of power against the West.

He believed the Soviets would utilize their relationships with the international business community primarily to lull the Free World into a false sense of security so that we would continue to expand our trade even while Soviet and Soviet-proxy troops threaten our vital interests in Central America, the Middle East, Southeast and Southwest Asia, and across the breadth of Africa.

He knew it was wrong to assume that an economically more powerful U.S.S.R. would come automatically to accept our values, our belief in the free enterprise system, and our commitment to individual liberties.

The shooting down of an unarmed civilian airliner shows just how little the Soviets have absorbed our standards, while they profit from our trade. The recent tragedy forces us to search for an appropriate response.

President Reagan was quick to speak out forcefully in strong condemnation of this terrible deed. He appealed immediately to the allies to join us in a measured range of sanctions in the area of civil aviation which have commanded broad international support.

He also pledged the U.S. would redouble its efforts to control the flow of strategic and military sensitive technologies to the U.S.S.R.

I can think of no finer tribute to Congressman McDonald than to intensify efforts to stem the hemorrhaging of our strategic technology which boosts the Warsaw Pact's warring capabilities. To this end the President is determined to achieve concrete results in our ongoing discussions with the allies concerning the security dimensions of East-West trade policy.

A top priority is assigned to our COCOM list review. Not only will many advanced technologies be added to the control list, we are also requesting a substantial upgrading of the COCOM secretariat. We are prepared to do whatever it takes to insure that COCOM has the resources to get the job done.

We seek our allies' support for new controls on oil and gas technology equipment vitally needed by the Soviets for their crash energy development program, as well as for some military purposes. We presented the U.S. control proposal to the allies in June and will be holding a bilateral round of discussions with them in October, preparatory to a special meeting of COCOM this January in Paris.

We have achieved substantial results in eliminating preferential credit terms of the U.S.S.R. The allies agreed to move the U.S.S.R. into a "developed country" category, insuring that official credits can be offered only at rates offered to other industrialized nations. The United States, of course, has furnished no official credits to the U.S.S.R. since the Jackson-Vanik amendment was adopted in 1974. This move means the Soviets, formerly charged rates at 7-8 percent, have since July of last year been forced to pay 12.5 percent.

In addition, through discussions in the International Energy Agency, the allies have agreed to avoid energy dependence on potentially unstable sources of supply and to accelerate the development of Western energy alternatives to Soviet natural gas. Our intent is to preclude expansion of the Siberia-West Europe natural gas pipeline network to more than a single export strand. If we are able to develop cost-competitive alternative sources of supply, the Soviets will be deprived of their only major opportunity to improve a bleak hard currency earnings picture. Soviet hard currency earnings could be diminished by as much as twenty-five percent beginning in the early 1990's as a result of our policy.

In short, the Soviets are paying a price for internal repression and external aggression, a price that will go far higher if they cannot learn to live at peace in the civilized community of nations. Through their outrageous acts—the invasion of Afghanistan, the destruction of human rights at home, the imposition of martial law in Poland, and the commission of this latest outrage against humanity—the U.S.S.R. has forced the West to react with a series of defense and economic measures which demonstrate our unwillingness to accept this conduct.

To complement our East-West trade work program with the allies, the Administration has submitted to Congress legislation extending the Export Administration Act which provides the President adequate authority to impose effective national security and foreign policy controls.

The President must retain this authority if our contributions to the Warsaw Pact's military buildup are to be limited, or if he is to have the ability to apply new economic sanctions against the Soviets or their surrogates.

There are voices in Congress who would strip away the President's power here, just

as they would tie his hands in responding militarily to any foreign challenge. These voices of isolationism would have the President and the country stand virtually powerless before the forces of aggression, incapable of using military or non-military instruments of diplomacy. They actually seem to believe that the world will be a safer place only when the democratic nations forswear any forceful or meaningful measures of reaction. We clearly cannot allow such voices to prevail.

For this reason, the Administration needs your support in the weeks ahead as Congress begins work on the Export Administration Act, in order to convince the American people and our allies that we are determined to shoulder the responsibilities before us.

From 1969 to 1979 our policies in administering the EAA were liberalized dramatically to facilitate the expansion of East-West trade. As a result, during the so-called era of detente, the Warsaw Pact's military infrastructure received a direct injection of our advanced computers, machine tools, and manufacturing systems.

In 1979, following the revelations about military production at the giant Kama River truck plant, Congress took some initial steps to place a national security emphasis back in the program.

Unfortunately, this year the progress so painfully achieved could be undone. There are proposals before Congress which, if enacted into law, could have serious adverse national security and foreign policy consequences.

These new proposals could weaken the controls system to the point where the worst licensing abuses of the past would be replicated on a far larger scale. Unlike the 1970's, however, when the alliance had a more favorable conventional and nuclear military posture with respect to the Warsaw Pact and thus could better tolerate the West-East leakage of strategic technology, today there are real questions whether Free World defense budgets can absorb the costs of compensating for capabilities we have bestowed on our adversaries. In other words, technology flows to the Warsaw Pact may shift the military balance against us at the margins in ways which cannot be offset by increased defense expenditures on our part. This certainly is certainly not a happy scenario for defense planners.

Let me now take just a moment to discuss the most troublesome provisions in the bill reported from the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

ELIMINATION OF COCOM LICENSING

The House Committee bill significantly weakens our enforcement program and our discussions with the allies on coordination of policy by eliminating certain licensing requirements for exports to COCOM countries, which consist of the NATO countries minus Iceland plus Japan. It states that a validated license can only be required for exports to certain end-users rather than the country as a whole. This eliminates the "paper trail" needed for effective enforcement and is administratively infeasible. Commerce would be required to identify and publish a list of foreign proscribed end-users. Having to establish the legitimacy of all potential end-users in advance and against the whole spectrum of controlled items would divert resources, be of limited effectiveness and generate controversy over the "blacklisting" of companies. Furthermore, virtually all other COCOM countries

have licensing requirements for transfers among themselves. At the very time the United States is seeking to harmonize the licensing procedures within COCOM, we should not be asked to take a unilateral step away from harmonization because of this provision.

MANDATORY ELIMINATION OF UNILATERAL CONTROLS

The bill also requires that militarily sensitive technology and equipment which has been approved for export to a country group for a one-year period must be decontrolled completely, unless Commerce is able to prove that a particular end-user should not receive such exports.

This provision raises many of the same problems with respect to national security and administrative effectiveness as the elimination of COCOM licensing. It would require compiling a list of proscribed end-users within that country group. More importantly, there would be no way administratively to assure that a product decontrolled for one country group would not be diverted to another country group for which controls on that product continue to apply. We would also lose the ability in particular transactions to monitor end-users and end-users in decontrolled country groups, increasing the chances that Soviet "front" companies would be able to illegally obtain military technology. The effectiveness of the licensing system would therefore be severely undercut.

FOREIGN AVAILABILITY PROVISIONS WEAKEN MULTILATERAL CONTROLS

The use of the foreign availability rationale in the Committee bill to decontrol strategic technologies and equipment would also have a very adverse impact on our licensing program. The bill states that negotiations must be conducted to eliminate the availability from foreign sources of items controlled for national security purposes; if the availability is not eliminated within six months the item must be decontrolled.

We agree that fair enforcement of controls requires multilateral cooperation, and we are committed to making every effort to eliminate foreign availability. Requiring negotiations to do this is entirely appropriate. But mandating that national security controls on such items be lifted if foreign availability is not eliminated within six months could have serious ramifications. We might, as a consequence, be required to unilaterally decontrol items on the COCOM control list which are available from other foreign sources even if our negotiations to control the items have not been completed. This would damage our position in COCOM. In addition, although we appreciate the concern that U.S. businesses should not be precluded from selling their products overseas if foreign competitors are not similarly restricted, our discretion to maintain U.S. controls on sensitive items under certain circumstances should not be eliminated.

EXTRATERRITORIAL AUTHORITY MUST BE RETAINED

Finally, the bill removes the President's authority to impose foreign policy export controls extraterritorially without prior approval of Congress. This provision undermines the President's ability to conduct U.S. foreign policy. For example, it severely limits the effectiveness of antiterrorist foreign policy controls which require extraterritorial application of U.S. laws to be effective. Additionally, the provision could be read to eliminate re-export controls as well. Controls on re-exports are necessary to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ensure that our export controls are not circumvented by shipments through third countries. Re-export controls must be maintained if our controls are to achieve their intended purpose.

In conclusion, I again want to emphasize the important contributions Congress can make in working with the Administration to advance our broad strategic trade goals. I also would like to commend the Republican Steering Committee for holding this hearing, and I wish you every success in your endeavors.●

HE KEPT US OUT OF PEACE

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, here is a letter I received from Mr. Judson F. Haggerty of Indianapolis, Ind. It seems fortunate that he and Mark Twain were able to get together at this critical time when the administration seems so prone to compel history to repeat itself. Our country should go to war when we have to, not just when we have a chance to.

HAGGERTY & HAGGERTY,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
Indianapolis, Ind., August 1, 1983.

Congressman ANDREW JACOBS, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ANDY: I have come up with Reagan's campaign slogan for '84—"He Kept Us Out of Peace." This latest foolishness in Central America reminds us of Mark Twain's warning:

"The loud little handful—as usual—will shout for the war. The pulpit will—warily and cautiously—object—at first; the great, big, dull bulk of the nation will rub its sleepy eyes and try to make out why there should be a war, and will say, earnestly and indignantly, "It is unjust and dishonorable, and there is no necessity for it." Then the handful will shout louder. A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against the war with speech and pen, and at first will have a hearing and be applauded; but it will not last long; those others will out shout them, and presently the anti-war audiences will thin out and lose popularity. Before long you will see this curious thing: the speakers stoned from the platform, and free speech strangled by hordes of furious men who in their secret hearts are still at one with those stoned speakers—as earlier—but do not dare to say so. And now the whole nation—pulpit and all—will take up the war-cry, and shout itself hoarse, and mob any honest man who ventures to open his mouth; and presently such mouths will cease to open. Next the statesmen will invent cheap lies, putting the blame upon the nation that is attacked, and every man will be glad of those conscience-soothing fables, and will diligently study them, and refuse to examine any refutations of them; and thus he will by and by convince himself that the war is just, and will thank God for the better sleep he enjoys after this process of grotesque self-deception."

Yours very truly,

JUDSON F. HAGGERTY.●

September 20, 1983

BOAT REFUGEES' HORRORS

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Roger Winter which recently appeared in the New York Times regarding piracy in the Gulf of Thailand.

Brutal atrocities, including murder, rape, kidnapping, and robbery, continue to be inflicted upon innocent refugees fleeing from Indochina in search of freedom by boat. In the first 3 months of 1983, 53 percent of the boats arriving in Thailand were attacked—on an average of 2½ times each.

Some progress has been achieved in curbing these criminal attacks, but the level of brutality remains intolerable. I agree with Mr. Winter's conclusion that "the world community can do much better." I commend Mr. Winter and the United States Committee for Refugees, which he directs, for the leadership and humanitarian concern which led them to recently send a delegation to Southeast Asia to study what could be done to protect these innocent refugees.

BOAT REFUGEES' HORRORS

(By Roger P. Winter)

WASHINGTON.—The flow of Vietnamese boat refugees has fallen sharply since 1979, yet there remains a steady leakage across the Gulf of Thailand and the South China Sea of those who have experienced or fear repression by Vietnamese authorities. Today's refugees face the same dangers as their predecessors; rough seas and unseaworthy boats; Vietnamese Navy patrols; and, in some cases, an inhospitable welcome on the receiving shores. But these dangers pale next to the horror of pirate attacks. The pirates are not of the swashbuckling variety, but rather common thugs and murderers on the high seas.

More than two-thirds of all Vietnamese refugee boats that land in Thailand and Malaysia are attacked by pirates, most more than once. "Attack" in a term that covers a multitude of atrocities. Theft of whatever valuables the refugees have brought with them is universal. Frequently the attackers also steal the boat's motor or otherwise disable the craft, causing enormous suffering and loss of life. However, violence is the most vicious of all.

On May 6, for example, a boat carrying 31 Vietnamese refugees was attacked twice by Thai pirates. Twelve of the refugees were knifed or clubbed to death and thrown overboard. Three young women were abducted; the possibility that they survived is minimal. Twelve more people drowned when the refugee boat sank while being towed by the pirates. Only four men survived. In this incident it is not known whether rapes occurred. The normal pattern, however, is for young women to be repeatedly raped, sometimes dozens of times. If abducted, they and any young children with them are usually thrown overboard; a few are sold into prostitution.

Of the scores of boat refugees I interviewed recently as part of a United States Committee for Refugees team in Thailand and Malaysia, only one traveled on a boat that was not attacked during the journey. In every case, the pirates were Thai. In most cases the pirates were armed, but in almost no cases were the refugees armed. Sometimes, the pirates appeared to be common fishermen opportunistically attacking a vulnerable target.

Many boat people do not live to tell their stories. Those who do are carefully debriefed by United Nations authorities. What emerges is a picture of mayhem on the high seas involving unarmed refugees that is, I believe, unequalled anywhere in the world.

No one disputes the evidence—not the Thai Government, the United Nations or the United States Government. But no one stops the attacks.

The Thai Government operates a small, marginally effective antipiracy program in the Gulf of Thailand. The \$3.6 million used in this effort last year was provided by a dozen nations, the United States being the largest donor.

The Thai Navy uses decoy boats, spotter planes and fast patrol boats to cover an area of 18,000 square miles. With only one unit of each type on daily patrol and many attacks occurring outside the project area, the deterrent effect, while perceptible, is minimal. A team of experts in marine patrol and interdiction recently analyzed the Thai effort and made recommendations to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. At the prompting of Representative Stephen Solarz, Democrat of New York, Congress has appropriated \$5 million to contribute to this and related efforts, rightly recognizing that these refugees are "our" people—individuals who have suffered for their identification with the United States and South Vietnam during the Vietnam War.

Of the hundreds of refugees we interviewed, almost all indicated that they knew from Voice of America broadcasts or other sources that pirate attacks should be expected. They also knew it was possible, if they landed in Thailand, that they would be interned for a period of years without hope of resettlement by Thai authorities seeking to eliminate the flow of boat refugees. We asked everyone, if, having emerged from the trauma of attack and impending internment, they would again attempt to flee Vietnam. In every case but one they answered with a clear yes. The one exception was a woman who had watched her 15-year-old daughter raped and abducted, probably never to be seen again. To her, the cost of freedom had been too high.

For refugees, the cost of freedom is always high. But all of us must agree that pirate attacks exact an inhuman price. Regardless of politics, the entire world has a vested interest in stamping out ruthless violence. It is intolerable for the civilized world to allow or to ignore such violence against refugees or any other peaceable people.

The world community can do much better. ●

ALIEN: YURIY ANDROPOV

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, when Yuriy Andropov ascended to the general secretaryship of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union last year, and subsequently became President of the U.S.S.R., the Western media was quickly engulfing the free world with false portraits of Mr. Andropov. If one were gullible enough to believe the reports and feature articles, one would have accepted Yuriy Andropov as a kind, tolerant, gentle, likeable connoisseur of Western literature and jazz music.

Fortunately a number of articles and books have recently been coming into print which present a more realistic look at Mr. Andropov and teach something about Soviet society and the power processes at work inside the party leadership. Two such books are "Andropov: New Challenge to the West" (by Beichman and Bernstam) and "The Russian Version of the Second World War" (edited by Graham Lyons), both of which are reviewed in fall, 1983 issue of the Heritage Foundation's Policy Review.

Mr. Speaker, the reviews follow:

ALIEN

(By Stephen Haseler)

Andropov: New Challenge to the West, by Arnold Beichman and Mikhail S. Bernstam (New York: Stein and Day Publishers).

The Russian Version of the Second World War, edited by Graham Lyons (New York: Facts on File Publications).

It was inevitable that much of the Western media, together with the remnants of the Western foreign policy establishments, would attempt to portray a new boss in the Eastern bloc both as a force for stability and as a Communist with a human face. Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, who ascended to the general secretaryship of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) on November 15, 1982, and subsequently became president of the U.S.S.R., was simply the beneficiary of a Western need. Whoever had won the tussle to succeed Brezhnev would have been accorded the same lenient treatment.

Pleasant characteristics—a certain liberalism, a measure of tolerance, a lack of fanaticism, and the like—would have been attributed to party leaders like Viktor Grishin, Vladimir Dolgikh, Mikhail Gorbachev, or Mr. Andropov's most serious rival for the post, Konstantin Chernenko. Even Mr. Andropov's predecessors at the head of the Soviet security apparatus—the odious Genrikh Yagoda and the repugnant Lavrenti Beria—had they been born later and succeeded to the top (rather than being executed), would have lived to see the gentler side of their natures paraded before Western eyes.

A world both hungering for stability and fearing war quite naturally wants to believe the best of the man placed in authority over the globe's most powerful military machine. And the trivial and often gullible media give

people what they want. Also, there is present in the aftermath of any Kremlin succession, when public attention is focused directly though fleetingly upon the rulers of the Soviet regime, a generalized tendency to contain the popular anti-Communist sentiment in the West that might take hold if the record of the new leader were properly scrutinized.

BEHIND THE MASK

Consequently, the KGB disinformation network hardly had to work overtime on Yuriy Andropov's image. An impression of a man of Western tastes who like American jazz—and for a separate generation the tango as well—emerged quite smoothly. The man of intellect and wide sympathies was easy to sell and package.

There was, quite naturally, something of a minor reaction to all of this among high-brow conservative circles within the West, but the initial image flickers on, and some seven months after the event a correspondent for the New York Times can refer to Mr. Andropov, without a shred of evidence or the use of named sources, as "said by his associates to be more cosmopolitan than his predecessors."

In this environment it is refreshing to be able to turn to the first serious account of Mr. Andropov's background to appear in book form. Andropov: New Challenge to the West is a political biography of the new Soviet chief. Mr. Beichman and Mr. Bernstam have produced a scholarly yet timely account of the rise and rise of the office clerk from Stavropol; and in so doing they provide the reader with intriguing glances not only into Mr. Andropov's background and character but also into the nature of the Soviet elite, its system of recruitment, its patterns of rewards and punishments, and the sheer ruthlessness, brutality, and luck needed to survive and prosper within it.

Mr. Andropov worked his way through the Komsomol (the Russian Communist youth organization) and at the age of 23 was working directly under the section of the NKVD (a predecessor of the KGB) that oversaw the Volga construction project and directed the slave labor that built it. During this period the future Soviet chief with liberal tastes evidently worked closely with two of the worst Stalinoid apparatchiks, Yacob Rappoport and Sergei Zhuk, both referred to in some detail in the second volume of Solzhenitsyn's Gulag Archipelago. Mr. Beichman and Mr. Bernstam argue that having worked closely with these two was "like having worked for Heinrich Himmler and Adolph Eichmann, in the later Nazi period." And Mr. Andropov was promoted. Later, at age 26, we see him leading, according to the biography, "a team sent to terrorize the population of the newly established Karelo-Finnish Republic."

Mr. Beichman and Mr. Bernstam develop a portrait of the young Mr. Andropov that is, to say the least, unsavory. Their Mr. Andropov is at home in the Stalinist world of slave labor and terror, a guileful operator in the lower reaches of the Communist system, a Komsomol opportunist carefully developing contacts with patrons in the party in Moscow and in the NKVD. The biographers tell us little about the personal life of the aspiring Mr. Andropov—indeed there is hardly anything known about it—but an investigation into this area would be fruitful, for the new Soviet chief, the man of Western tastes and liberal outlook, hardly derived such human sensibility from his official life.

ONE OF THE GANG

One particularly intriguing aspect of Mr. Andropov's rise from local and regional "politics" to the center of events is revealed in this readable biography. Mr. Andropov was evidently a junior member of what Mr. Beichman and Mr. Bernstam discern and describe as a brotherhood within the Communist party, a "loosely organized hierarchical group within the party, one with its own rules, its own traditions and aspirations, a Marxist-Leninist brotherhood of power and strategy." This group included such figures as Mikhail Suslov, Brezhnev, Nikolai Patolichhev (Mr. Andropov's patron), Frol Kozlov, and Boris Ponomarev. After the Second World War this brotherhood began to take up key positions in the party apparatus, and in 1952 they began preparing, with Stalin, a new wave of terror and another party purge. But the brotherhood evidently received a serious setback after Stalin's death. The coalition of Georgi Malenkov, Beria, and Khrushchev, and then the emergence of Khrushchev, virtually exiled Mr. Andropov from the outer ring of power, and he was on his way to the Budapest embassy.

The biographers suggest, however, that the brotherhood succeeded in making a comeback as Khrushchev's power waned, and that the key figure was the austere Suslov, who was able to place his client Mr. Andropov into a seat in the party secretariat following the Cuban missile crisis. By 1967, with Brezhnev and Suslov and Mr. Ponomarev increasing their reach and power, the brotherhood was able to secure for Mr. Andropov both a candidate membership in the Politburo and the control of the KGB.

The authors argue that the gang around Suslov, a coterie in which Mr. Andropov was playing an ever-increasing role, was never at home with the destalinization process attempted in the fifties, and that the Khrushchev period was, in the words of a key sentence in the book, "in the nature of a long transition between Stalin and the Brezhnev-Suslov coalition." The brotherhood also disliked the party line, still in force years after Khrushchev's ouster, that no reference should be made in public to the NKVD, Stalin's instrument for mass terror. Yuri Andropov, obviously hiding his liberal tastes, became so frustrated with this state of affairs that he made an extraordinary speech as early as 1967 that, in effect, resurrected the reputation of the NKVD.

MILLENNARIAN PSYCHOPATHS

Here was the newly installed KGB chief showing his real colors and speaking for a gang that saw clearly that Communist party power rested securely upon "state security organs"—the NKVD, the NKGB, the MGB, and their present version, the KGB—from day one of the takeover in 1917.

Mr. Beichman and Mr. Bernstam have not only set out to put before their readers a detailed biographical sketch of Yuri Andropov; obviously, they are also attempting a much larger task: to weaken or destroy the Western intelligentsia's fatal attraction to the notion that Soviet leaders are the same kind of species of political being as our own politicians and that they are understandable in Western terms. Robert Conquest, in an introduction to the political biography, argues, "There are those in the West who would simply have us ignore the historical and psychological background of men like Andropov. They would pay no attention to the fact that he and those like him are the products of a history quite alien to our own and are the exemplars of a political psychol-

ogy of a type hardly seen in the West outside small sects of millenarian psychopaths."

For those who remain, after reading this powerful book, unconvinced about Mr. Conquest's thesis that "them" and "us" are utterly different and distinct, I can recommend an intriguing little book entitled "The Russian Version of the Second World War," edited by Graham Lyons. In his book, published in 1976, Mr. Lyons has compiled an account of the Second World War as seen through the eyes of Soviet authors of Russian schoolbooks. Naturally, things being what they are, these schoolbooks amount to the official history of the war according to the Soviet party. They are deeply instructive.

Any Soviet, or indeed Russian, interpretation of the events of the Second World War is bound to be distinct from those prevalent in the West. Among normal states this is certainly the case: The American view presented in the schools no doubt differs significantly from that of the British, and the British from that of the French. As a young Englishman, I was brought up to believe that we British virtually won the war single-handedly, that the Americans came in late, at the last moment as usual, that the French let us down in 1940, and so forth.

These impressions were culled from schoolbooks, from home life, and from movies. However, these simplistic and distorted notions did not last long as I, together no doubt with my generation in other democratic countries, gained access to other points of view, read more scholarly interpretations, and traveled. There was certainly no official view of the Second World War imposed upon me, and there was also a good deal of plain old anti-British sentiment in many of the schoolbooks. Just as American schoolchildren today are instructed in the wickedness of the American war in Vietnam, so were British schoolchildren told about the evils of the British Empire.

These points need to be borne in mind when one reads *The Russian Version*. It is not actually the Russian version; it is rather the Soviet Communist party version, a point strangely omitted by the editor. Furthermore, it is the only version available to any Soviet citizen.

THE FRATERNAL SOVIET FAMILY

But the main interest in this small book lies in some of the breathtaking assertions made by Yuri Andropov's KGB as it helped prepare and approve this history. Let us take the official account of the Nazi-Soviet pact, which is called, interestingly, the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact. It is argued that the Soviets were right to sign because the pact "enabled the Soviet Union to avoid war on two fronts and to gain time to strengthen the country's defenses." Evidently, "the Soviet government realized that Hitler had not given up his plans for war against the Soviet Union, and his proposal was a routine manoeuvre of the Fascist leadership."

Following the pact, "The Nazis could not be allowed to reach the Soviet border . . . This is why in pursuance of its liberation mission the Soviet Army marched into the Western Ukraine and West Byelorussia, where it was enthusiastically welcomed by the population." Then, "Throughout October 1939, democratic elections were held in the newly liberated areas to people's assemblies. Acting on the will of the people, these assemblies proclaimed Soviet power and requested the Supreme Soviet to admit Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia in the

fraternal family of Soviet nations. The Supreme Soviet complied."

The Soviet invasion of Finland, described as "armed conflict with Finland," is treated in the following way: "The Soviet state was faced with the acute problem of further strengthening its security, in particular on the frontier with Finland . . . At the end of November 1939, artillery fire directed in provocation against our territory from the Finnish side forced the Soviet government to take retaliatory measures. Thus Finnish reactionary forces, incited by Fascist Germany and the other imperialist powers, unleashed war against the Soviet Union."

The incorporation of the Baltic states into the Soviet system is dealt with in the following way: "The German invasion of Poland also added to the danger of a Nazi attack upon the Soviet Union from the Baltic shore . . . There was the danger that they [the Baltic states] would become German vassal states . . . In view of this the Soviet government approached the Baltic governments with the offer of mutual assistance treaties. The Soviet proposals were met favorably by the peoples of these countries, and their Governments gave their consent . . . The treaties fortified the defenses of the Soviet Union and the Baltic republics."

One is tempted, even in the medium of a review, simply to reproduce quote after quote from "The Russian Version," and without comment. Soviet "historians" can rightly argue that it was the Soviet Union that bore the brunt of the fighting and the horror, and there is now a preponderance of Western opinion that would agree with them. But the sheer Orwellian doublespeak and the "big lie" technique that infuse this Russian version on so many other fronts take the whole issue beyond rational argument.

The madness of it all is that the Soviet historians who wrote this version may even believe in it. Can Robert Conquest be gaisayed when he argues that men like Yuri Andropov are "products of a history quite alien to our own"?

(Stephen Haseler is a visiting professor at Georgetown University and a visiting fellow at the Ethics and Public Policy Center. His most recent book is *The Tragedy of Labor*, published by Blackwell's of Oxford.)

SINGLE-EMPLOYER PENSION PLAN AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1983

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, today my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Mr. ERLENBORN, and I are introducing the Single-Employer Pension Plan Amendments Act of 1983, which amends the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) and makes conforming changes in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The bill is urgently needed to put the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation (PBGC), the agency which insures that workers get their private pensions when their companies are in financial difficulty, back on a sound financial footing.

The bill would strengthen the PBGC program in two significant ways: by raising the insurance premium for single-employer plans from the current \$2.60 per year per plan participant to \$6 and by restructuring the single-employer insurance program to limit access to PBGC assistance only to those cases in which workers' pensions are jeopardized because their employers are in genuine financial difficulty. No changes to the multiemployer insurance system are made by this bill.

Over a year ago, the administration asked Congress to approve the single-employer premium increase but the business community strongly objected to the increase unless the system was reformed. At the request of Congressman ERLBORN, the former chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations, Phillip Burton, agreed to defer action on the premium increase request until the necessary reforms were developed and could be enacted at the same time.

Few dispute the need for reform. The problem is deciding what type of reform is necessary and how to balance the conflicting interests of providing strong Federal controls to assure the least possible risk to the PBGC insurance system while at the same time permitting private sector business decisionmaking processes to proceed undisturbed. For at least 3 years, representatives of big and small business, organized labor, and the administration have been struggling to reconcile these competing interests and produce a reform package that all could support. Although they are very close to achieving consensus, a handful of outstanding issues remain.

Because Congressman ERLBORN and I are committed to assuring both the premium increase and reform measures are enacted this year, we recently instructed the subcommittee staff to prepare a bill addressing to the greatest extent possible the concerns of all parties and identifying for us the issues which remain unresolved.

We are most concerned that 3 years have passed and no one has been willing or able to make the hard choices which are necessary to forge consensus. As elected policymakers, the Members of Congress have a responsibility to undertake that task when the private parties are unable to agree. And that is what we have done in this bill.

While I believe this is a good bill, I have no illusions that it meets all the objectives of all the parties who have been working hard on this issue for so many years. If each of us could write with a clean slate, none of us would pen this precise bill. But the longer we delay making these essential changes, the greater the financial pressures on the insurance system.

We invite the administration and the single-employer pension community as a whole to work with us to refine this bill. We have identified particular areas of concern in the summary which follows. We intend to work quickly. Enough time has gone by and the problems are well-known. The Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations will hold a hearing on this bill on September 28, 1983, in room 2261 of the Rayburn House Office Building at 10 a.m. Shortly thereafter the subcommittee will mark up the bill. We urge all affected parties to share their comments and suggestions with us as soon as possible so that, working together, we may enact this urgently needed legislation this year.

SUMMARY OF THE SINGLE-EMPLOYER PENSION PLAN AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1983

GENERAL POLICY OBJECTIVES

The overall policy objectives of the bill are to encourage the maintenance and growth of single-employer defined benefit plans while at the same time increasing the likelihood that workers receive their promised pension benefits, to assure that unfunded pension liabilities are transferred onto the termination insurance system only in cases of severe business hardship, and to put the termination insurance system back on a fiscally sound basis by raising the single-employer plan premium and tightening the rules governing both access to the insurance system and liability upon plan termination.

DEFINITIONS

For purposes of clarity and consistency, key terms used throughout the bill and ERISA itself are defined in section 102 of the bill. Among those terms are contributing sponsor, employer, and controlled group.

PREMIUMS

Effective for plan years beginning after December 31, 1982, the single-employer pension plan termination insurance premium will be \$6.00 per participant per year. A special payment rule is provided for plans which may have made their payments to PBGC for this year at the time the bill is enacted. In addition, the process by which Congress may adopt any future premium increases is changed from a concurrent to a joint resolution procedure. Finally, the Congressional Research Service (CRS) is directed to study the premiums established for single-employer plans under Title IV of ERISA and report to Congress any legislative or operational recommendations for change not later than two years after date of enactment of the bill. CRS will be assisted in its study by an Advisory Council consisting of individuals expert in these matters representing single-employer plan sponsors, employee organizations and the general public (Section 103).

TERMINATIONS BY PLAN ADMINISTRATORS

Sections 104 through 106 of the bill provide the framework for single-employer plan terminations initiated by the plan administrator. Plans may terminate only under a "standard termination" (new section 4041(b) set out in section 105) or under a "distress termination" (new section 4041(c) set out in section 106).

The general rules which apply to both a standard and distress termination are in new section 4041(a)(Section 104) and require prior notice and other preconditions to termination in the case of certain collec-

tively bargained plans in which coverage of participants is specifically bargained and embodied in collective bargaining agreements or plan documents.

A. Standard termination

This type of termination is available to all contributing sponsors regardless of financial condition and does not require PBGC approval. Certain procedural requirements must be met, however, and certain obligations to employees may not be abrogated. Under a standard termination, future benefit accruals cease but additional service beyond the termination date must be counted for vesting and eligibility purposes. This is generally a codification of the current practice permitted by the Internal Revenue Service (the so-called "shallow freeze"). Cessation of benefit accruals outside of a standard termination will no longer be permitted.

Subsequent to a standard termination, contributing sponsors and members or their controlled groups will be required to fund the plan under the normal funding rules until the plan is fully funded. Full accrued benefits would continue to be paid after a standard termination. Faster funding would be required if the plan did not have enough money to pay benefits when due.

A plan could only close out its affairs when it had sufficient assets to discharge all vested liabilities. This is consistent with the overall policy goal of the bill to increase the likelihood that participants receive their full promised and earned benefits.

Procedurally, plan administrators must notify PBGC, participants, and employee representatives that the termination will take place on a proposed date. The notice of PBGC must contain certain actuarial information. The plan must be amended to reflect the cessation of accruals and any other additional obligations which arise as a result of standard termination. Until the plan administrator makes a final distribution of all assets, the plan administrator must provide the PBGC with a copy of certain actuarial information included on the Schedule B of the Form 5500 annually.

B. Distress termination

Consistent with the overall policy goal of the bill to limit access to the termination insurance system to plans of companies in genuine financial difficulty, PBGC would only be required to pay guaranteed benefits for plans who met one of four threshold tests:

(1) All plans maintained by the contributing sponsor and each substantial member of its controlled group must have received funding waivers from the Internal Revenue Service for three of five plan years preceding the year of plan termination, including the most recently completed plan year.

(2) The contributing sponsor and each substantial member of its controlled group has filed a petition (which has not been dismissed or converted) seeking liquidation under federal or state bankruptcy law.

(3) The contributing sponsor provides substantial evidence to the PBGC that unless a distress termination is granted, the sponsor and each substantial member of its controlled group will be unable to pay their debts when due and unable to continue in business.

(4) With respect to all plans of the contributing sponsor and each substantial member of its controlled group, the ratios of (A) required pension contributions to total annualized wages of covered participants, and (B) required pension contributions to

gross income, have doubled over a stated period of time.

For purposes of these tests, a substantial member of a controlled group is a person whose assets comprise 5% or more of the total assets of the controlled group.

Once one of these tests is met, the procedure followed by the PBGC to effectuate the termination is intended to be generally the same as current law. Determinations of sufficiency and net worth must be made before any distress termination is complete. We do not intend to put PBGC in any worse position than it is under current law nor do we intend to set up a structure for distress termination which invites additional litigation. We, therefore, solicit the comments of the PBGC and others as to the appropriateness of these distress tests to identify financially stressed companies for whom pension relief is essential. In addition, we invite comments on the necessity for providing greater protection for PBGC (and the premium-payers) against unnecessarily lengthy disputes over net worth.

TERMINATIONS BY THE CORPORATION

The PBGC's authority to terminate a plan involuntarily under section 4042 of ERISA is generally unchanged.

LIABILITY FOLLOWING PLAN TERMINATION

Once a plan has been terminated in a distress termination or by the PBGC under its own authority, persons may be liable to the PBGC and, in certain instances, to participants and beneficiaries. That liability is described in section 4062 (section 110 of the bill). Those who are liable (each contributing sponsor and all members of their controlled groups) are identified in subsection (a). The amount of liability to PBGC and participants is set forth in subsections (b) and (c) respectively. Subsection (d) contains a special rule limiting liability for certain persons who are liable under section 4062 not as contributing sponsors but rather only as members of controlled groups of those sponsors.

A. Liability to PBGC

The contributing sponsors and all members of their controlled groups are liable for the full underfunding of the plan with respect to guaranteed benefits. In addition, unpaid contributions (including any contributions for which funding waivers have been granted and any contributions which would have been due but for the filing of a bankruptcy petition) must be added to the amount of unfunded guaranteed benefits.

If the sum of all the amounts described above exceeds the sum of 30 percent of the net worth of each liable person, then the amount of liability is limited to the following:

- (1) The 30 percent amount described above, and
- (2) An amount equal to 10 percent of the pretax-profits of each contributing sponsor and all members of their controlled groups for a period of 10 fiscal years following the fiscal year in which the plan terminates. If there are not profits in any fiscal year, no profit payment to the PBGC is required.

B. Liability to participants and beneficiaries

Contributing sponsors and all members of their controlled groups who are liable under section 4062 are required to contribute to a special termination trust described in new section 4042A (Section 108 of the bill). The contribution is limited to 5 percent of pretax profits calculated and payable in the same fashion as the 10 percent of profits

which is due to the PBGC. Payments to participants, and beneficiaries from the termination trust are designed to pay whenever possible the difference between vested and guaranteed benefits.

Although payments into the termination trust are limited in duration to a period of time ending on the earlier of the 10th fiscal year after the year in which the plan terminated or the year in which the trust has assets sufficient to pay all benefits not otherwise payable by the PBGC or the plan, payments from the trust to participants and beneficiaries will continue as long as there is money in the trust. If in any given year, however, there is not enough money to make the annual lump sum payments to all participants and beneficiaries, they may get no payment at all or only a pro rata payment. If money is subsequently contributed to the trust, generally no makeup payments are required.

CONTINGENT LIABILITY

A new part (Part 2) is added to Title IV to close the loophole under present law (1) which allows a controlled group of corporations to spin-off a subsidiary and its related pension liabilities thus removing the controlled group from the reach of the PBGC in the event the subsidiary terminates its pension plans and (2) in which the liability to the PBGC can be increased dramatically when a company sells its assets and transfers its pension liabilities to a buyer which is financially weaker than the seller. Section 112 of the bill contains all the new sections added to ERISA related to contingent liability.

Section 4071 defines the event, called a benefit obligation change, which triggers a 5 (or in certain cases a 10 year period) in which a formerly obligated contributing sponsor or controlled group member is contingently liable. In the event of a benefit obligation change, a formerly obligated person is jointly and severally liable on a contingent basis for 5 years from the occurrence of the event. The 5 year period is extended to 10 years if within the first 5 years one of the following events occur in connection with the new contributing sponsor (e.g., the buyer): a bankruptcy proceeding is initiated against such person, such person makes an assignment for the benefit of his creditors, a custodian, receiver, or trustee is appointed with respect to such person, or such person begins to undergo liquidation. An additional condition necessary to trigger the extension of the 5 year period to 10 years is that the total unfunded nonforfeitable benefits in connection with the change must exceed \$5 million and the ratio or employer pension plan contributions to total net operating income must equal or exceed 1/2.

Under regulations of the PBGC, the contingent liability provisions may be applied to composite single-employer plans under which two or more employers who are not in the same controlled group) contributes to the covered plan.

Section 4072 describes the conditions under which a person undergoes a "benefit obligation change" with respect to benefits under a single employer plan, thus triggering contingent employer liability.

Under the first set of conditions, contingent liability is triggered in any case in which the liability for some or all of the benefits under a single employer plan is transferred to one or more other single employer plans. Any person who, at the time of the transfer, is a contributing sponsor of the transferor plan, or a member of such sponsor's control group undergoes a benefit obli-

gation change with respect to the benefits for which the liability is transferred. An exception to the general rule occurs in the case in which a person who is a contributing sponsor of the transferor plan is also a contributing sponsor of the transferee plan. In this case, such contributing sponsor and each member of such sponsor's control group does not undergo a benefit obligation change (and thus contingent liability is not triggered).

Under the second set of conditions, in any case in which a person ceases to be a contributing sponsor with respect to a single employer plan, each member of such sponsor's control group undergoes a benefit obligation change. An exception to the general rule provides that such a person does not undergo a benefit obligation change if immediately after the change such person is a contributing sponsor of the plan or a member of the controlled group of a contributing sponsor of the plan.

Under the third set of conditions, in any case in which a person ceases to be a member of a controlled group (1) such person undergoes a benefit obligation change with respect to benefits under any single employer plan of which any member of such person's controlled group is a contributing sponsor and (2) each such controlled group member undergoes a benefit obligation change with respect to benefits under any single employer plan of which such person is a contributing sponsor as of both immediately before and immediately after the change. An exception to the general rule provides that any such person does not undergo a benefit obligation change if the amount of the assets of such person at the time of the change is less than 5% of the total amount of assets of the controlled group and there is not more than one such change within 5 years of the plan termination.

Section 4073 sets forth the amount and payment of contingent liability. Subject to reductions under Section 4075, the liability of any contingently liable person under part 2 in connection with a single employer plan termination is equal to the amount of unfunded guaranteed benefits, less the amount of any liability collected by the PBGC from primarily liable persons. Under regulations a person may amortize the amount of contingent liability over a period up to 15 years.

To the extent that the amount of contingent liability exceeds 30% of the person's net worth, the excess amount is payable in the same manner and to the same extent as is the case for persons who are primarily liable (e.g., subject to the 10% of pre-tax profit and 10 year limitation).

In addition to the 10% of pre-tax profit payments, a person is also liable to the extent of 5% of pre-tax profits to the termination trust established jointly by primarily liable and secondarily liable persons.

Under Section 4074, if the PBGC receives liability payments in full satisfaction of amounts of unfunded guaranteed benefits and unpaid contributions, then contingently liable persons who have made liability payments succeed to the claims which the corporation would otherwise have against primarily and other secondarily liable persons to the extent of any amounts not collected by the PBGC. The recourse of contingently liable persons against primary and other secondarily liable persons is subject to any relevant agreement which may have been made among such persons.

Under Section 4075 the amount of contingent liability for which a person may be

liable may be reduced if the person demonstrates to the PBGC that the amount of unfunded guaranteed benefits immediately before the benefit obligation change is less than the amount previously described under Section 4073. In addition if a subsidiary is liable by reason of membership in a controlled group based on a percentage of common interest of less than 80 percent but more than 50 percent, the amount of such person's liability is limited to the previously determined amount multiplied by the percentage of common interest. Finally the amount for which any contingently liable person may be liable is reduced by the amount of such person's liability which may arise under Section 4063 or Section 4064 in connection with a composite single employer plan.

Section 4076 sets forth exemptions and safe harbors in connection with contingent employer liability. A person is not liable under the contingent liability provisions if the person is also primarily liable under Section 4062.

A person is not contingently liable if, after the plan termination, he demonstrates that one of the following requirements have been met. Under the first safe harbor the otherwise contingently liable person must demonstrate that the total amount of unfunded nonforfeitable benefits under all single employer plans for which such person is a contributing sponsor is less than \$500,000. Under the second safe harbor the otherwise contingently liable person must demonstrate that a particular ratio equals or exceeds one-third. The ratio is the total net operating income of all persons who are (as of immediately after the benefit obligation change) contributing sponsors of the plan and all members of such sponsor's control group, divided by the total amount of unfunded nonforfeitable benefits under all single employer plans of which such persons' are contributing sponsors. Under the third safe harbor, the otherwise contingently liable person must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the PBGC that the financial position of the new control group in connection with the benefit obligation change is at least as favorable as the financial position of the old control group prior to the change.

The fourth safe harbor is available if (1) the benefit obligation change occurs as part of an arm's-length sale of all assets of the employer (2) the sale occurs because of the death or retirement of any beneficial owner of any contributing sponsor or controlled group member, (3) the total number of employees of all such contributing sponsors and controlled group members does not exceed 250 at the end of the 2 plan years preceding the death or retirement, and (4) the unfunded nonforfeitable benefits under all plans covering the employees of such contributing sponsors and controlled group members does not exceed \$750,000.

Under the fifth safe harbor, the contingent liability provisions do not apply in any case in which the terminated plan has no unfunded nonforfeitable benefits for any 2 consecutive plan years beginning on or after the date of the benefit obligation change and ending on or before the termination date. In addition, in the event of the transfer of liability for benefits between plans, if the amount of assets transferred exceeds such liability, then the contingent liability provisions are made inapplicable.

Under Section 4077, the PBGC may waive some or all of the contingent employer liability if it determines upon application that the interest of the PBGC are adequately protected without such liability.

Under Section 4078, the PBGC and any person liable under Title IV shall in a timely fashion and after a written request (and to the extent not otherwise prohibited by law) provide any other contingently liable person such information they may have in their possession which is required under the Section 4076 safe harbors to show that the conditions under that section are met.

Under Section 4079, to the maximum extent possible, the PBGC shall take such actions as may be necessary and appropriate to assure that all civil actions against persons who are primarily and secondarily liable are brought under the jurisdiction of a single Federal Court.

LIENS IN FAVOR OF THE PLAN

As we understand current practice, when a waiver of the minimum funding requirements is granted, the Internal Revenue Service often requires that if a plan terminates before the waived amounts are fully repaid, those amounts become a debt due and owing to the plan at the time of termination. Both the bill introduced in the Senate (S. 1227) and section 112 of this bill provide for a lien for the waived amounts arising in favor of the plan at the time of the waiver. Both bills (to varying degree) rely on the plan administrator to decide whether, when, and on what collateral to perfect. This raises both theoretical and practical fiduciary responsibility questions which we are currently trying to resolve. Rather than hold up introduction of the bill any longer, we are soliciting suggestions from the PBGC, the Department of Labor and others as to the best way to provide protection for the plan and PBGC while not needlessly encumbering all property of the contributing sponsor.

ENFORCEMENT

Section 113 of the bill contains the enforcement provisions. In addition to expanding PBGC's authority to enforce the conditions of a standard termination, the bill adds a new section 4096 to ERISA in which is consolidated all rights of contributing sponsors of participants and others to enforce certain Title IV provisions against terminated single-employer plans or the PBGC.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The provisions of the bill are generally effective on the date of enactment.

CONFORMING INTERNAL REVENUE CODE AMENDMENTS

These are contained in Title II of the bill and include provisions providing for deductibility of contingent liability payments for controlled group members and for payments required under a standard termination. ●

THERE IS MORE THAN ONE WAY TO SAVE THE WHALES

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions I have taken the floor of this House to express my concern about environmental extremism. I want to bring to my colleagues' attention the latest in a long series of attempts by preservation groups to save something and thereby

prevent sound conservation and management practices.

Sea World, Inc., a well-known institution dedicated to research and education through public display, has applied for a permit to remove from the wild up to 10 killer whales over the course of 5 years. The killer whales will be transported live to Sea World facilities and will become part of Sea World's captive marine mammal breeding program, a program that has successfully preserved a number of species. Due to the wording of the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the permit includes a request to take up to 100 whales; however, "take" in this context means simply to disturb, not to harm or kill. During the course of the operation, Sea World will allow scientists to conduct a number of needed research activities on the whales so that our knowledge of this animal can be increased.

One would think that a program designed to increase knowledge about a relatively unknown species and to breed that species so that it will survive in perpetuity, all at no cost to the taxpayer, would be supported by conservationists everywhere. Unfortunately, such is not the case. Greenpeace, an organization dedicated to saving whales, has filed objections, as have other groups and individuals. For those of you who have forgotten, Greenpeace is the organization that sent members into the Soviet Union and then used that episode to raise funds with large advertisements in the Washington Post. Greenpeace objects to the proposal because the killer whales removed from the wild will be put on public display. They ignore all of the scientific knowledge that will be obtained from this proposal, as well as the information that every visitor who goes to Sea World will receive. I wonder if those who oppose Sea World's proposal believe that knowledge should only be available to the select few that belong to environmental organizations.

George Will, the distinguished writer, recently authored a column on the Sea World proposal. I think it should be read by every Member of this House and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

[From Newsweek, Aug. 29, 1983]

THE ORCAS OF SEA WORLD

(By George F. Will)

Whales deserve no enemies and better friends. Some misanthropes love whales only because they (the misanthropes, not the whales) are repelled by humans. Furthermore, because protecting whales is a cause adopted by some persons who despise everything in Western civilization except bran muffins, right-wingers sport bumper stickers that say "Nuke the whales." (Hardliners prefer "Nuke the gay Iranian whales.")

Today a dispute about a few orcas (killer whales) is jeopardizing a worthy institution.

Sea World in San Diego blends entertainment, education and research. It is comparable in quality to San Diego's famous zoo. It cooperates with many universities and research institutions, such as the Scripps Institution of Oceanography. The most famous feature of Sea World is a show by orcas performing with trainers. Last year 6.6 million persons visited Sea World and two sister facilities near Cleveland and Orlando.

Anyone who sees the orcas perform is unlikely thereafter to be indifferent about harm done to whales. More than 75 million have seen them perform at the facilities. So Sea World is not only expanding knowledge about whales in the wild, it is mass-producing opposition to commercial whaling. Yet Sea World now is the object of immoderate opposition because of its request for permission to acquire a few more orcas.

Captivity: Orcas live in groups, called pods, of six or more. For the orcas' contentment in captivity, and for attempts at breeding, the three Sea Worlds, which have a total of eight, need 18. Some critics say breeding in captivity is impossible. Dr. Lanny Cornell, Sea World's zoological director, notes that the same was said about elephants and lowland gorillas, which are now frequently bred. (Twenty-seven bottlenose dolphins have been bred in San Diego. Sea World has the only U.S. display of Antarctic penguins, and three of the species are breeding.)

In 1972, in response to the clubbing of baby seals and the catching of dolphins in tuna nets, Congress passed a law that prevents the taking of marine mammals other than for research or display. No one knows how many orcas there are. There certainly are so many that they are not an endangered species. Sea World wants to collect 10 in five years.

Headlines shout that Sea World wants to "capture" 100. But 90 would be released within four hours, after scientific studies. They would be photographed (for identification by color patterns). A few would receive radio packs for tracking by satellite. One tooth would be taken (using a local anesthetic) from perhaps 20 whales to determine aging. Stomach and blood samples would be taken, and liver biopsies may be performed on animals with certain symptoms, to learn about their feeding habits and what parasites and pollutants threaten them. Some electroencephalograms would be made to measure hearing, as is done with human infants.

At hearings in Seattle last week some scientists endorsed and others criticized Sea World's research proposals. But the dispute is less about science than about cultural values. Representatives of Greenpeace, an anti-whaling organization, say Sea World is only interested in profits, a word they speak as though it soils their lips. The charge is an unfounded smear. It is especially obnoxious because Sea World's profits are funding numerous research projects, and an entire research institute, at a moment when public research funds are shrinking.

Environmentalists and others have had the salutary effect of encouraging zoo improvements, such as getting lions out of cages and elephants unchained. But the complaints of some environmentalists about the wickedness of separating creatures from their natural "ecosystems" suggest that the attack on Sea World is the thin end of a large wedge—an attack on the display of animals in man-made environments.

Bashing Sea World has become a cottage industry in Washington state. In 1976

Ralph Munro, who is now Washington's secretary of state and whose family has lived on Puget Sound for four generations, was sailing when he observed a Sea World attempt to collect orcas, using boats, planes and small noisemakers that critics enjoy calling "bombs." (Sea World no longer uses them.) He found it "gruesome" and now says things like: "The people" are tired of "these southern California amusement parks taking our wildlife down there to die." (He says life expectancy in captivity is two to four years. Sea World says it is 10 years and rising.) Munro dismisses Sea World's research as "baloney" and asks: "Why should our children who have the opportunity for generations after generations to see these animals in the wild have to go to southern California and pay \$10" to see them?

Easy, Ralph. Sea World's research satisfies many scholarly journals. Sea World does not want "your" whales; it wants whales from Alaskan waters. And taking 10 will not blight the lives of Munros unto the seventh generation.

Progress: Whales, with their enchanting grace and playfulness, their individual personalities, intricate social behavior and complex brains, are so magnificent that commercial whaling, which is unavoidably cruel and utterly unnecessary, lacerates the feelings of sensitive persons. Only a person whose spirit is dead to the poetry of the planet can fail to see that life is richer because these graceful creatures are swimming—and singing—on the sea's surface, and in the sunless depths. Mankind's slow, meandering progress toward a nobler sensibility can be gauged, in part, by finer standards of stewardship over earth; such standards dictate respectful dominion over animals.

We are the responsible portion of creation and we are improved by observing creatures like whales, which make vivid the mysteriousness of the natural. It is best to see animals in their natural habitats. But zoos, aquariums and other responsible facilities, such as Sea World, are the only place where most people can acquire the sense of wonder that comes from exposure to magnificent creatures.

If Sea World is denied a permit for 10 orcas, I hope 230 million Americans go to Puget Sound, unfold lawn chairs on Munro's lawn, ask for iced tea and water-cream sandwiches and watch the whales. It will be good for their souls, and will serve him right. ●

REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON KAL 007

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, on September 16, the Republican Study Committee, of which I am chairman, held a hearing on the destruction by the Soviet Union of Korean Air Lines flight No. 007 near Sakhalin Island.

One of the people who was invited to testify but was unable to do so was Dr. Zdzislaw M. Rurarz, former Ambassador of Poland to Japan who defected to freedom after the imposition of martial law in his country. Dr. Rurarz,

submitted a written statement for the RSC hearing. I am asking that the statement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of the Members.

The statement was hastily drafted at our request and has not been edited.

STATEMENT BY DR. ZDZISLAW M. RURARZ, FORMER AMBASSADOR OF POLAND TO JAPAN ON THE DOWNING OF THE KAL'S JETLINER BY THE SOVIETS; DELIVERED BEFORE THE CONGRESSIONAL COMMISSION ON SEPTEMBER 16, 1983

Mr. President, it is with the deepest sorrow that I have learned about the downing of the KAL's jetliner on September 1, 1983, by the Soviet SU-15, only seconds from international waters.

But as much as I was shocked by this new Soviet barbarism and as much as I joined in the grief by all those who lost their loved ones among the 269 innocent victims, I was not at all astonished by the act itself. Neither I was astonished by the silence, lies and all other abominable efforts by the Soviets to whiten themselves and blame everybody else instead.

We Poles have an exceptionally long list of grievances against the Soviets. Not once we were told that somehow it was perhaps our own behavior that invited the Soviet anger against us. Not once we were told that it was our representatives who were not capable to speak to the Soviets. And as the consequence of this the Teheran and Yalta agreements were served to us, leaving us and other nations of Central and Eastern Europe at the mercy of the Soviets.

It is only now that the Free World is learning in a shocking way what we have learned more than four decades ago.

Mr. President, I am very honored that you decided to invite me to speak before the forum chaired by you on the murder by the USSR of another tens of innocent people. Your initiative on learning what may be the motive behind that murder and all the ensuing Soviet behavior afterwards is something you should be congratulated for. It is still not too late to draw the conclusions from the Soviet behavior. It was this behavior which was behind my decision to seek the political asylum in the United States after the martial law was declared in Poland. It was not that I did not know earlier whom the Soviets are, but up to the last moment I wanted to believe that perhaps they may come to reasons and change. After invading Afghanistan and after pushing Jaruzelski to declare the war on the Polish nation, I could only lose the rest of my hope that the Soviets are corrigible. The downing of the Korean jetliner is only another proof of the same Soviet behavior. And promising to behave in the same way in the future too, means beyond any doubt that the Soviets have in deep contempt the human life, truth and dignity.

Mr. President, as I have already mentioned, we Poles have a particular reason to be concerned about the Soviet behavior.

I believe it can be of interest to you, Mr. President, and other Honorable Congressmen, to learn something about the Poles' experience in their relations with the Soviets. Our experience can be very instructive to the others, because the Soviets do not change by one iota.

Let me quote some historical facts.

On August 23, 1939, when the new world war was hanging over the mankind, and over Poland in particular, Hitler, still hesi-

tating as to launching it, received the encouragement from Stalin in the form of Ribbentrop-Molotov pact. At that time the world was unaware of the secret protocol on Poland's partitioning attached to it.

Next day, namely on August 24, 1939, the Soviet Ambassador to Poland, Nikolay I. Sharonov, told the Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Joseph Beck, that the Soviet-German non-aggression agreement in no way changed the nature of the Soviet-Polish non-aggression agreement.

Three days later, the head of the Red Army, Marshal Kliment Voroshilov, gave an interview to the Soviet journal *Izvestia* saying the following:

"The question of assistance in the form of raw materials and military supplies is a commercial one and there is no need to conclude a mutual assistance pact, still less a military convention, in order to supply Poland with these things.

This statement was to encourage the Poles to resist the German pressure and to go to war. Naturally, that statement was also to suggest nothing like stabbing the Poles on the back by the Soviets.

Moreover, on September 1, 1939, when Poland was already under the attack by Hitler's Germany, that same Soviet Ambassador N. I. Sharonov called again on Minister J. Beck and asked why Poland was not negotiating with Moscow for supplies as mentioned in the Voroshilov's interview?

And the Polish Government sent a special courier to Moscow to approach Molotov, the same who signed the sinister pact with Ribbentrop against Poland and in fact against world peace, to find out about the issue.

Molotov not only explained, on September 6, that no such supplies could be counted on as mentioned by Voroshilov, but even the supplies from the West could not pass to Poland over the Soviet territory.

But this is not the end of Soviet duplicity. In order to confuse the Poles even more, Molotov stated by the end of the conversation, that the above Soviet position can change.

Still on September 11, the Soviet Ambassador Sharonov was assuring the Polish Government that the Soviet Government had the said matter of supplies under consideration.

Six days later, without any declaration of war on Poland, the Soviet troops invaded Poland. The Soviet tanks waved the white flags and the troops were saying to the shocked Poles that the Red Army was coming to help them. And Poland, crumbling under the overwhelming superiority of German forces, decided not to declare the war on still another mighty neighbor. Believing that this would spare the lives of many of her citizens.

How wrong the Poles were! Soon the Soviets would execute many Poles on the spot and many arrests, among them some 15,000 officers, of whom only some 4,500 were found dead in Katyn and with the rest murdered in unknown places.

That is how the Second World War started and what the experience we Poles have.

In the course of that war we lost some 6 million people, about 1 million in the Soviet hands although Poland was never, even a single day, at war against the USSR.

The fate of some 2 million ethnic Poles deported to the USSR, with almost half never returning, was one of the most gruesome martyrdoms in the history of the humankind.

Mr. President, I am not going to mention more examples on the many atrocities com-

mitted by the Soviets on the Polish nation. The litany is too long and known too many in this country.

But what I wanted to emphasize in this connection it is the fact that the Soviets would never admit any, I repeat any, of the above facts. Not only they do not feel guilty for anything, although in fact they helped to unleash together with Hitler the last war in which also many of the Americans fell, but they demand instead that the Poles be grateful for being occupied by the Soviets.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am not astonished what the Soviets did and what they say. This is something we have learned by experience.

Yet there is something more than that.

Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Rumania and Finland were relatively small countries on which they could have taken without a risk of even being condemned. Thus that after all those aggressions the USSR was expelled from the League of Nations, but very soon the "Uncle Joe" became the most precious ally of the Democracies and in Teheran and Yalta they went as far as to abandon not only the above countries, with the possible exception of Finland, although after agreeing to some limitations of her freedom, but to add few more.

By conquering Central and Eastern Europe, with the Red Army on the Elbe river, the USSR started a new round of conquests, dragging even the United States in two major and costly wars, one not won and not lost and one lost terribly.

It was overlooked that by abandoning Central and Eastern Europe to the USSR it was in fact the making of it a superpower.

With Western Europe practically indefensible, with Japan extremely vulnerable, with the Middle East, Central American, Africa, Southeast Asia and the Pacific in turmoil, and with the Soviets having an edge in first strike nuclear weapons, the world has entered the era which is as dangerous as never before.

And, Mr. President, you may see by the Soviet behavior how much you may count on the Soviet willingness to diminish the dangers this era is carrying along with it.

The old Soviet crimes, never punished and even truly condemned, are now supplemented with the new ones. And more is to come, you may be sure, Mr. President. I as a Pole who lived for more than 42 years under the two totalitarian systems, can assure you that there is no such crimes the Soviet totalitarianism would not commit.

Moreover, you better forget that a crime would be ever admitted and much less regretted. It will be you who will be guilty for everything and it will be you who will finally get used to crime as a matter of life reality if you do not draw the proper conclusions from the lesson over the Sakhalin island.

Mr. President, I know only too well Marxism-Leninism and its main fortress the USSR. There is nothing strange about the Soviet behavior. The Soviets claim that Lenin said the future belongs to Communism. That is supposedly in total accordance with the so-called scientific socialism. And Lenin was a main "scientist" here. And what was he saying? Let me give you an example, quoted from the Lenin's "works" as edited in Moscow—telegram to L. D. Trotsky of September 10, 1918:

"In my opinion, one must not spare the city and put things off any longer, for ruthless annihilation is essential once Kazan is said to be in an iron ring" (Lenin, p. 147, Vol. 44, Moscow, 1977.)

Mr. President, Kazan was the Russian city, inhabited by Russian children, women

and the elderly. And it was to be "ruthlessly annihilated" because such was the interest of the Bolshevik Revolution opening the door to the world dominated by Communism.

And you think, Mr. President, that anybody in the Kremlin would hesitate to send the Korean, American, Japanese, Canadian, Chinese, Australian and other civilian passengers to certain death carried by the heat-seeking missile against a defenseless passenger jet if the act is to serve Communism?

Do you believe, Mr. President, that Gromyko's statement about the "sacred borders" of the USSR is a slip of tongue or that Marshal Ogarkov's warning that in the future the same murderous acts will be repeated, are only limited to the inviolability of Soviet air space?

No, not at all. The Soviets want to scare the whole humankind and to bring it to submission. By killing, not repenting and threatening even more killing, the Soviets effectively defy the human civilization.

Mr. President, the Great American nation was defied by the Soviets as never before. The Soviets deliberately test the firmness of your nation. They know only too well how short are memories of those who actually never saw the totalitarian systems function. They count very much on the fact that the good-natured Americans will soon forget the shock and will return to seeing the world through the prism of a wishful thinking. I know how the Soviets know you and how in fact they neglect you. Believe me, Mr. President, I do not want to tease you on this sad occasion. But I am only warning you—beware of the Soviets.

Mr. President, I do not suggest you any particular action. I am not the citizen of this country and I am not entitled to recommend you anything.

I have the full confidence in American free and democratic institutions and I know that there are the limits to American patience and tolerance.

But if the Polish or my own experience may help you in making up your mind, then I can tell you with all the responsibility that contrary to the past you must not allow the latest Soviet murder sink into oblivion.

You bear a great responsibility before the humankind and not only before the Great American Nation.

Once were compromised the ideals for which we the Poles went to war, because we could not surrender before the humiliating ultimatums.

Nobody more than I wanted to live somehow with the Soviets hoping that one day they would mature. And when I lost that hope a death sentence was the only response to me.

Mrs. Kathryn McDonald was right when she said that you are at war with the USSR. Not at a shooting war yet, but at the war over the ideals. If you surrender your ideals no shooting war will be necessary.

But if you don't, then be prepared for more trials like you had in the last days. I hope the Americans will stay by their ideals.

Thank you, Mr. President. ●

CENTRAL INDIANA COUNCIL ON AGING CELEBRATES 10 YEARS OF SERVICE TO OLDER AMERICANS

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Central Indiana Council on Aging is completing 10 stunningly beneficial years of service to the citizens of our community. Its services benefit not only senior citizens but in a very real sense all citizens. All good citizens feel gratitude to the council:

SENIOR LUNCHEON PROGRAM TO MARK 10TH YEAR

The Central Indiana Council on Aging's Nutrition Program will mark its 10-year anniversary Friday, October 7 at nutrition sites throughout central Indiana.

The purpose of this program, which is funded through the Older Americans Act of 1965 title IIIC money, is to provide older persons, 60 years and over, with a low-cost, nutritionally balanced meal five times a week. These meals, which are served at lunchtime throughout Marion and the seven surrounding counties, are provided to the elderly with the intent to promote better health through improved nutrition.

The Central Indiana Council on Aging is 1 of 16 area agencies on aging in Indiana. Each AAA operates their own nutrition program in their particular area. Central Indiana is known as area 8 and is operated by CICOA.

Area 8's nutrition program began in 1973 and evolved from a pilot project which was conducted by the Major's Task Force on Aging through the Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee. At that time, the program was operating about 12 sites in Indianapolis and serving around 500 meals daily. Ten years later, 45 nutrition sites have been established in Marion and the seven surrounding counties, serving daily more than 1,600 older persons at the congregate sites and providing meals for nearly 500 homebound seniors. In total, approximately 350,000 meals are served yearly.

Besides meals, nutrition sites also serve a vital purpose in providing active socialization among the elderly. Activities such as trips, card games, dances, lectures, arts and crafts aid seniors in expanding their capabilities and allows them an opportunity to dine with and socialize with persons who have similar interests and remembrances.

For the future, CICOA's nutrition program hopes to further expand the program into areas that aren't served, if federal funding continues at a good level. The program director hopes that as the elderly population increases in the coming years, funding for the nutrition program will continue to grow at the same rate.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1983, H.R. 3231

HON. ED ZSCHAU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon consider H.R. 3231, the Export Administration Act Amendments of 1983. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and a cosponsor of the bill, I have sometimes found the terminology associated with discussions about export control to be difficult to understand. With this in mind, I am submitting for the RECORD a glossary of terms that I hope will be of use to my colleagues during the debate on H.R. 3231.

The glossary follows:

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT, GLOSSARY

Some of the terminology used in discussions of U.S. export policy and the Export Administration Act may be confusing to those without a long history of involvement with the issue. This glossary is intended as a quick, though necessarily incomplete, guide for use in understanding some of the terms related to export policy.

ACEP

Advisory Committee on Export Policy. An Administration interagency group at the assistant secretary level. Chaired by the Commerce Department and including the Defense, State, Treasury, Transportation, and Energy Departments, the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Council, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Committee began meeting in 1982 to develop recommendations on the Administration policy on renewal of the Export Administration Act.

ARRAYS OF KNOW HOW (DESIGN OR MANUFACTURING)

Systematic arrangements, groups, or categories of know how. (See Militarily Critical Technologies.)

CCL

See Commodity Control List

CHINA DIFFERENTIAL

In 1981 the Reagan Administration announced a policy (the "China Differential") calling for licensing of exports to the People's Republic of China up to roughly twice the capacity and sophistication of goods that could be licensed for export to the Soviet Union. There are some exceptions such as nuclear technology.

COCOM

The Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Security Export Controls. Member countries voluntarily restrict exports to potential adversaries in order to preserve mutual security. There is no treaty or formal international obligation undergirding COCOM. Members are Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, and West Germany (Japan and all NATO countries except Iceland and Spain).

COCOM LIST

A list of items whose export is controlled by governments participating in COCOM.

September 20, 1983

The COCOM list contains 100-150 categories of items. Some of the individual items on the list require unanimous approval by all COCOM members before they can be exported to Communist countries; others simply require notification of member countries after the export has taken place.

COMECON

Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. Members are Albania, Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Vietnam. Albania has not participated since 1961, but has not withdrawn. See Communist Countries entry also.

COMMODITY CONTROL LIST

For each of the commodities subject to licensing jurisdiction of the Commerce Department, the Commodity Control List shows the licensing requirements for each destination (Country Group). Commodities are listed numerically on the CCL by Export Control Commodity Number (ECCN).

COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

The Export Administration Act states that U.S. export policy toward an individual country is not to be determined solely on the basis of that country's Communist or non-Communist status. However, the term "Communist Countries" is often used to describe the group of countries to which U.S. exports are restricted. (Country Groups P, Q, S, W, Y, and Z.)

COUNTRY GROUPS

For export control purposes, every country except Canada is administratively classified in one of the following country groups:

P—People's Republic of China.

Q—Romania.

S—Libya.

T—All Western Hemisphere countries except Cuba and Canada.

V—All other countries except Canada.

W—Hungary and Poland.

Y—U.S.S.R., Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Laos, Latvia, Lithuania, and the Mongolian People's Republic.

Z—Cuba, Kampuchea, North Korea, and Vietnam.

Canada is not included in any country group since exports to that country are normally not controlled.

EAA

Export Administration Act of 1979. Establishes authority for the U.S. Government to control exports. Administered by the Department of Commerce. A few types of exports are controlled through the use of other statutes, such as the Arms Export Control Act which governs munitions exports.

EARS

Export Administration Regulations. Based on Export Administration Act and administered by Office of Export Administration in the Department of Commerce.

EAST-WEST TRADE

Trade between the U.S. (or one of its allies) and a Communist country.

EASTERN BLOC

An informal term usually used to refer to the U.S.S.R., its Warsaw Pact allies, and other communist countries in Eastern Europe. U.S. exports are restricted to these countries.

ECCN

Export Control Commodity Number. The ECCN consists of a four-digit number and is followed by a code letter. Commodities are listed numerically on the Commodity Control List by their ECCN. The code letter is not part of the ECCN but indicates the country groups for which a Validated License is required for that particular commodity.

EMBEDDED MICROPROCESSOR

A microprocessor (chip, integrated circuit) which is built into a product to perform one or more specific operations. A microprocessor can be either reprogrammable or non-reprogrammable. The ECCN for instruments containing embedded microprocessors is 4529B.

END USE STATEMENTS

Statements by the ultimate consignee and purchaser named in an application for a Validated License certifying to certain facts relating to the proposed transaction.

EXPORT DENIAL LIST

A list of names of persons or firms which are subject to denial or probation orders of the Office of Export Administration. Any person who contravenes or violates any law, order, regulation, license or other authorization relating to export control is subject to revocation of Validated Licenses and/or general denial of export privileges.

EXTRATERRITORIALITY

For foreign policy purposes, the President may prohibit or curtail the export of any goods or technologies subject to U.S. jurisdiction or exported by any person subject to U.S. jurisdiction. Thus, in some cases, the authority can extend to products produced in a foreign country by a foreign firm which is exporting to another foreign country.

FOREIGN AVAILABILITY

Foreign availability exists when a good or technology is available to a particular destination from sources outside the U.S. in sufficient quantity and of sufficient quality so that U.S. export controls would be ineffective. (This is the definition of the term in the current Export Administration Act; other definitions have been suggested.) Foreign availability is one factor that must be considered in license decisions under the Export Administration Act.

FOREIGN POLICY CONTROLS

The Export Administration Act authorizes three types of export controls. Foreign policy controls are imposed to further significantly the foreign policy of the United States or to fulfill its declared international obligations. Foreign policy controls were used in the pipeline sanctions against the U.S.S.R. and Poland. (See also: National Security Controls and Short Supply Controls.)

FREE WORLD

An informal term used to describe the non-Communist countries of the world. (Country Groups T and V and Canada.) There are few restrictions on most exports to these countries.

ITAR

International Trade in Arms Regulations. Based on Arms Export Control Act and administered by State Department. It is the munitions counterpart to the commercial sector EARs.

KEystone EQUIPMENT

Equipment required for effective application of technical information or know-how. Generally includes manufacturing, inspection, or test equipment. (See Militarily Critical Technologies.)

tion, or test equipment. (See Militarily Critical Technologies.)

KNOW-HOW

Services, processes, procedures, specifications, design data and criteria, and testing techniques needed to achieve a significant development, production or utilization purpose. (See Militarily Critical Technologies.)

LICENSEE

The U.S. individual or firm receiving a license to export a good and/or technology.

LICENSES

The Export Administration Act permits the Secretary of Commerce to require the following types of licenses in order to control exports:

VALIDATED

Authorizes the export of commodities and/or technical data within the special limitation set forth in the license document. It is issued only upon the basis of a formal application.

QUALIFIED GENERAL

Authorizes multiple exports of commodities and/or technical data. It is issued upon the basis of a formal application and is used for exports to Eastern Bloc nations. This type of license was first authorized by the 1979 amendments to the Export Act. It has seen very little use.

GENERAL

No specific application needs to be made and no document is issued for shipments made under an established General License authorization. There are different types of General Licenses including:

G-DEST

Applicable to the export of any commodity listed on the Commodity Control List to any destination for which the list indicates a Validated License is not required.

GLV

Applicable to selected commodities but then only to shipments of limited value and to free-world destinations.

GTDA

Authorizes free dissemination of: (i) data generally available to the public; (ii) scientific and education data not significantly related to design, production or utilization of industrial processes; and (iii) patent application soon to be published in the U.S.

GTDR

Authorizes the export of certain types of technical data which may not be exported under GTDA. Both the types of data which may be exported and its destinations are limited. Written assurances against reexport are generally required.

SPECIAL LICENSES

The Secretary of Commerce may establish other types of licenses as appropriate. Some of these licenses are:

DISTRIBUTION

Authorizes exports during one year (renewable for two) of specified commodities to specified consignees in specified countries. The consignees must have been approved in advance as foreign distributors or users.

SERVICE SUPPLY

Authorizes the export of spare replacement parts. Enables firms to provide prompt service for equipment exported from the U.S.

PROJECT

Authorizes exports during one year of all commodities requiring Validated Licenses

that are needed for certain large-scale operations such as construction projects. Various conditions are attached to project licenses.

COMPREHENSIVE OPERATIONS LICENSE

This type of license does not exist at the present time but is proposed in current legislation to amend the Export Administration Act. It would govern the export of goods and technology (particularly items on the MCTL) between a domestic concern and that concern's approved foreign subsidiaries, affiliates, and consignees.

MCTL

See Militarily Critical Technologies List.

MILITARILY CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES

Technologies which are not possessed by potential adversary countries and which, if exported, would permit a significant advance in a military system of any such country. Primary emphasis is on: (i) arrays of design and manufacturing know-how; (ii) keystone manufacturing, inspection, and test equipment; and (iii) goods accompanied by sophisticated operation, application, or maintenance know-how.

MILITARILY CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES LIST

Defense Department list of militarily critical technologies. Is classified but guides decisions on export licensing. Consists of 620 to 700 technologies depending on how they are counted. Technologies on list might in future be placed under ITAR or Validated License controls.

MULTILATERAL CONTROLS

The U.S. and the other member countries of COCOM cooperatively control the export of 100-150 categories of items. The U.S. also controls some items unilaterally.

MUNITIONS

Arms, ammunition, implements of war, and the equipment and technical data related to their use, design and production.

MUNITIONS LIST

A list showing licensing requirements for the export of munitions. Maintained by the State Department under authority of the Arms Export Control Act of 1976. Similar to the Commodity Control List except that the CCL applies to commercial products.

NATIONAL SECURITY CONTROLS

The Export Administration Act authorizes three types of export controls. National security controls are imposed to restrict the export of goods and technologies which would make a significant contribution to the military potential of any other country or combination of countries which would prove detrimental to the national security of the United States. (See also: Foreign Policy Controls and Short Supply Controls.)

NATO

North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Members are Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, and West Germany.

OEA

Office of Export Administration. Located within the Department of Commerce. Has general responsibility for administering the Export Administration Act.

OPERATION EXODUS

EXODUS is a large-scale U.S. Customs enforcement program designed to stop the illegal export of strategic technology. The program began in late 1981.

PRC

People's Republic of China.

REEKPORT

The transfer of a good and/or technology of United States origin from one foreign country to another.

RELIABILITY

Reliability, along with price and quality, is one of the factors considered by some customers in choosing a supplier. Industry groups claim that changes in U.S. export policy cause U.S. firms to be perceived as unreliable suppliers by foreign customers.

REVERSE ENGINEERING

A process starting from the finished product and going backward to its design and construction methods. Products differ greatly in their susceptibility to reverse engineering.

SANCTITY OF CONTRACTS

A sanctity of contracts provision in the Export Administration Act would prohibit Foreign Policy Controls from affecting any contract entered into before the date on which such controls are imposed. There is no such provision in the Act at the present time. (Sanctity proposals authored by different Members of Congress differ in some respects.)

SHORT SUPPLY CONTROLS

The Export Administration Act authorizes three types of export controls. Short supply controls are imposed to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the serious inflationary impact of foreign demand. (See also: National Security Controls and Foreign Policy Controls.)

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The Export Administration Act provides for the formation of Technical Advisory Committees (TACs) wherever goods and/or technologies are difficult to evaluate with respect to technical matters, foreign availability, licensing procedures, or the actual utilization of production and technology. The Committees are composed of government and industry members.

TECHNICAL DATA

Technology. Information of any kind that can be used, or adapted for use, in the design, production, manufacture, utilization, or reconstruction of articles or materials. The data may take tangible form, such as a model, prototype, blueprint, or an operating manual; or they may take intangible form such as technical services.

TECHNOLOGY

The know-how, process steps, and ability to convert scientific theory into products and practice. Includes technical data.

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

The transfer of technology from one country to another. May be accomplished directly or via a third country through licenses, sales or theft of technology, turnkey plants, hardware sales or theft, joint ventures, contract bids, patents, publications, textbooks, sales brochures, visits, conferences and symposia, training and education, public policy debates, immigration, espionage, and capture of weapons. Successful transfer requires a capacity on the receiving end to work with the technology and adapt it to local conditions.

UNILATERAL CONTROLS

Export controls imposed by the U.S. but not by other countries capable of supplying the relevant good or technology. In addition

to the categories of items controlled in cooperation with COCOM, the United States also controls the export of an additional 30 categories of commercial items.

WARSAW PACT

Also known as the Warsaw Treaty Organization (WTO). Includes the U.S.S.R., Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Romania. Communist countries in East Europe which do not belong to the Warsaw Pact are Albania and Yugoslavia.

WEST-WEST TRADE

Trade between Free World countries.●

HISPANIC HERITAGE WEEK

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, our Nation just observed the annual celebration known as Hispanic Heritage Week. On this occasion we look back and look ahead at what invaluable contributions Hispanics have made to our Nation and the prospects of a far greater contribution in the future.

The demographic data compiled by the 1980 census tells us a great deal about our Nation today. Perhaps one of the most dramatic of all data has to do with the growth of the Hispanic community. In 1970, the total population of the Hispanic community was 9.1 million. By the year 1980, it rose to 14.6 million and today the level is at 15.9 million.

A further breakdown of the various Hispanic ethnic groups shows the Mexican-American population has increased by 93 percent—the Puerto Rican population by 41 percent and for those of Cuban background the increase is 47 percent. The increase for all others who fall into the Hispanic category rose by 19 percent.

My home State of New York has one of the higher concentrations of Hispanics constituting 11 percent of our population, up from 7 percent in 1970.

These numbers translate into a dramatic growth pattern for Hispanics in our Nation and in so doing the Hispanic community gains in importance in many areas of our society.

Yet there are two sides to every statistic. While it is evident that the numbers of Hispanics is increasing, it is also apparent that the quality of life is actually eroding for the Hispanic community in our Nation. Consider the fact that the poverty rate among Hispanics is a unacceptable 30 percent. The unemployment rate has almost doubled from 6 to 11 percent since 1979. The numbers are even more graphic when one considers unemployment among minority youth including Hispanic is two and even three times higher.

It seems evident to me that after 2 years of the present administration

and its economic program—the casualties it has claimed have come disproportionately from the Hispanic community. It is therefore incumbent upon any economic recovery plan that it benefit all those groups most affected by the recession. If we are to develop such a program its centerpiece must be employment. We must be aggressive in putting people back to work in this Nation especially in those communities where unemployment has been more rampant and chronic. We cannot abdicate our responsibility at the Federal level by substituting training for jobs. There are too many people in this Nation who are being trained with Federal funds for jobs which may not even exist. I propose that we adopt legislation such as H.R. 1036 which I have cosponsored and combine employment and training under one roof.

We must adopt improved policies to aid women especially those vested with the responsibilities of heads of household. In the Hispanic community this problem is far more significant. Households headed by women are at a rate of 23 percent in Hispanic families as compared to just 15 percent among the rest of our Nation's racial and ethnic groups. We must make sure that there is truly economic equity in our programs and policies for women.

We must improve our educational system and make it more responsive to the changing demographics of this Nation. While the number of Hispanics attending college has increased in the past decade we still must improve the quality of education at the elementary and secondary school level to combat underachievements in math and science.

On this occasion we salute those from the Hispanic community who have enhanced our Nation through their work. Whether the profession be medicine or music—sports or government—we find constant leadership among men and women of Hispanic heritage. This will only increase in the future and as a nation we should be proud of the growth in size and stature of the Hispanic community. These are Americans who have a proud heritage but who have goals to make our Nation better.●

RABBI ARTHUR CHIEL

HON. BRUCE A. MORRISON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the greater New Haven area mourns the death of Rabbi Arthur Chiel, a spiritual leader of the largest conservative synagogue in southern Connecticut and a distinguished community leader. Over 2,000

men, women, and children of all backgrounds participated in the farewell tribute to Rabbi Chiel at his synagogue, an event which I found very moving.

Our hearts go out to the Congregation B'nai Jacob in Woodbridge, who had to celebrate the Jewish high holy days this year—Rosh Hashonah and Yom Kippur—without its rabbi of 20 years. Rabbi Chiel always encouraged lay leadership of this congregation, and supported and approved a woman as its president. He leaves as his legacy a congregation that is involved, committed, and flourishing.

Dr. Chiel was a man of enormous spiritual, social, and intellectual commitment. He served as a founding member of the New Haven Commission on Equal Opportunities during the turbulent 1960's and developed strong and productive associations with minority residents. In 1978, Dr. Chiel was honored by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and received the Torch of Liberty Award for his distinguished contributions in furthering intergroup relations in the community.

He was a scholar of both American colonial and New Haven Jewish history. He served as a fellow of Ezra Stiles, one of Yale University's undergraduate colleges, and was a guest lecturer at the Yale Divinity School and at Fairfield University. Just this May, Dr. Chiel was honored as the keynote speaker at the rededication of the Touro Synagogue in Newport, R.I. His community lectures on local Jewish history have always been very well attended, and his weekly column in the Jewish Ledger was so widely read that it was eventually released for wider circulation.

But more than this, Rabbi Arthur Chiel loved and was loved by many. Those with whom I spoke at the funeral felt that they had lost not just a spiritual and community leader but also a personal friend. He was an extraordinary person, and I feel privileged to have known and to have been with him on several occasions this past year. The Third Congressional District has lost a powerful and dynamic man. I offer my sincerest condolences to his widow, Kenneret, and to their four children.●

INTRODUCTION OF THE HOME-OWNER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1983

HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, the unusually heavy winter rains this year created many pressing problems for residents of my congres-

sional district, as well as throughout the State of California. Floodwaters destroyed crops, made thousands of acres of cropland unworkable, and made life difficult for thousands of the San Joaquin Valley's residents.

One unfortunate side effect of the heavy rains was the delay it caused in the construction of hundreds of homes that would otherwise have been completed. These delays hurt the builders, the construction workers, and the prospective buyers of these homes. Especially hard hit by the winter rains will be those people participating in the Department of Housing and Urban Development's section 235 housing assistance program.

The section 235 program provides a helping hand to those families who could not afford to own their own homes without Federal assistance. Unfortunately, the Reagan administration has targeted the section 235 program for expiration at the end of 1983 fiscal year, September 30. This action by the administration would deny almost 200 families in the San Joaquin Valley the Federal assistance that had been promised them, and that they are depending on to help them buy their first home. HUD estimates that somewhere between 12,000 and 14,000 families nationwide face similar circumstances.

Because of rain-induced delays, the homes which these families would have moved into by now are as yet unfinished. However, because the 1983 funding which would assist them with purchasing these homes expires on September 30, the Government will renege on its promise to assist them in buying a home. The Reagan administration has refused to recognize the commitment it has made to these families, and administration officials continue to insist that any savings from the program at year's end be returned to the Federal budget.

Today, I am introducing legislation to correct this injustice. H.R. 3934, the Homeowner Assistance Act of 1983, will extend the authorization of the HUD section 235 program for 1 year. This extension will allow those families across the country who have been victimized by unforeseen construction delays to receive the mortgage assistance that the Federal Government has promised them.

I would like to urge my colleagues to support the extension of this worthwhile program so that we can honor the commitment we have made to assist these families in purchasing their homes.●

HEARINGS ON KAL 007

HON. DENNY SMITH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity on September 16 to take part in the hearings conducted by the Republican Study Committee on the downing of Korean Air Lines flight No. 007. One of the witnesses at these most effective hearings was the distinguished scholar and former intelligence official, Dr. Ray S. Cline, of the Center for Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown University. Dr. Cline, a recognized authority on strategic matters, especially in view of his experience as an official of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Department of State, made a distinct contribution to the content of the hearing.

I am having Dr. Cline's statement reprinted for the edification of my colleagues:

MASSACRE OF 269 PASSENGERS ON KOREAN AIRLINER 007

I appreciate the opportunity to testify on the tragic destruction of Korean Airliner 007 by Soviet missile fire over the Sea of Japan. It is very real to me because I was in Seoul that night waiting for Congressman Larry McDonald and several other members of the United States Congress to arrive for a Conference on Security in Northeast Asia, where he was to speak on the morning of 1 September, about eight hours after his untimely death on 007.

Needless to say, the sad incident made our words meaningful at the subsequent sessions of the conference, which had been convened under the sponsorship of the Asiatic Research Center, Korea University, to commemorate the Thirtieth anniversary of the signing of the United States-Korean Defense Treaty, one of the main strategic strong points in support of American interests in the Northwest Pacific and Northeast Asia.

A South Korean airliner, a KAL Boeing 747, with 269 civilian passengers en route from New York to Seoul was shot down near the Soviet island of Sakhalin by a heat-seeking missile fired by a Soviet jet fighter, (Sukhoi) Su-15, in the early morning of September 1, 1983. Among the passengers were 61 Americans, including Congressman Lawrence P. McDonald (Democrat of Georgia).

The regularly scheduled passenger aircraft had strayed off course and passed through Soviet airspace over Kamchatka Peninsula and then over Sakhalin Island. The Korean pilot, apparently unaware of any navigational error, reported to Tokyo at 0323 Korean time that he was proceeding on the planned flight pattern northeast of Hokkaido, Japan.

After more than two hours of radar tracking of this aircraft and a near approach to it by a Soviet jet fighter from Sakhalin, Soviet authorities gave instructions to fire a missile at the Korean plane as it was approaching the Sea of Japan. The Soviet pilot reported at 0326 Korean time, according to intercepted voice transmissions, "The target

is destroyed. I am breaking off attack." Obviously, everyone aboard was killed in the plane's plunge to the sea.

At the European Security Conference in Madrid on September 7, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, insinuating that the South Korean airliner was on a preplanned intelligence mission, warned that any future violations of Soviet "sacred borders" would receive the full brunt of Soviet retaliation.

On September 9 Marshal Nikolai V. Ogarkov, Chief of the Soviet General staff, in an unprecedented Moscow press conference, charged the entire flight pattern was the result of a U.S. intelligence "special mission" and that the destruction of the aircraft was fully justified. He said, "Termination of the flight . . . was not an error," and confirmed that, "In the general staff we were all informed."

The most devastating comment at the press conference came from Deputy Foreign Minister Georgi Kornienko, indicating no admission of error and suggesting a similar incident in the future would be dealt with in the same way. He said, "Protection of the sacred inviolable borders of our country and our political system [is] worth to us, as you know very well, many, many million lives."

This statement implies that military response at the expense of civilian lives in the case of a single civilian aircraft is as justifiable as repelling Hitler's invasion of Russian territory in World War II. It reveals a narrow rigidity of thinking and a truculence in foreign relations that bodes ill for the several complex arms limitation negotiations as well as other international agreements under discussion between Washington and Moscow.

About the only solace to be drawn from the Korean airliner tragedy is that Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the United States, as well as some of the other American allies, drew noticeably closer together in handling the diplomatic crisis. There appears for now at least a new readiness in Japan under the leadership of Prime Minister Nakasone to face up to the harsh facts of the menacing Soviet military buildup of armed forces in the Pacific Northwest region, where they threaten normal lanes of air and sea communication along the Kuriles linking Japan and the United States. The vital strategic value of the Pacific offshore and littoral triangle of Japan, Taiwan, and the Korean Peninsula facing the narrow sea-passage choke-points of the East China, Japan, and Okhotsk seas was illuminated by the stubborn Soviet military hard line in justifying its shooting down of the Korean airliner. The Soviet leaders, in both words and actions, are resolutely defying world opinion to claim their right to act in the same way in the future, come what may.

President Reagan condemned the "Korean airline massacre" as the kind of violence citizens in the West find hard to believe. "I speak for all Americans and for people everywhere who cherish civilized values," he said. "Words can scarcely express our revulsion at this horrifying act of violence." Foreign Minister Gromyko and General Staff Chief Ogarkov have put the Soviet Union on record as rejecting these American values and defending such acts of violence.

I would like to make two quick final comments:

The Soviet lie about American responsibility for the tragedy, arguing that KAL 007 was on an "intelligence mission", is ridiculous. There is nothing a civilian airliner could observe in that part of the world that

could not much more effectively be learned from U.S. satellite sensors or from U.S. peripheral military reconnaissance flights over international waters.

The KAL airliner was on an innocent civilian, regularly scheduled commercial flight, and it is criminal for the Soviet Union to have massacred its 269 passengers on any pretext whatsoever. There is no excuse for such barbarity. We should never forget this callousness. The voting in the United Nations Security Council on a very mild resolution deploring the loss of KAL 007 shows an extraordinary clash of moral values. One group of nations reflected real concern for the lives of individual human beings. The contrast was stark in comparison with totalitarian values of nations insisting on the absolute priority of defense of the political and military power of the state. The United States vigorously sought support for the resolution stating the Security Council "deeply deplores the destruction of the Korean airliner" and that "such use of armed force against international civil aviation is incompatible with the norms governing international behavior and elementary considerations of humanity." Eight nations joined in voting for the resolution, Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Jordan, Zaire, Togo, and Malta. Poland voted against the resolution, and the Soviet Union predictably vetoed it. Shockingly, the People's Republic of China, Guyana, Nicaragua, and Zimbabwe abstained. The conflict of cultures thus relected is seldom seen so clearly as in this vote of the nine versus the two nays and the four abstentions. ●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN ANSON FORD

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, on September 29 of this year Los Angeles' most distinguished citizen, John Anson Ford, will celebrate his 100th birthday. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize a lifetime of achievements by this extraordinary individual.

John Anson Ford served on the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors for 24 years. During his service, he established a reputation for honesty, integrity, and genuine concern that was reflected in all operations and activities of the board. The projects he supported, his proudest accomplishments, all bear witness to his keen sensitivity for the needs and feelings of his fellow human beings.

In addition to his overriding concern for the rights of others, particularly the poor, the sick, and the elderly, John Anson Ford worked in a number of ways for the betterment of the human condition. He was particularly interested in the enhancement of the arts, in the preservation of the cultures unique to Los Angeles, and in the development of industry. Among his many achievements he can number the revitalization of the Hollywood Bowl, and the restoration of the Los Angeles Plaza where the history of our

great city began. Thanks in large part to his efforts, Olvera Street has been changed from a dusty old alley into a cultural and historical treasure.

These achievements were of great benefit to the community as a whole, but John Anson Ford never lost sight of his concern for the individuals who make up that community. He established the department of senior citizens' affairs almost 40 years before the Congress of the United States established a committee to address the problems of the elderly population of this Nation. He also worked for those at the other end of the age spectrum, establishing the first toy loan program in the county and working to improve postnatal care.

As he carried out all his responsibilities, as he spent his considerable energies on many important projects, John Anson Ford saw to it that Los Angeles County's great institutions operated with due regard for human rights and the dignity of others. During his years of service, there was definite improvement in the operation and treatment of persons at the general hospital, juvenile hall and health departments throughout the county.

It is difficult to sum up an entire century of achievement and dedication. However, the common thread of concern for others that runs through the career of John Anson Ford makes it clear that he has been a true and successful champion of human rights and dignity. We in the House of Representatives wish him a very happy birthday and express to him our gratitude for his unflagging efforts to improve the human conditions. ●

INABEL B. LINDSAY: 1900-83

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the field of aging has suffered a serious loss because of the death of Inabel B. Lindsay, who was nationally and internationally known in gerontology and social work.

Dr. Lindsay was respected by her colleagues and friends as a top flight professional and gracious individual.

She held numerous positions in the field of aging, serving as a board member for the National Caucus and Center on Black Aged and the National Council on the Aging, a consultant for the Senate Committee on Aging, a member of the National Advisory Committee for the 1971 White House Conference on Aging, and a member of the President's Task Force on Aging.

Dr. Lindsay served with distinction and conviction in all these capacities. In addition, she wrote extensively on aging-related subjects. Her working

paper for the Senate Committee on Aging on the "Multiple Hazards of Age and Race" was considered one of the foremost authoritative studies on the economic situation of aged blacks.

In 1945, Dr. Lindsay became the first dean of the School of Social Work at Howard University. Because of her leadership and dedication, it became one of the most respected schools of social work in the Nation.

Dr. Lindsay received numerous awards and honorary degrees throughout her illustrious career, including:

Howard University's Distinguished Post-Graduate Award in 1961;

A Distinguished Alumna Award from the University of Pittsburgh School of Social Work in 1970;

The Alumni Medal by the School of Social Service Administration from the University of Chicago in 1974;

Social Worker of the Year Award from the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers in 1974; and

An Honorary Degree of Doctor of Humane Letters from Howard University in 1982.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to her family and relatives.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a brief description of her life and accomplishments:

INABEL BURNS LINDSAY: 1900-83, DEAN EMERITA, SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK, HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Inabel Burns Lindsay was born in St. Joseph, Missouri, and became nationally and internationally known through her contributions in social welfare services and social work education.

She received a Bachelor of Arts degree (*cum laude*) from Howard University in 1920 and then entered the New York School of Social Work with an Urban League Fellowship earned on a nationwide competitive basis. She received a Master of Arts in Social Work from the University of Chicago, and the Doctor of Social Work from the University of Pittsburgh.

Before joining the faculty of Social Work at Howard University in 1937, Dr. Lindsay served as a public schoolteacher in Kansas City, Missouri; for a number of years she worked as a social worker in St. Louis, where she attained the position of public welfare administrator. She held the rank of assistant professor and then acting director of the Division of Social Work in Howard's Graduate School. In 1945, she became the first dean of Howard's newly established School of Social Work. Under her leadership it became one of the outstanding social work schools in the nation and was early utilized by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the training of United Nations fellows and in the training of foreign scholars.

When Dr. Lindsay retired in 1967 she remained actively involved in current issues in social work, making numerous contributions through writings, speeches, and participation in professional proceedings. In addition, she served as Social Services Advisor to the Assistant Secretary for Community and Field Services, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from October 1967 to April 1970; Lecturer, School of Social Work, University of Maryland; Lecturer, School of

Social Service, the National Catholic University of America; and as consultant for the National Urban League in 1969.

In addition to the policy and educational implications of her doctoral dissertation, "The Participation of Negroes in the Establishment of Welfare Services, 1865-1900, with Special Reference to the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia," Dr. Lindsay wrote and consulted extensively on international social welfare issues. Among her publications is the 1959 article "Adapting American Social Work Education to the Needs of African Students." She had similar concerns for social work education in the Caribbean, the Middle East and other parts of the world.

Dr. Lindsay's professional participation, with emphasis on aging, included the National Council on Aging, National Advisory Committee for the White House Conference on Aging, the President's Task Force on Aging, and Special Consultant for the Special Committee on Aging of the U.S. Senate, where she prepared a Working Paper on "Multiple Hazards of Age and Race." Her memberships included: Chairman, Committee on Social Welfare, National Urban League; Board of Directors, Edwin Gould Foundation and Edwin Gould Services to Children; Lois and Samuel Silberman Fund, Grant Committee, among others.

In 1961, Dr. Lindsay received Howard University's Distinguished Post-Graduate Award; in 1970 she was honored by the University of Pittsburgh School of Social Work with a Distinguished Alumna Award, and in 1974 she was awarded the Alumni Medal by the School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago. Also in 1974, she was named "Social Worker of the Year" by Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers. In 1982, Howard University bestowed upon Dr. Lindsay the Honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters, which she regarded as a fitting climax to an educational and service career that began with her entering Howard University in 1916 at the age of sixteen.

Dr. Lindsay will always be remembered as a distinguished professor, administrator, and pioneer in the development of social welfare in the Americas and around the world.●

NOW, TELL THE TRUTH: WHAT DOES OCS MEAN?

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD today an excellent article written by Mr. David C. Russell who is the Acting Director of the Minerals Management Service of the Department of Interior.

In this article, Mr. Russell accurately portrays the overwhelming need for an orderly and systematic development of our vast energy resources on the Outer Continental Shelf.

While Americans may no longer find themselves waiting in gas lines, our energy problems are far from being over and I believe we must move forward in an environmentally safe

manner to lease, explore, develop, and produce these vital OCS resources.

I would highly recommend that every Member of this legislative body review this insightful article closely and join with me in opposing any attempt to restrict or prohibit activity on the Outer Continental Shelf.

The text of the article follows:

NOW, TELL THE TRUTH: WHAT'S OCS MEAN?

(By David Russell)

Most Americans know as much about the Department of the Interior's offshore oil and gas leasing program as they know about Chad. Yet, when it comes to energy, the program is probably America's most important.

Now, tell the truth; did you know that our Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) may contain over one-half of this nation's future petroleum production—worth over \$2 trillion at today's prices? Or that the oil could replace 25 years' worth of imports at 1982 rates, and the offshore natural gas could heat 23 million homes for 50 years?

After the recess, Congress will again be asked to amend the Interior Department's appropriations bill to include language to prohibit leasing off certain coastal areas. If successful, this action would undermine the offshore leasing program and balkanize the U.S. into separate and competing energy-producing and consuming states. This language, already passed by the House, represents parochial excisions, a misuse of the appropriations process, and an attempt to relitigate arguments rejected by the Courts June 9 in *California vs. Watt*. It would allow regions which can find vocal sponsors in Congress to avoid their responsibility to make a contribution to America's energy needs.

This is a disturbing trend. Obviously, if every member of Congress from a coastal district were to say, "Sorry, not off my beaches," that would be the end of offshore leasing and production. If inland states were to take the same attitude toward coal, oil shale, oil and gas, we could write off our nation's future.

Offshore oil resources provide significant energy without the need for government subsidies. In fact, offshore oil and gas development could generate billions of dollars, provide jobs and ensure increased supplies of domestic energy.

Recent lease offerings underscore this potential: \$2.1 billion for drilling rights in Alaska's Diapir Field, in September 1982; a record \$3.4 billion at the May 1983 Central Gulf of Mexico offering; and \$1.4 billion for Western Gulf of Mexico tracts offered just a few weeks ago. Since Secretary Watt took office, the offshore leasing program has generated nearly \$8.5 billion in lease bonuses alone. Leases have been issued for a little over 2,000 tracts covering about 11 million acres.

Recent discoveries indicate that many of these tracts will be very productive. In fact, a record bid for a single lease in the Santa Maria Basin off California was followed less than 18 months later by the discovery of what could be a billion-barrel oil field—the biggest discovery in North America since Prudhoe Bay. Discoveries like these make all the lawsuits, criticisms and delays well worth the hassle.

Previous administrations pursued policies which leased only 22 million acres—2.5 percent of the OCS—in 26 years, compared to 123 million acres leased by Canada. Those

policies were largely responsible for the disastrous 34 percent decline in offshore oil production between 1970 and 1980.

The new program is intended to reverse this decline and respond to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, which requires "expeditious and orderly" exploration and development, to reduce dependency on foreign sources and ensure stable and adequate supplies of reasonably priced energy when the leases come into production in the next decade.

This act also requires "an equitable sharing of developmental benefits and environmental risks among the various regions" of the United States. Prior to Secretary Watt's program, however, nearly 85 percent of the federal leasing and drilling had been in the Gulf of Mexico.

America cannot keep its energy resources in limbo until use; long exploration and production lead times dictate that, if we want energy tomorrow, we must issue our leases today. Nor can we base energy policies on parochial special interests masquerading as moral principles.

Clearly the most vocal opposition comes from the groups that have a long tradition of opposing even the timid leasing programs of previous administrations. Ironically, vocal criticism is also coming from regions which have the most consumers, use the most energy, and have complained the loudest about high energy prices, past shortages and high unemployment. They seem to be under the false impression that it is a choice between offshore development and other uses of the ocean.

From the day a lease is issued to the day the first oil or gas is pipelined to consumers can take up to 10 years. It is essential, then, that the federal government begin to promote an orderly inventory of these resources. Of course the law and sound public policy dictate that any program balance these needs for energy with the need to protect the human, marine and coastal environments. *California vs. Watt* held that the Secretary's five-year offshore leasing program achieves this proper balance and assures the receipt of fair market value. It will not lease the entire Outer Continental Shelf. It will merely consider broad regions of the OCS for possible leasing.

Environmental and other values are protected throughout the exploration, development and production process. The risks are kept at a minimum through the use of modern technology, tough regulations, and constant vigilance. To date, over \$320 million has been spent on environmental and socioeconomic studies which cover every stage of the offshore leasing, drilling and production process. In addition, each OCS facility is inspected by the Minerals Management Service on both a scheduled and an unscheduled basis.

The Santa Barbara spill of 1969 is the only blowout in the course of drilling 30,000 U.S. offshore wells which resulted in a significant amount of oil reaching shore. According to marine biologists it caused no lasting ecological damage. Following the spill, the Interior Department implemented new regulations, and since then we have produced more than four billion barrels of oil from the Outer Continental Shelf, while losing a total of only 791 barrels due to blowouts.

Of all the oil pollution resulting from tankers, natural seeps and offshore operations in the past 12 years, only 3 percent came from oil and gas operations; of these, 85 percent came from tankers, and 12 per-

cent from natural oil seeps. America's rivers dump more oil into our oceans every year—from roads, driveways and other sources—than do tankers, natural seeps and OCS operations combined.

Of approximately 4,000 wells that have been drilled off the California coast since 1894, nearly 3,300 have been in state waters—under leases and permits issued by the state. From 1975 to 1982, while some vigorously protested drilling in federal waters off the California coast, the State of California issued 575 drilling permits in state waters much closer to shore.

Because fair market value has become almost an incantation against the supposed evils of leasing, misinformation and emotional statements concerning it have been widely disseminated. It is time to set the record straight.

Fair market value means getting a fair or reasonable price, as determined in a marketplace, assuring the receipt of fair market value does not mean assuring the highest possible bonus bid. A leasing policy based on maximizing bonuses would cast the U.S. in the role of a classic energy monopolist, manipulating supplies and prices at the expense of the consumer. It would stand in diametric opposition to the goals of the OCS Lands Act.

The bonus paid to get a lease reflects the experts' estimate of the value of the rights and opportunities conveyed by the lease, to explore, develop, produce and sell whatever resources might be present in a particular tract. It does not represent fair market value of the resources.

Annual rents of \$3 per acre must also be paid, until there is production on the lease. The government keeps these bonus and rental payments, even if no oil or gas is found. If resources are found and produced (something that happens on less than 2 percent of all leases) federal law requires that the lessee pay royalties—customarily set at 16.7 percent—and taxes on the profits. The fair market values of the resources must therefore, be viewed as the sum of the bonus, rent, royalty and tax payments received by the government over the life of the lease.

The lease bonus is expected to account for only 30 percent of all future offshore leasing revenues. The other 70 percent is expected to come from rents, royalties and taxes collected after a lease is issued. Obviously, if we limit the amount available for lease, in an effort to increase bonuses a little, we give up or delay these other revenues.

Neither a centralized government planning office nor a single energy firm should make all the decisions about which tracts have the highest potential and should be offered for lease. What makes the offshore leasing programs—and the American economy—work is the opportunity it gives individual companies to take risks, test their theories and prove that they were right (and their competitors wrong) about where to look. Each of them will have a different opinion about how much will be found in a particular tract, what it will cost to develop and transport the energy, and what oil prices will be when the resources are actually produced.

No one has a corner on this knowledge. One tract in the May 1983 Gulf of Mexico lease offering went for \$92 million. The next highest bid was less than \$1 million. Other companies did not bid at all, because they viewed the tract as unpromising. This is not uncommon. Obviously there are very

divergent views about what a tract's value is, and only drilling will ultimately determine who is right about its potential. But even the most optimistic companies get what they pay for—a chance to test their exploration theories—and for that they pay fair market value in the form of a lease bonus.

The coming together of these different viewpoints determines the fair market value of a tract. If the government determines that the high bid assures the receipt of fair market value, it accepts the bid and issues the lease. If not, the bid is rejected.

The oil companies invest billions of dollars just to get these leases. They cannot afford to sit on them, so will spend billions more to evaluate and get them into production. These expenditures have already begun to generate jobs for Americans, increase U.S. oil and gas supplies and help keep prices stable.

Lower energy prices and adequate supplies—far from being undesirable, on the grounds that they depress bonus bids—should be a primary goal of any leasing program. Indeed, it is hard to understand why critics of the program talk as if there were something wrong with leasing to keep prices and supplies at a reasonable level.

Among America's greatest attributes are its sense of equity and fair play, combined with a collective wisdom that, sooner or later, cuts through the fears, misconceptions and rhetoric. Given the facts, Americans generally make the right choices. Let us hope that the offshore leasing program will not prove an exception.

The leasing program deserves the support of all Americans—in the Congress, media, courts and general public. It must not fall victim to parochial interests, unsupported emotional charges, and the rhetoric of politicians. ●

DOWN FROM THE MOUNT

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring the following op-ed piece from the August 12, 1983, Wall Street Journal, to the attention of my colleagues.

The recently completed Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches provides cause for alarm.

DOWN FROM THE MOUNT

The World Council of Churches has just descended from a mountain in Vancouver with a stone tablet saying that the focus of evil in the world today is the United States.

The U.S. is trying to "contain the aspirations of Central American people," the council said at its just completed Sixth Assembly. It accused the Reagan administration of trying to "destabilize the Nicaraguan government, renew international support for Guatemala's violent military regimes, resist the forces of historic change in El Salvador and militarize Honduras."

The assembly opposed "any type of military intervention by the United States, covert or overt, or by any other government." It didn't see fit, however, to name any other names.

Indeed, the assembly rejected a proposal calling for an immediate Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan, in favor of a resolution allowing Russian troops to remain in Afghanistan until an "overall political settlement" is reached, i.e., when the freedom fighters are crushed. Just to make sure, American delegates at the assembly voted with their Soviet and East bloc counterparts for a call for a cutoff of arms supplies to Afghan freedom fighters.

Moreover, the council refused to hear two appeals from Christians in Russia begging for a "helping hand to the persecuted faithful." One letter was circulated from the Christian Committee for the Defense of Believers' Rights in the U.S.S.R. accusing Soviet authorities of "implementing a policy of genocide against believers." It said that 33 Christian believers are currently in prison, labor camps or special psychiatric institutions and that 20,000 others are seeking to emigrate so they can practice their faith. The letter also charged authorities with harsh discrimination in jobs, education and housing.

Deacon Vladimir Rusak of Moscow also wrote to the council asking for help against religious persecution. He said he has been prevented from writing a history of the Russian Orthodox Church after the 1917 revolution by the church's own hierarchy and the KGB, which confiscated his archives in January. "I believe in the Lord, I love my church, feel concern for her future and wish to serve her—but not by a compromise of conscience, that price which is exacted from our church leadership and which I am being urged to pay," he said.

The council didn't take up the appeals because that would have intervened in the "internal situation" of a member of the WCC, of which the Russian church is a part, said WCC executive Ninan Koshy. The appeals recall a similar letter sent to the previous WCC assembly, in 1975 in Nairobi, by Father Gleb Yakunin of the Russian Orthodox Church, who accused Moscow of persecuting Christians. After sending the letter, Father Yakunin was convicted of "anti-state activities" and is now serving a five-year sentence in a Soviet labor camp.

All of this may come as a surprise to many of the approximately 500 million members of the more than 300 Protestant, Orthodox, Anglican and independent churches represented at the World Council. But it shouldn't. The council has long supported many of the same leftist revolutionary causes aided and abetted by the Kremlin and its proxies. There have even been charges that offerings from collection plates have been handed over by the council to guerrillas, possibly for arms purchases. An exposé on the WCC and the U.S. National Council of Churches earlier this year by CBS's "60 Minutes" concluded that "whether it is by design or mischance or deliberate manipulation from outside the churches, church money and the churches themselves are found to be supporting highly political movements."

The World Council is supported by the mainline U.S. Protestant denominations. After its Vancouver revelations, it would seem to us, its supporters have some explaining to do. A good time to start would be with Sunday's sermons.●

REAGAN: MOVING BACKWARDS ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, for years I have been pointing out that limited English proficient students have been humiliated and penalized for using their native language in school; they have been left to sink or swim in classrooms with teachers who cannot communicate and texts which are unintelligible.

The Supreme Court, in *Lau against Nichols* was very clear in observing:

We know that those who do not understand English are certain to find their classroom experience wholly incomprehensible and in no way meaningful.

The Court also noted that to impose English as a requirement before a child has acquired basic skills in the language, is to make a mockery of public education.

The following letter to the editor of the *New York Times* points out these truths and emphasizes that if the Reagan initiative becomes law, it is predictable that too many who could have succeeded if taught bilingually will fall by the wayside.

The material follows:

[From the *New York Times*, Sept. 20, 1983]

ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION, REAGAN IS MOVING BACKWARD

To the Editor:

Your enthusiastic editorial support [Sept. 13] of the Administration's legislative proposals on bilingual education puzzles us. On other civil rights issues, you have been swift to label the Reagan freedom-of-choice approach as a meretricious gambit that in fact heralds a retreat from this nation's historic commitments.

Bilingual education has been declared a matter of equal opportunity by Congress. To allow localities to choose whether to afford an equal opportunity to language minorities is effectively to wipe that congressional policy declaration off the books.

As private legal practitioners who collectively have spent more than a dozen years litigating bilingual education cases throughout the country, we admit to a point of view but believe we have gained some fundamental insights.

Local option is fine where demographics and political realities permit educational decisions to be made on educational grounds. But that is not the case everywhere, e.g., where Spanish-speaking people are considered a growing, particularly threatening part of a community in which teaching jobs are scarce. Wisely, Federal law does not mandate that children in such areas languish educationally because of considerations having nothing to do with their abilities.

Likewise, a sink-or-swim philosophy (represented by so-called "immersion" programs) is always praised by those who managed to stay afloat. But many do not, and Federal law wisely mandates that those who would otherwise sink must be given alternatives for learning. And the virtue of bilin-

gual education, as numerous studies have shown, is that it works educationally for some children for whom other, more traditional approaches do not work.

What is the defect in today's statutes that the proposed law would remedy? "[I]t would stop requiring that youngsters be taught in their native tongue," according to the editorial. But there is no such requirement that all language minority children who lack proficiency in English be taught bilingually. School districts are free to use other pedagogic methods if they can demonstrate that these are equally effective. Furthermore, parents can opt not to put their children into bilingual programs if they so desire. That, in our view, allows meaningful local freedom of choice.

Unfortunately, what the Reagan Administration has in mind is turning the clock back a decade to a time, before Congress and the Supreme Court spoke, when many school districts, exercising their prized and unfettered discretion, chose to do nothing for children who lacked English-language proficiency. Many school districts in those days decided, under the freedom-of-choice rubric, simply to maintain the status quo in terms of school personnel and budgets.

Sad to say, we fear that once again there will be districts where bilingual education will not be offered to any students. How does that increase students' or parents' freedom to choose an appropriate education?

If the Reagan initiative becomes law, it is predictable that some, perhaps many students who could have blossomed if taught bilingually will fall by the wayside. Your callousness about that inevitable outcome troubles us.●

A TRIBUTE TO DR. ROBERT E. "BOB" WEINTRAUB

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I report the death last Monday, September 19, 1983, of Robert E. Weintraub, senior economist with the Joint Economic Committee, and for many years, the leading expert on monetary policy on Capitol Hill.

Bob was a distinguished professional in his own right. He was, as all know, the firmest advocate of monetarist economic principles, and a man who pursued his convictions with clarity, determination, and force. He was a major figure in alerting Congress to the importance of monetary policy oversight into the careful, regular reviews that are conducted today. Moreover, he was a force on other issues in his long career, from the financial rehabilitation of New York City, to the reform of banking regulation, to foreign exchange rate policy, to the international debt crisis.

Bob worked with both parties and in both Houses. Among members and past members of our Joint Economic Committee, Senator PROXMIRE, former chairman Reuss, John Roussetot, and

current chairman JEPSEN all had the pleasure at one time or another of employing Bob and benefiting from his wisdom, judgment, and indefatigable energy. He has many other friends in this body as well, where he served for years on the staff of the Committee on Banking.

All who knew Bob recognized in him a man who took public life and public service seriously. He loved the Congress, and maintained his faith in our willingness to learn, our ability to do good, and in our mandate, as the people's representatives, to exercise the powers with which we have been vested. There are not many men of Bob's age and talents—he was 58—who would devote their professional lives, as he did, to helping us with our tasks. For Bob, this was an evident joy.

I know I join with many others, including Bob's friends in Congress and on the staff, in recording my deep sorrow at his death, and my sympathy for his wife, Sue, and their children, and for the rest of his family.●

DR. KARL-HEINZ MADER

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 23, 1983, the management and employees of Schott Glass Technologies, Inc., will be honoring a very special man, Dr. Karl-Heinz Mader who is currently their vice president in charge of research and development.

Unable to attend this gathering due to a long-term commitment, I would like to take this opportunity to ask Congress to join me along with Dr. Mader's many friends and colleagues in expressing our deep appreciation and gratitude for his many contributions both to the scientific industry and his community.

Dr. Mader is solely responsible for Schott Optical Glass, Inc.'s development of laser glass for the U.S. Department of Energy's laser fusion experiments. During his stay at the Duryea based firm, Dr. Mader has been responsible for the supervision of research and development activities related to the U.S. market, expanded customer technical service capabilities and improvement of Schott Optical's scientific market capabilities. He has headed up the DOE laser program, including the production of BK-7, an extremely high quality glass which is also used in the Energy Department's fusion system. The DOE experiments are currently being carried out at Lawrence Livermore Laboratories outside of San Francisco, Calif.

A native of Pyritz, Pomerania, in which is now East Germany, Dr.

Mader first joined Schott Optical's German parent company, the Schott Group in 1969. He served as a senior scientist with the group's Deutsche Spezialglas AG subsidiary.

Recognized worldwide for his scientific contributions, Dr. Mader holds a master of science degree from Humboldt University in Berlin and a doctorate in natural science/physical chemistry from the University of Hamburg. Dr. Mader has published numerous articles in scientific journals.

Dr. Mader will be returning to Germany this fall to continue his research. Although we deeply regret losing such a valuable individual, we take this opportunity to wish him and his family good health and good fortune.●

UNITED STATES STRIVES FOR
MORE EQUITABLE DEFENSE
SHARING ARRANGEMENT
WITH JAPAN

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a House concurrent resolution on the defense burden sharing efforts of the United States and Japan. This resolution states that it is the sense of the Congress that Japan should increase its defense expenditures to insure a more equitable defense burden sharing arrangement with the United States than presently exists. The defense of Japan and the western Pacific region has been a vital part of the U.S. defense posture since World War II. The United States has contributed a significant portion of its defense expenditures for the protection of this area.

Times have changed since the adoption of our immediate post-war policy seeking a "completely disarmed and demilitarized" Japan. Unfortunately, Japan's military expenditures have not risen accordingly. American attitudes toward Japan's defense spending began changing in the Nixon years. The implication of the Nixon Doctrine, for example, was that Japan would have to assume more of the burden of securing Western interests in Asia. However, neither the Nixon administration nor the Ford administration made Japanese defense efforts a central focus of U.S. policy. The Carter administration, in its initial plans, included a continuation of the reduction of the United States presence in Asia and a reduction of the cost of supporting U.S. forces in Japan. After the events in Afghanistan and Iran, the Carter administration began putting even more pressure on the Japanese to increase defense

spending. The Carter administration had hoped that the pressure would result in at least a 9.7 percent increase in the fiscal year 1981 defense budget, but it resulted in only a 7.6-percent increase. (Japan's defense expenditures have increased on the average of 7 percent per year in real terms over the last decade.)

We all know that defense spending is a very sensitive political topic in Japan, and that Japanese leaders create a good deal of grief for themselves by mentioning the possibility of increasing defense expenditures. While I believe that the United States should not meddle in the political affairs of other countries, I do believe that it is quite reasonable for the United States to encourage Japan, at the minimum, to implement the modest defense spending goals it has set for itself. Japan has not realized the goals in its second 5-year plan (fiscal year 1983—fiscal year 1987). In the first year of the plan (fiscal year 1983), Japan ended up with a 5-percent increase in real terms, which is inadequate if Japan's defense goals are to be met. For fiscal year 1984, Prime Minister Nakasone announced a defense spending ceiling of 6.9 percent, although officials of the Japanese Defense Agency sought an 8.9-percent increase, and stated that Japan must increase defense spending by 7-9 percent over the coming years in order to meet the goals of the 5-year defense plan.

With Japan's trade surplus with the United States increasing each year, it is time for the Congress to send Japan a signal that we must develop a more equitable defense burden sharing arrangement. In 1982, Japan's trade surplus with the United States hit \$16.8 billion, in 1983 it is expected to reach \$22 billion, and analysts are predicting that in 1984 the trade surplus will hit \$27 billion. Meanwhile, we are not seeing much change in Japan's defense spending levels. Even with an historical perspective on the causes for Japan's low defense spending and the internal Japanese political problems associated with increasing defense expenditures, it seems wise, in these times, to express the sense of the Congress that Japan should increase its defense expenditures to insure a more equitable defense burden sharing arrangement with the United States than presently exists. This is precisely what my resolution does.

The resolution follows:

Whereas, the defense of Japan and the Western Pacific has been a vital part of the defense posture of the United States since World War II;

Whereas, the United States, since World War II, has had a significant portion of its defense expenditures consumed in the defense of Japan and the Western Pacific region;

Whereas, Japan is the number one economic partner and ally of the United States in the Western Pacific region;

Whereas, Japan is a major economic power in the non-Communist world;

Whereas, Japan's trade surplus with the United States is expected to hit a record high in 1983;

Whereas, military spending accounts for 6.6 percent of the gross national product of the United States, and below 1 percent of the gross national product of Japan;

Whereas, Japan has pledged to strengthen its military capabilities in order to develop a self-defense capability to enable Japan to defend the home islands in conjunction with the United States;

Whereas, Japan adopted its second five-year defense plan for the years 1983-1987 with specific goals for increasing Japanese defense capabilities;

Whereas, the Japanese defense budget for the first year of the five-year plan was inadequate to meet the initial procurement goals set in the plan;

Whereas, officials of the Japanese Defense Agency sought an 8.9 percent increase in real terms for the second year of the five-year plan, but received only a 6.9 percent ceiling;

Whereas, officials of the Japanese Defense Agency have stated that Japan must increase defense spending by 7 to 9 percent in real terms, over the coming years, in order to meet the goals of the five-year defense plan on schedule; and

Whereas, it is the policy of the United States to encourage Japan to make steady and significant progress in its self-defense capabilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that Japan should increase its defense expenditures to ensure a more equitable defense burden sharing arrangement with the United States than presently exists.

SEC. 2. The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President with the request that the President transmit such copy to the Prime Minister of Japan and to the Japanese Diet. ●

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, last week, Senator STROM THURMOND received an honorary degree from Voorhees College in South Carolina. In his remarks, he addressed the subject of Martin Luther King, Jr. Day and discussed the need for legislation to deal with the rising costs of the Federal holiday system. As President pro tempore of the Senate and as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator THURMOND's concern should be translated into congressional action. Based on sincere efforts to deal with the cost factor, I wrote to President Reagan urging him to sign the legislation creating Martin Luther King, Jr. Day. The text of the letter, which I would like to share with my colleagues, follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 20, 1983.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing concerning congressional efforts to establish Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, a new national holiday to honor the Civil Rights movement. As you know, the House passed this legislation last month and the Senate is expected to follow suit in the near future.

The vote on Martin Luther King, Jr. Day was a difficult one for me. On the one hand, I share with most Americans respect and admiration for those who have worked so hard to advance the cause of Civil Rights. Indeed, I believe it is entirely appropriate to recognize the gains of Black Americans and other minorities through a day of commemoration and I have strongly and consistently supported the concept of creating a Sunday holiday.

On the other hand, however, I am deeply concerned about the cost of a new Federal holiday and the signal we would be sending if we shut down the productive machinery of this country for another day at a time when our economy is beginning to come around and productivity is on the rise.

On balance, I had to reject the spending priority embodied in H.R. 3706 and I voted against the bill. It was a tough call.

Now, however, it is my understanding that some congressional leaders are exploring options that would allow us to reduce the cost of the Federal holiday system. One possibility would be to require each Federal employee to work on one holiday of his or her choice, thereby allowing the government to remain in operation on most holidays. Surely there are reasonable approaches that would allow us to streamline and reduce the cost of the Federal holiday system. I should point out that no options of this kind were considered in the House. Indeed, they could not have been because of the strict rule under which this legislation was brought up.

Mr. President, given the fact that cost-cutting options are being seriously considered, I would urge you to sign the legislation creating Martin Luther King, Jr. Day. Based on sincere efforts to deal with the cost, should I have the opportunity through a conference report, I will now support this legislation. The Civil Rights movement has contributed much to the goal of human understanding and respect for all, which is basic to the American dream. This holiday will, in fact, appropriately honor the accomplishments and goals of the Civil Rights movement itself.

Respectfully,

CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.,
Member of Congress. ●

RESPONSE TO "DEAR ABBY" COLUMN ABOUT SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have as have most of my colleagues, received hundreds of letters during the last few weeks from constituents who are concerned about a "Dear Abby" column printed on September 5, 1983,

which refers to an alleged inequity in the social security retirement affecting those beneficiaries born between 1917 and 1921.

The facts in the column are not entirely accurate, and I have received several official but lengthy explanations about the situation. The best discussion I have seen to date, however, is in an article by Janet Reinka, a reporter for the Peninsula Times Tribune, a newspaper in my district. The article appeared in the September 16, 1983, edition of the paper, and I would like to share it with you.

"DEAR ABBY" HAS TO BACKTRACK ON COLUMN ABOUT SOCIAL SECURITY

(By Janet Reinka)

Say it ain't so: Abigail Van Buren, who writes the widely read "Dear Abby" advice column, was wrong.

In a column to appear in subscriber newspapers on Sept. 26, Abby will have to backtrack a bit on a letter she published recently alerting some Social Security recipients that they were being shortchanged on their benefits.

"Notch-Year Baby," as the letter was signed, invited Abby's fans who were born between the years 1917 and 1921 to write their congressmen to get "corrective" legislation passed so their benefits would be "restored."

The trouble was that Notch-Year Baby had it, if anything, backwards because recipients born during those years actually are getting a break over those born after 1921.

But, incredible as Abby faithful will find it, Notch-Year Baby's letter was followed up by a postscript from Abby herself, telling readers she had checked his information and he was right.

Readers apparently did just what Notch-Year Baby suggested and have swamped congressional and Social Security Administration offices with calls and letters.

To some congressional aides, Notch-Year Baby's name is mud.

"I didn't keep a count of how many people wrote and called," said Bob Woldow, a staff assistant in the Sunnyvale office of U.S. Rep. Ed Zschau, R-Los Altos. "Many people clipped the article and sent it in. I'd say at least three-fourths of the letters for the next few days after the letter appeared were about it."

Woldow said the trouble is that most people who read "Dear Abby" believe her.

"Even if she does write a retraction, by then nationwide millions of people have written to their congressmen."

Abby's editor at Universal Press Syndicate obviously was sick of hearing about Notch-Year Baby, too.

"We've heard from lots of Social Security offices and 20 congressmen," editor Alan McDermott said. "*** Abby's trying to provide some amplification. I know she won't want to talk to you. Abby will respond in the column."

The column is to include at least part of a "Dear Abby" letter from the Social Security Administration, which was written in rebuttal to the first one, plus whatever Abby herself has to say about the whole affair. Whether it will be an outright retraction or just an explanation remains a mystery.

In his letter, Notch-Year Baby drew readers' attention to the "fact" that people drawing Social Security who were born

during the five-year "notch" were being "unjustly penalized by receiving lower benefits than those born prior to and after the above-mentioned years."

"For example," he said, "if you worked until you were 65 before starting to draw Social Security, you are receiving about \$100 less in your monthly check than those born before 1917 and after 1921."

Notch-Year Baby said a bill to correct the "unfair situation" had died in committee but he urged readers to write their congressmen to get them to introduce a new bill.

In fact, the discrepancy Notch-Year Baby was describing arose because of a batch of changes that were made in 1977 as part of former President Carter's attempt to control the ballooning costs of the retirement system.

What got the publicity at the time were the tax increases Congress passed to "save" the system. Overlooking in the fine print were provisions to gradually scale back future benefits.

Because of a 1972 change in the benefit formula, recipients were, in effect, receiving benefits that were double-indexed for wages and inflation. In some cases, according to the Social Security Administration, retirees actually were receiving more in benefits than they did when they were working because of the inflation bonus that was being figured into the formula.

To keep from bankrupting the system, Congress "corrected" the formula to eliminate the inflation bonus, according to Hal Foss, San Mateo District manager for the Social Security Administration. (The formula is further complicated because benefits depend on how long a recipient worked and when he retired.)

Many people born during the five-year notch were nearing retirement and had been counting on the higher benefits. So, for them, Congress approved a two-tiered formula. Those recipients get less money than retirees born before 1917 but more than those born after the notch.

The reduction in future benefits amounts to up to 25 percent for those born after 1916, Foss said, but, because of the two-tiered formula, the full impact falls on those born after 1921. Notch-year babies who have held off retiring retain the right to the old formula computation. When they retire, they will automatically get the highest amount they are entitled to under either the new or the old formula, Foss said.

"There was an incredibly multiplying effect," Foss said of the old formula. "It's more of a windfall for the (notch-year and older) folks who the government refused to roll back."

One unintended result of Notch-Year Baby's letter was that it has belatedly called attention to Congress' sleight of hand in reducing benefits in 1977. The change was made deftly, compared to the senior citizen revolt President Reagan stirred up when he openly talked about cutting benefits.

Social Security recipients who have found out about the benefit reduction usually stumbled upon it by accident. Foss said, for example, that two neighbors in his San Mateo District were comparing checks and found that one was receiving \$120 more a month than the other. They came down to the office and learned that the notch-year legislation was responsible.

"There was no real resolution of the problem because one was getting less than the other," Foss said. "But at least they knew why."

Foss said people should not feel cheated because of the scaling-back of benefits between 1977 and 1983.

"It's not that they are being treated unfairly," he said. "It's just that the other people (born before 1917) are being treated more than fairly."

Editor McDermott said he had issued an advisory to subscriber newspapers that Abby's response was scheduled for Sept. 26, but they can run it earlier.

Zschau's aide, Woldow, said most constituents who called to ask about the letter were satisfied with his explanation.

"When you explain it, they have said, 'I thought there must have been something wrong with it (the letter) if no one had noticed it in six years,'" Woldow said.

He would like an answer to something Abby herself may not know:

"I shouldn't speculate," Woldow said, "but I wonder who Notch-Year Baby was?"

SIXTH DISTRICT OF ALABAMA RESPONDS ON THE ISSUES

HON. BEN ERDREICH

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, this summer I sent to my constituents in the Sixth District of Alabama a questionnaire on some of the major problems and issues facing our Nation.

I am very appreciative of the many citizens in my district who returned their questionnaires. Their views are of great value and guidance to me, and I wanted to share with my colleagues the sentiments of the 7,776 Alabamians who answered my questionnaire.

The questions included in the questionnaire and response percentages follow:

CONGRESSMAN BEN ERDREICH'S CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

	Percentage		Total number of respondents
	Yes	No	
BUDGET AND ECONOMY			
With the fiscal year 1982 budget deficit of \$110.5 billion, the fiscal 1983 deficit of \$207.7 billion, and the administration proposing a deficit of \$188 billion for fiscal year 1984, to cut these staggering Federal deficits, would you favor:			
1. Across-the-board cuts in Federal Government spending.....	71	29	7,518
2. Cuts in defense spending.....	40	60	7,572
3. Cuts in domestic programs.....	74	26	7,533
4. A combination of restraint on Federal spending and revenue increases.....	78	22	7,456
5. Cuts in Medicare by improved controls on health care providers.....	79	21	7,622
6. Cuts in Medicare by reducing services provided to beneficiaries.....	27	73	7,521
7. President Reagan's proposal to impose a standby income tax surcharge and tax on oil in fiscal year 1986 should the deficit exceed 2½ percent of the gross national product.....	48	52	7,189
8. A constitutional amendment mandating a balanced Federal budget.....	72	28	7,488
To achieve economic recovery do you favor:			
9. Tight money policies by the Federal Reserve Board to reduce inflation.....	74	26	7,313
10. Measures to stop the dumping of subsidized imports on the U.S. market.....	80	20	7,524
11. The creation of a U.S. Department of Trade.....	33	67	7,215
12. Reducing paperwork and government regulations on U.S. business and industry.....	83	17	7,571

CONGRESSMAN BEN ERDREICH'S CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE—Continued

	Percentage		Total number of respondents
	Yes	No	
DEFENSE			
Do you favor defense policies which would:			
13. Appropriate funds for the MX missile.....	70	30	7,332
14. Fund the purchase of the B-1 bomber.....	67	33	7,240
15. Provide military assistance in El Salvador.....	54	46	7,307
16. Support covert activities to overthrow the Sandinista government of Nicaragua.....	50	50	7,149
17. Send peacekeeping troops to Lebanon.....	44	56	7,313
18. Freeze at current levels the number of nuclear weapons each nation can build or store.....	53	47	7,324
19. Reduce the number of nuclear weapons each nation can build or store.....	70	30	7,338
20. Pursue arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union to bring about mutual and verifiable reductions.....	87	13	7,572
NATIONAL ISSUES			
Do you favor:			
21. Laws to limit abortions to cases where rape or incest are involved or where a physician has determined that the life or health of the mother is in danger.....	48	52	7,538
22. Prohibiting Federal funding of abortions under the Medicaid program and Federal employee insurance programs.....	61	39	7,610
23. A Constitutional amendment banning abortions and prohibiting them in all circumstances.....	15	85	7,553
24. Congress allowing the states to vote on ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment.....	52	48	7,478
25. Flat rate income tax proposals that would eliminate mortgage interest, medical and charitable deductions.....	44	56	7,421
26. Emergency basic medical care or medical insurance for unemployed workers and their families.....	65	35	7,473
27. Stricter immigration laws including penalties for employers of illegal aliens.....	90	10	7,618
28. A Constitutional amendment to allow a moment of silent prayer in our public schools.....	71	29	7,595
29. Tuition tax credits to aid parents whose children attend private schools.....	56	44	7,633
30. Federal programs to provide increased funding of basic education programs in the public schools.....	50	50	7,582
31. Abolishing the Department of Education.....	54	46	7,354
32. Merit pay for exceptional public school teachers.....	70	30	7,535

¹ The total number of respondents on each question varies, and is less than the 7,776 total received, because a small number of those answering did not respond to all of the questions.

JIM HARPER

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to have entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this tribute to a great public servant, recently deceased, who served as administrative assistant to my good friend and colleague, Congressman LOUIS STOKES. His name was Jim Harper.

Jim Harper should be remembered for his courageous spirit, competence, and dedication as a public servant. Throughout the suffering of his last years, he overcame the discomforts of his chronic illness and projected his friendly, soft-spoken countenance to all who came his way. As dean of the congressional black caucus administrative assistants, his counsel was always readily available, freely offered, and very helpful. An inveterate practical joker and purveyor of humor, he was a

joy to all who knew him. This uncomplaining, dedicated civil servant should have his obituary entered for its inspirational value of a life lived well, with much meaning.

OBITUARY

James Curtis Harper was born and reared in Cleveland. Even though he spent the last 12 years of his life in the Nation's Capital, his heart, his thoughts and his energies never left the city of his birth. He worked tirelessly as the Administrative Aide to Congressman Louis Stokes, D-21 of Warrensville Hts., to better the lives of the people of Cleveland.

Mr. Harper died Friday, August 26, 1983 at his home in Silver Spring, Maryland surrounded by his wife of 31 years and his children. Even though Mr. Harper's health had been precarious for some time, due to a hypertensive condition, he continued to function in his professional capacity until the day before his death. Mr. Harper would have been 58 on August 28th.

James C. Harper was an erudite, soft-spoken man who will be remembered, in part, for his integrity, his dedication to his ideals, and his devotion to his wife and his children.

He was graduated from Western Reserve University with a double major in psychology and sociology. During his years at WRU James became a member of the Kappa Alpha Psi fraternity. Mr. Harper continued his education through graduate programs at WRU as well as Rutgers University.

From 1953 to 1954, Mr. Harper was a social worker at the Warrensville Workhouse. Ten years later, after a stint as county probation officer, Mr. Harper went back to the workhouse as assistant superintendent.

When the superintendent of the city prison resigned unexpectedly in 1966, Mr. Harper was appointed to the position. During his three years on the job, he developed a program permitting prisoners to leave the grounds for regular jobs during the day. Mr. Harper once said he regarded the program as just one in a campaign to change the workhouse from a place of detention to a place of rehabilitation.

In 1969 James Harper became the Commissioner of Manpower Development in Cleveland. While in this position Mr. Harper developed and implemented myriad programs to facilitate and encourage job-training programs. A year later he became the first Executive director of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council. In that capacity he coordinated the distribution of federal and state funds to various criminal justice programs in Cuyahoga County.

In 1971 Mr. Harper left the CJCC to become the Administrative Aide to Congressman Louis Stokes in Washington, D.C. He remained in this position and lived in Silver Spring, Md., until his death.

James Curtis Harper is survived by his wife, Barbara, sons, James C. Harper II of New Orleans and Malcolm J. L. of Cleveland; daughters, Sandra L. and Kimberly A., both of Silver Spring, Md.; his mother Evelyn and sisters, Mrs. Dorris M. Hill of Shaker Heights, and Mrs. Mildred M. Pollard of Cleveland.

TRUE HAPPINESS

Happy are those who reject the advice of evil men,
who do not follow the example of sinners
or join those who have no use for God.

Instead, they find joy in obeying the Law of the Lord, and they study it day and night.

They are like trees that grow beside a stream, that bear fruit at the right time, and whose leaves do not dry up. They succeed in everything they do.—Book 1 (Psalms 1-3)●

SPIRALING POPULATION
CRIPPLES AFRICA

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, this is the second in a series of six recently published articles on sub-Saharan Africa written by Nicholas D. Kristof, a Rhodes scholar from Yamhill, Ore.

[From the Oregonian, May 24, 1982]

SPIRALING POPULATION CRIPPLES AFRICA

(By Nicholas D. Kristof)

COTONOU, Benin.—Little Boka is a bright-eyed 9-year-old girl who plays and begs in the dust near the Hotel Babo. One of eight children, she is a victim of the size of her family: The numbers mean less money to go around, less food, less clothing and less space in the hut.

But Boka, herself perhaps only a few years from motherhood, shyly explained that she wanted eight more children for herself. And so one more baby factory will soon begin production, consigning more offspring to a thinner sliver of the economic pie.

Dizzying population growth is a primary reason for and result of poverty in Africa. Modest increases in the national income and food production are overtaken by surges in population, so that the amount of income and food per person is stagnant or falls.

Population in Africa is growing faster than anywhere else in the world—and the growth rate is accelerating. Annual population growth in the 1960s was 2.5 percent; in the 1970s, 2.7 percent; and the World Bank predicts that for the next 20 years, the population will grow by 3 percent per year. At that rate, the population will double every 24 years.

The snowball effect is dramatic. In Boka's homeland, poverty-stricken Benin, 4 million people eke out an existence in a country less than half the size of Oregon. The World Bank projects that when the population stops growing in the year 2110, Benin's population will be 16 million. Even that figure could be low.

Thomas Malthus' grim predictions of population growth outstripping food production are coming true in Africa. In the 1960s, the volume of agricultural production rose by an average of 2.3 percent per year, and in the 1970s, by 1.3 percent per year. But both figures were behind the rates of population growth, so Africa now produces less food per person than it did 20 years ago.

Furthermore, natural resources such as timber and oil are being increasingly swallowed up for domestic consumption, eroding the countries' limited export base. Nigeria has abandoned its agriculture and has come to depend on oil exports for survival. But the Nigerian population, now about 90 million, is shooting upward so quickly that by the year 2000 all its oil may be needed for

domestic consumption—a formula for unimaginable disaster.

The cities are bearing the brunt of the new oceans of people. As everywhere in the developing world, people are fleeing the villages for the dazzling lights of the cities—only to sleep in the streets and slums. Urban populations are soaring by 6 percent per year in Africa, or 8.5 percent in 35 large capitals. At that rate, the population doubles every nine years.

The cities cannot absorb the influx, so the people live in the vast shantytowns of Lagos, Dakar, Cotonou and other cities. Pressed together amid the stench and filth, the streets their only toilets, they do anything to survive. Many become entrepreneurs, selling fruit, cigarettes, their own sisters.

The reason for the population boom is simple: Improved health care slashed death rates while birth rates remained constant or fell only slightly. For example, in Liberia, one of the fastest growing countries in the world, the birth rate dropped 4 percent from 1960 to 1979, but in the same period the mortality rate fell 33 percent. Now in Liberia, 48 babies are born each year per 1,000 people, while only 14 die.

The impulse in the West is to call for birth control strategies, but the obstacle is that parents frequently want very large families. When African women are surveyed and asked how many children they want, the national averages range from 5 to 10. And that is how many they get; the current average in Africa is 6.6 live births per woman.

Why do they want so many children? The answers often are quite rational. In societies without social security or pension plans, children are the parents' only guarantee that they will be cared for in old age. Sometimes, the parents believe the children will be able to bring in extra money, by hawking fruits or cigarettes.

Where disease or injury can strike anyone anytime, a child is the only insurance available. In Mali, river blindness is widespread, afflicting 10 percent of the population in some areas. The victims who have no children sit all day, all night, on the street, hands outstretched. The victims with children at least have a child to lead them to places where they can beg, buy food, escape from storms or simply relieve themselves.

So parents want a few children as insurance. But to get a few children, they must have many children because of high infant mortality and child mortality rates. In some rural areas, half the children die before the age of 5. Moreover, sons are much better insurance than daughters, so the parents really want a few sons. But this is an expensive insurance policy, exhausting for the mother and debilitating for the country.

Eventually, this mad roller-coaster ride will grind to a halt, for with urbanization and development comes a tempering of the desire for large families. Education is one brake: Schooling delays the point when a child becomes a benefit rather than a burden to the family, and studies also show that educated women have markedly fewer children than uneducated women. Some countries in Africa already are enjoying declines in population growth, and birth control programs can help significantly at this stage.

The World Bank predicts that between 2075 and 2140, all African countries for which data is available will reach zero population growth. But the stationary populations reached by then are daunting: 450 mil-

lion for Nigeria (compared to 90 million now); 109 million for Kenya (16 million now); 42 million for Zimbabwe (7 million now). Tiny Gambia will swarm with 3 million inhabitants (600,000 now), Zaire will rise from 28 million to 139 million.

This is the population bomb. It detonates not with a bang but with the whimpers of millions of newborn, hungry children. Defusing it is perhaps Africa's greatest challenge. ●

LEBANON—LET'S LOOK BEFORE WE LEAP

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration, having dropped U.S. marines into the Lebanon quagmire, now wants Congress to ratify the action and sign a blank check for future commitments. Yet, curiously, the administration does not want to concede that Congress has any right to participate in the decisionmaking as to the terms and conditions of present or future troop commitments there.

This might not be so bad if the administration had presented a definitive statement as to the policy it is pursuing in Lebanon, how the marines' presence there fits into the picture, how many personnel will ultimately be needed, what it will cost and how long it will take. But neither the Congress nor the American people have been given any such statement. One may be forgiven for wondering whether the administration itself has any clear policy or has any answers to these questions.

In any event, before Congress takes any action that would give its blessing to the continuation of U.S. Armed Forces in Lebanon, Congress should insist upon at least the following:

First, an acknowledgment by the administration that the War Powers Act was triggered when the marines became the objects of hostile fire in later August or early September.

Second, an explanation by the administration in precise and full detail as to the policy reasons for a continuing U.S. military presence in Lebanon.

Third, not only a policy but one that appears to have some chance of achieving a political solution that will restore peace and stability to Lebanon within a reasonable time.

Of course, the proposed policy itself should be thoroughly aired and tested in an informed debate in both Houses of Congress before any final military commitment is made. Some of the factors to be taken into account have already been brought out in the lively debate that has developed in the news media. For example, the Washington Post of September 4 contained an excellent article by L. Dean Brown, who

was President Ford's special envoy to Lebanon. Mr. Brown points out that the American and other units of the multinational force are close to being regarded as allies of the central government under domination of the Maronite Christian Phalangist Party and its private militia. The trouble with that is that the Maronites are a minority in Lebanon and the Moslems fear a state dominated by them. As Mr. Brown points out:

Constant American repetition of a policy toward Lebanon of territorial integrity, independence and creation of a strong central government—without ever a word about political reforms or the need to recreate a national consensus based on power sharing—amplified the fears.

Brown goes on to outline the kind of change that is needed in American policy if it is to have any chance of success in Lebanon:

American policy toward Lebanon needs a dramatic change. It cannot rely on the premise that the Soviet Union and Syria are somehow behind all the troubles, that Syrian and Israeli withdrawal will somehow bring peace or that a Phalange-dominated government can prevent a renewed outbreak of guerrilla and urban war.

Instead of relying solely on President Gemayel, the United States should turn its energies toward the creation of a new national consensus. Once again—how often does it have to be said?—the United States needs to support widely shared aspirations rather than personalities.

In another excellent article, printed in the Akron Beacon Journal of September 16, the New York Times writer Anthony Lewis states the question in even stronger terms:

In this political tangle then, what is the mission of the Marines? Are they to be one more American military force dispatched without political understanding and diplomatic will, so that they become sitting ducks?

Or are the Marines really there to support the Gemayel government right or wrong, as the Reagan administration has seemed to be signaling lately? If so, that is folly built on ignorance. It will not impress the Syrians, or our partners in the multinational force. A policy without the political determination to move toward a more inclusive Lebanese system is a recipe for disaster: for Lebanon and the United States.

These comments give added force to the editorial in the Akron Beacon Journal of September 17, which points out that:

Unless Americans aims in the mess are clearer than they seem so far to much of the public and many in the Congress, we might be only stepping deeper into a quagmire without any clear notion of how we plan to pull ourselves out of it.

Today's Washington Post carries a story that a compromise has been worked out between the Senate leadership and the White House and that it is hoped that Speaker O'NEILL will agree. That is all very well, but the White House and the leadership ought to understand that an issue of this importance is not going to be resolved by

a backroom deal. The Congress and the American people are entitled to a clear, detailed justification for continued American military presence in Lebanon. Failing that, the Marines should be withdrawn.

The complete text of the articles and editorial referred to follow these remarks:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 4, 1983]

SAVING LEBANON

(By L. Dean Brown)

Since Lebanon's independence in 1943, its dream has been a carefully balanced coalition held together by a presumption of equal treatment for all religious communities. The fragile network of understanding has been shattered in the past, then patched up, and then shattered again.

Unfortunately, it is again on the path to disintegration. In 1958, American Marines and an astute political operator, the late ambassador Robert Murphy, were able to facilitate the patching process. Today, American Marines may be watching, or even participating in, a collapse.

What has happened? Malik Salam, a respected Moslem leader, says the Lebanese parliament elected Amin Gemayel as president of Lebanon, but it did not elect the Maronite Phalangist party and its private militia to take over power in the country.

Walid Jumblatt, leader of the Druze, believes there was a political deal with the Phalange before the Lebanese army went into Christian East Beirut, the Phalange's home territory, earlier this year. He insists he will not let that army into the mountainous Chouf area—where Druze have lived for centuries—until there is a far-reaching political understanding with the central government.

The type of understanding he and many Sunni and Shia Moslem leaders—seek is not clear; little is clear in Lebanon. It increasingly appears to be a demand for change in the political structure of the country that would permit a greater sharing of power. "Greater sharing" could lead to a denunciation of the decades-old unwritten National Covenant, which gives the powerful presidency, army command and parliamentary control to Maronites, or it could be the creation of a government of reconciliation to include leaders like Saeb Salaam, a respected Sunni, Nabih Berri of Amal, which is the Shia fighting force, and Druze leader Jumblatt.

In a powerful end-of-Ramadan address this summer, the leading Sunni religious figure, addressing tens of thousands of Moslems in the Sports Arena, said there can be no usurpation of power by one armed group, that political power must be shared through a revision of the National Covenant and that all private militias—not just some—have to be disbanded.

It is this last point that has precipitated the present crisis. On Aug. 16 Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Arens flew to Beirut where he met, first, with Sheik Pierre Gemayel, head of the Phalange political party and, second, with Fadi Frem, the commander of the Phalange militia. The minister said later he had urged "political accommodation between the Christian and Druze communities."

In Beirut, however, the meeting was viewed differently. Non-Maronite Christians and Moslems alike saw it as a blessing of the Phalange forces. It exacerbated their fear

that Amin Gemayel was not a president committed to protect all religious communities but the captive of the Phalange militia that had already flexed its muscles in Beirut, the Chouf and the south.

From fighting over turf in the Chouf between Maronite and Druze forces the conflict has spread to Beirut, involving not just Druze and their new enemy, the Lebanese army, but others. The Shia militia, Amal, is heavily armed and is driven by the demand for "social justice" that we saw in the struggle against the shah in Iran. It has entered the fray. So have the long-dormant Murabitoun, a leftist and originally pro-Nasser force.

Fighting now is as complicated and as difficult to understand as it was in 1976. The chief difference is that the PLO is not involved and that the multinational force can become the accidental—or perhaps, if fighting rages uncontrolled—the planned target. We are not yet at the latter stage. Much of the fighting is a form of political bargaining. The Druze and Moslem groups are saying: "We too have arms and power. If you refused to hear our pleas in former times of peace, we'll make them louder today with guns." This sort of political bargaining can quickly degenerate into chaos.

This is where the United States comes in. Washington talks of sending in more troops or pulling them out. But it's not that simple. It is obvious that the nature of the game has changed. From unloaded rifles when they arrived a year ago, the Marines have moved to exchanging fire—often with unknown opponents. The hope that the presence of a multinational force would calm the situation and then lead to popular support of a strong central government whose army would control and disarm the multiple militias is gone. Instead, American, French, Italian and British troops are close to being regarded as allies of a central government under Phalange domination. This is a dangerous situation.

It was indeed former Israeli defense minister Ariel Sharon's desire to see a Maronite-dominated government in power, a government that could sign a peace treaty with Israel even if it meant cutting off Lebanon from the Arab world. Many Lebanese Moslems, who saw themselves no longer as unequal partners in a national consensus but as doomed to subservience in a one-party state, viewed American policy as supporting the Sharon line. Constant American repetition of a policy toward Lebanon of territorial integrity, independence and creation of a strong central government without ever a word about political reforms or the need to recreate a national consensus based on power sharing amplified the fears.

American policy toward Lebanon needs a dramatic change. It cannot rely on the premise that the Soviet Union and Syria are somehow behind all the troubles, that Syrian and Israeli withdrawal will somehow bring peace or that a Phalange-dominated government can prevent a renewed outbreak of guerrilla and urban warfare.

Instead of relying solely on President Gemayel, the United States should turn its energies toward the creation of a new national consensus. Once again—how often does it have to be said?—the United States needs to support widely shared aspirations rather than personalities.

In June 1982 Henry Kissinger wrote in *The Post* that the Israeli invasion of Lebanon "opens up extraordinary opportunities for dynamic American diplomacy in the Middle East." How pretentious that all

seems today. How necessary it is to deal with the perverse realities.

[From the Akron Beacon Journal, Sept. 16, 1983]

A PROPER LEBANESE SYSTEM CANNOT EXCLUDE FACTIONS

(By Anthony Lewis)

BOSTON.—A Lebanese Moslem who prospered in the construction business, Rafiq Hariri, launched a charitable project near his home town of Sidon: a \$300 million hospital and college. Last spring Phalangist Christian militiamen visited the site. At gunpoint they took bulldozers, tractors, trucks and other equipment. Phalangist leaders made clear that Hariri was suspect because of his religion and his business activities in Saudi Arabia.

Hariri stopped construction. He appealed to President Amin Gemayel, whose family runs the Phalange. But last month the Washington Post reported that most of the stolen equipment was still missing and the project stopped.

That small incident—small by the bloody standards of contemporary Lebanon—makes a point that Americans ought to understand as our military commitment in Lebanon deepens. It is that many elements in the Lebanese mosaic have legitimate fears about the way things are going under the Gemayel government: not just the Druze who are fighting now, but Sunni and Shia Moslems and some Christians.

In recent days, the White House has been sparring with congressional leaders about constitutional issues in the deployment of Marines in Lebanon. They are in substantial agreement now on a resolution authorizing the President to keep forces there for an extended period. The remaining question is whether President Reagan will accept language that recognizes Congress' authority in this area.

All that is very interesting to constitutional scholars, and important in the endless contest of power between our executive and legislature. But it has little to do with the problem in Lebanon. That is a political problem: the failure of the Gemayel government to build the national Lebanese consensus needed to govern a country divided by tribe and sect.

The real question about the Marines, in short, is what diplomatic and political strategy they are supposed to be supporting. The answer to that question is not clear. If the Reagan administration has an idea on how to piece together even a limpingly viable Lebanese policy, it is keeping the concept a secret. It has worked for a ceasefire, but does it have any longer-run political vision?

Gemayel took office with a lot of good will going for him. He won the support of some of the grand old feudal leaders of Lebanon. Americans who care about the once beautiful country were rooting for him.

But today no realist can fail to see that much of the early hope for Gemayel has dissipated. Authoritative reports from Lebanon agree that a fundamental reason is the feeling of other communities that he has run, or at least tolerated, an excessively sectarian government.

Consider the situation in the Shouf Mountains, the region near Beirut that has been the scene of the recent heavy fighting. That is the heartland of the Lebanese Druze. Scattered among them are villages of Christian Maronites, mostly followers of Camille Chamoun, a Maronite warlord and former president of the country.

After the Israeli invasion last year the Phalangist militia, the private army of the Gemayel branch of the Maronites, moved 2,000 soldiers into the Chouf. The Druze are insistent that they must leave; Chamoun's Maronite followers also reportedly want them to go, feeling life would be more peaceful if it returned to the old way of local arrangements. But the Gemayel government, unwilling or unable to move the Phalangists out, proposed to send in on top of them a national army that the Druze distrust. Tension was inevitable.

Beyond the obscure hatreds of the Chouf, there are widespread feelings among the Moslem majority in Lebanon that its people are not getting a fair shake from the Gemayel government. Some bureaucratic jobs and ambassadorial posts that in the past had gone to them have now been given to Christians.

Gemayel may well have the best of intentions and simply lacked the power to carry them out. His degree of influence over the Phalange is uncertain. But in any event an internal solution, as a Western diplomat in Lebanon said the other day, will have to involve "the Phalange reducing its demands and tolerating more equal treatment for the Moslem segments of the community."

In this political tangle then, what is the mission of the Marines? Are they to be one more American military force dispatched without political understanding and diplomatic will, so that they become sitting ducks?

Or are the Marines really there to support the Gemayel government right or wrong, as the Reagan administration has seemed to be signaling lately? If so, that is folly built on ignorance. It will not impress the Syrians, or our partners in the multinational force. A policy without the political determination to move toward a more inclusive Lebanese system is a recipe for disaster: for Lebanon and the United States.

[From the Akron Beacon Journal, Sept. 17, 1983]

U.S. AIMS IN LEBANON NEED TO BE MADE CLEARER

The reason for this week's change in the orders to U.S. forces in and off Lebanon, it is reported, was that Secretary of State George Shultz—and then President Reagan—agreed with Mideast envoy Robert McFarlane's view that it will improve chances for a cease-fire and the start of a political rather than military resolution of Lebanon's problems.

Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger and the chiefs of staff, it is further reported, disagreed—but they lost the debate.

If it works, that's great. If it doesn't, unless American aims in the mess are clearer than they seem so far to much of the public and many in the Congress, we might be only stepping deeper into a quagmire without any clear notion of how we plan to pull ourselves out of it.

The change is a considerable lengthening of the leash on those on the scene in freedom action.

It not only allows the Marine contingent onshore to call for U.S. air and naval artillery support when it is deemed needed for self-protection, but allows extension of that "umbrella" to other contingents of the multinational peacekeeping forces there and even to the Lebanese army under specified circumstances.

The order authorizes not only shooting back when shot at, but possible pre-emptive

strikes where they are judged necessary to protect the sheltered forces.

And where earlier any decision to use this kind of force had to be cleared through Washington, the naval task-force commander there will be free to make up his mind on the spot—shortening reaction time.

This, the Shultz-McFarlane school reasons, may cause Syrian-backed Druse forces to rethink the wisdom of continuing their foray toward Beirut, substantially changing their "cost-benefit" calculations.

That, in turn, could encourage a cease-fire and the start of an exchange of ideas rather than shells.

The change is a clear, if limited, strengthening of U.S. support for the struggling government of President Amin Gemayel; but that, after all, was a main point of the putting U.S. and other peacekeeping forces there.

Few in the Congress seem eager to demur—even among those arguing most strongly that under the War Powers Act congressional approval and advice should now be brought into play.

There appears to be a near-unanimity that it would be unwise to withdraw the U.S. forces involved, and this seems a logical extension: If they have to be there, they should somehow be made more effective.

But even Howard Baker, Mr. Reagan's team leader in the Senate, is underscoring a need for clarification of American aims so that the Congress and the public can better understand what is being done and why.

What is likely to be haunting at least some of them is the other possible reaction to broadening of American activity there.

The forces opposing the Gemayel government there, and their Syrian and ultimately Soviet backers, might decide to up the combat ante instead of talking. And the Gemayel government might prove unequal to dealing with it even with this stepped-up help.

Then we might face a long, costly and confused involvement. To cope with it we would need at the very least to be clear about what we are trying to do and how. ●

PARRIS INTRODUCES FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PAY RAISE LEGISLATION

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which calls for a 6.9-percent pay increase for Federal officers and employees, effective as of January 1, 1984.

For several years now, Government workers have received limited pay increases, have had substantial reductions in health benefits, and have been required to contribute to the medicare trust fund. To add insult to injury, these same employees will soon experience further reductions in their compensation and benefits.

Depending on how quickly the Congress acts, the new compensation formula will result in a pay reduction beginning next month or whenever Government workers get a pay increase. Unfortunately, any pay increase is

going to be offset by new reductions in the Federal employees health benefits program.

While we do have legislation which would increase the Government's contribution to the health benefits program, its uncertain how quickly we will be able to win congressional approval for that proposal. It has been reported that increases in health insurance premiums could average between 18 to 25 percent in January, a 3.5- or 4-percent pay increase would be offset completely if this happens.

The President's own pay advisers have reported that Federal pay lags behind the private sector by about 20 percent. Labor Department surveys show that the average pay increases for U.S. workers in 1983 were between 4.2 and 9.7 percent, with most raises ranging in the 6.5- to 8.5-percent range.

After reductions are made in health benefits and the new pay formula is implemented, it will take at least a 6.9-percent pay increase to enable Government workers to just to break even. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and any other effort to preserve Federal employee pay and benefits from any further reductions. ●

THE MEDICAID PRESCRIPTION DRUG COPAYMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1983

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H.R. 3941, the Medicaid Prescription Drug Copayment Amendments of 1983. This bill would prohibit States from imposing copayments or any similar charges on Medicaid beneficiaries with respect to prescription drugs.

Under current law, States are permitted to impose nominal copayments on Medicaid recipients for a range of covered services. There are certain exceptions. States may not impose any copayments on pregnant women (for pregnancy-related services), on children, or on nursing home residents. In addition, States may not impose copayments on emergency services, family planning services and supplies, and services provided by an HMO.

Where a State chooses to impose copayments, the provider is generally responsible for collecting the required amount. States will commonly reduce reimbursement to participating providers by the amount of the required copayment. If the beneficiary cannot pay the required copayment, the provider must nonetheless deliver the service. Of course, the beneficiary remains liable to the provider for the copayment amount, and may be subject to Collection Action, Inc.

About 22 States and the District of Columbia now impose copayments on prescription drugs. These copayments range from 50 cents to \$3 per prescription. They represent a reduction in the dispensing fee paid to pharmacists and drugstores by the States for processing the prescriptions of Medicaid patients. This reduction varies from 8 percent to 73 percent of the fee.

The copayment requirements pose a special problem for pharmacists and drugstores. Many Medicaid patients simply cannot afford to pay the copayments, particularly if they require multiple prescriptions. Moreover, it is virtually impossible, as a practical matter, for a pharmacist to determine whether a beneficiary is unable to pay. Efforts to collect these small amounts are extremely costly. Yet, in the aggregate, the loss in reimbursement for the pharmacists and drugstores can be large, particularly in those stores located in poor neighborhoods serving large numbers of Medicaid patients. According to the National Association of Chain Drug Stores, the potential loss to pharmacies resulting from Medicaid copayments in the States that now impose them could be as high as \$43 million.

Whatever justification there might be for imposing copayments on the poor with regard to hospital care or physician services—and I do not believe there is any—there is none in the case of prescription drugs. The classic rationale for copayments is the reduction of unnecessary utilization of medical services. If patients are required to pay part of the cost of their care, they will use less.

This argument assumes, however, that the patient makes the decision about whether to use the service or not. Certainly, the patient generally decides whether to see a physician. However, it is the physician—not the patient—who decides whether a prescription is necessary. The patient can only decide not to fill the prescription that the physician has written, presumably because the drug is necessary for the patient's treatment. The pharmacist simply fills the prescription.

The current Medicaid copayment policy penalizes both the patient and the pharmacist, neither of whom make the critical decision. If excess utilization of prescription drugs is a problem in State Medicaid programs, then it should be dealt with directly by addressing physician prescribing practices, not by reducing the income of the poor or the reimbursement to pharmacies.

This legislation would eliminate an unnecessary and costly burden on pharmacists and patients alike. I would urge my colleagues to support it. ●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, due to previous commitments in Illinois yesterday, I was not present and voting during the consideration of H.R. 3222, State-Justice appropriations bill for fiscal year 1984. Had I been present, I would have voted against the motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill back to the House since there were several amendments relating to school busing and school prayer which were precluded from being offered by this motion. I was "paired against" final passage of this bill because it was grossly over budget. ●

IN HONOR OF MILITARY
RETIRED IN FEDERAL SERVICE

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a group of constituents in my district of Sacramento, Calif., who have recently formed an organization to address the needs of retired military personnel working for the Federal Government. This organization, Military Retired in Federal Service, now has more than 500 active members in the Sacramento area, with plans to expand membership throughout California and the Nation. The aim is to work with the Congress and Federal agencies to insure fair and equitable treatment for former military personnel employed by the Federal Government. Membership by active-duty military personnel is also encouraged.

The impetus for developing Military Retired in Federal Service was the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1982, which, as you know, provided that civilian Federal salaries of military retirees would be reduced dollar for dollar by the amount of pay increase in retired military pay. Believing that this reduction constituted an unfair burden on military retirees, efforts were begun to organize a group that could speak for the interests of this special group of Federal workers.

The development of Military Retired in Federal Service is thus a fine example of the American political process in action. I commend the organization to my colleagues and look forward to working with its membership on issues of concern over the course of the congressional session. ●

THE 101ST LABOR DAY

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, currently, the House is considering a major jobs creation bill, the Community Renewal and Employment Act. For this reason, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues Congressman WILLIAM FORD's very eloquent description of the unemployment crisis which cripples our Nation. Below is the text of Congressman FORD's Labor Day address:

LABOR DAY ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN
WILLIAM FORD, SEPTEMBER 3, 1983

This is Congressman Bill Ford of Michigan.

This weekend we observe our 101st Labor Day to honor America's working men and women.

This year we should pause to reflect on the plight of those millions of men and women who are unemployed. Approximately ten and a half million American wage earners can't find jobs. And more than a million and a half others have become so discouraged that they have quit looking.

Today President Reagan is taking credit for reducing the nation's unemployment rate. What could be more ironic? In effect he is saying he is reducing the suffering he caused in the first place.

In July of 1981, when President Reagan's economic program was put into place, the unemployment rate was 7.2 percent and the President said he would reduce it steadily.

Since then we have experienced the worst economic pain for workers since the Great Depression.

The record is clear. President Reagan's economic policy guaranteed both the recession and the high unemployment rate that followed. He pushed through the biggest tax cut in history for the rich and the largest peace time defense budget, while slamming on the monetary brakes.

Reaganomics, it turns out, was a dreadful miscalculation. And American workers and their families are paying for it. So are the families of the disadvantaged.

President Reagan promised that drastic cuts in social programs would pay for the tax cut and the defense buildup. He said the tax money saved by the wealthy would be turned into new plant and equipment and this would generate more than enough offsetting revenues.

Obviously it hasn't worked out this way. Instead many of the budget cuts have damaged our social fabric and pose a threat to our future.

Let's look at some of the results:

Spending on employment and training during 1982-85 has been reduced 60 percent at a time when Americans desperately need new skills for a new economic age. Job training programs have been cut 35 percent.

Despite convincing studies that the U.S. is falling behind in education, spending on almost every education program has been cut almost \$4 billion in the last 3 years.

Child nutrition programs have been slashed 28 percent. A million lower income children have been cut from school feeding programs. Now the same President who dictated these cuts says that he is "perplexed

and confused" by the growing problem of hunger in America.

I am especially disturbed by this President's lack of vision in terms of education. The enviable standard of living we enjoy in this country is a direct result of our commitment to educational opportunities.

Mr. Reagan is fond of reminding people that he was a union president thirty years ago. He has forgotten a lot in 30 years. Why else did he appoint an anti-union activist to head the agency that protects the right to join a union? Why did he cut the budget of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration? Why did a union have to sue Mr. Reagan's Secretary of Labor to get Trade Adjustment benefits for workers whose jobs were eliminated by imports?

I ask you to judge this President not by what he says, but by what he does and what he is not doing.

America urgently needs a coherent industrial policy, a program of aid to education, encouragement of basic science and applied research, financial aid to essential industries, trade restrictions and tax policies that stimulate innovation and production instead of mergers and plant closings.

We need credit policies that favor productive investment in basic industries and growth in the supply of basic needs such as housing.

Mr. Reagan has undermined each element that should be part of this policy. He opposed the Chrysler loan guarantee. He opposes reasonable trade legislation such as the domestic content bill. He supports tight money policies, and has artificially overvalued the dollar, making it difficult for American companies to sell products abroad.

Worst of all, Mr. Reagan has ignored the needs of workers hurt by his policies.

Between May of 1982 and May 1983, 6.8 million Americans exhausted their unemployment benefits. Mr. Reagan's response was to cut food stamps, to oppose legislation to provide health care and jobs for the unemployed.

President Reagan's record is one of broken promises for America's working men and women. And his policies pose a threat to their future. ●

DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Gertrude Quist Walker, the Republican town clerk of the town of Weston for 38 years. Ms. Walker's life in public service has certainly been a distinguished one. She was first elected town clerk in 1945, the post she still occupies today. In addition to her fine service as town clerk, Ms. Walker also served as secretary to the planning and zoning commission and other zoning board of appeals. All of us in public service will miss her daily presence in town hall and thank her for her fine record of outstanding service. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. ●

ONE SOLUTION TO THE DRUNK DRIVING EPIDEMIC: STATES RAISING THE DRINKING AGE TO 21

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in the last year, I have become very active in Congress, in some of the States, and with private organizations in promoting legislation addressing a very serious problem in this country: teenage drunk driving.

Do you know what I have learned? Although drunk driving is a problem that pervades all age groups of our licensed population, it is especially severe for teenagers. The combination of learning to drive, youthful risk taking, and drinking makes auto accidents the No. 1 killer of teenagers in this country.

I have made a real effort to draw attention to this problem, and to persuade the Congress to make a strong statement in support of a uniform national policy, enacted individually by the States, because 23 years in the education field has taught me a valuable lesson—that the youth of this country are valuable to this country beyond description.

Most of the ones so tragically affected by teenage drunk driving are just beginning to understand who they are and what they want out of life. They have parents. They have interesting, and chances are, innocent faces. They listen to stereos. They play video games. They compete on athletic fields and in the classroom. They talk for hours on the telephone. And all too many of them can only be remembered now—remembered by the high school graduation picture hanging on the living room wall of a family that will never be the same. Remembered for who they were, and sadly, for whom they might have been.

Consider these tragic facts: Our teens make up only 8 percent of the population, drive only 6 percent of the highway miles, yet they are involved in 15 percent of fatal alcohol related accidents.

Of the 25,000 persons who die each year in drunk driving accidents 5,000 are teenagers and almost 35 percent are between the ages of 16 and 24.

In fact, 14 teenagers die each day in drunk driving accidents.

On the other hand, many innocent persons driving within the limits of the law are also affected by teenage drunk drivers. All too often, we forget about the teenager who caused someone in the other car to lose his or her life, and then was forced to live with that stigma and terrible nightmare long afterward.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

In response to this, I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 23, a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the minimum age for drinking and purchasing alcoholic beverages should be raised to 21.

This resolution reflects one of the key recommendations of the Presidential Commission On Drunk Driving. Senator ARLEN SPECTER has introduced the companion resolution, and so far 15 U.S. Senators and 78 Members of Congress have cosponsored the measure. It has received endorsements from Cabinet Members Elizabeth Dole, the Secretary of Transportation, and Margaret Heckler, the Secretary of Health and Human Services. In addition, numerous organizations and affiliations have endorsed 21 nationwide, led by the National Transportation Safety Board, the National Safety Council, and Mothers Against Drunk Drivers (MADD).

I hope we see passage of House Concurrent Resolution 23 in this session of Congress, for I really do believe this is an issue which all the State legislatures should take up in their respective chambers—particularly at a time when many of the States are reviewing their educational systems. If we really are in pursuit of excellence in education, then we cannot overlook teaching our teens as well as our youngsters about the problems of alcohol abuse, and the dangers posed by drinking and driving.

Recently, I received the following letters of support for this idea, which I commend to my colleagues' attention, from: The American College of Preventive Medicine, Public Citizen, the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association, the Nurses Association of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (NAACOG), and the National Extension Homemakers Council, Inc.

The letters follow:

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF
PREVENTIVE MEDICINE
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1983.

HON. WILLIAM GOODLING,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GOODLING: On behalf of the American College of Preventive Medicine, I am writing to indicate endorsement of H. Con. Res. 23, now pending in the House Committee on Judiciary and on Public Works and Transportation.

As I am sure you are aware, the College has been quite active in the area of automotive safety and is particularly supportive of measures that would lessen the severe toll of automobile accidents on our nation's youth. We therefore congratulate you on your introduction of H. Con. Res. 23 and are pleased to lend our support to it.

Sincerely,

JEFFERSON C. DAVIS, M.D.,
President.

September 20, 1983

PUBLIC CITIZEN,

Washington, D.C., August 2, 1983.

Representative BILL GOODLING,
2263 RHOB,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GOODLING: Thank you for your letter of June 28. I agree with you that teenage drunk driving is a severe problem which should be more actively addressed than it is now. I will be happy to support your efforts to ameliorate the problem. Please accept my endorsement of House Concurrent Resolution 23.

Sincerely,

JOAN CLAYBROOK,
President.

MOTOR VEHICLE
MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., August 9, 1983.

HON. BILL GOODLING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GOODLING: I am pleased to assure you that, as a member of the Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving, I endorse and support your efforts to raise to 21 the minimum age for purchasing and drinking alcoholic beverages in those states which now permit drinking below the age of 21.

At the regional hearings of the Commission, officials and citizens discussed the drinking and driving problem in their states and communities. These hearings convinced me that the overinvolvement of young drivers in fatal crashes justifies intensive nationwide action to reduce the extraordinary social and economic losses from alcohol-related accidents. Your resolution is a vital part of that action.

Very truly yours,

V. J. ADDUCI.

AUGUST 11, 1983.

HON. BILL GOODLING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GOODLING: The Nurses Association of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists supports the intent of House Concurrent Resolution 23 to raise the drinking age to 21. We agree with the concept that we should have a national standard with the legal minimum age of 21 to purchase alcoholic beverages.

Sincerely yours,

EILEEN C. LEAPHART, RNC, MN,
President.

NATIONAL EXTENSION
HOMEMAKERS COUNCIL, INC.,
Vale, Oreg., September 9, 1983.

Representative BILL GOODLING,
Cannon Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GOODLING: At our recent Conference, the representatives of our 500,000+ membership voted to support your efforts to raise the legal age for drinking to 21. Extension Homemakers have long been active supporters of traffic safety with extensive programs in ridding the highways of drunk drivers and supporters of use of seat belts and infant restraints.

Our organization has an excellent communications network already in place, with contracts from our national chairmen to state chairmen to county chairmen and the local club member. We are ready to put your message into the hands of these club members if this is what you wish.

Our National Safety chairman is Mrs. Mabel Givens, 713 Market Street, George-

town, Del. 19947, phone (302) 856-3498. You may contact her if you wish us to share your concerns of the "21" law with our members. We have state councils in 44 states, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

We will be looking forward to hearing from you as to what programs we can offer to assist in making this into a law.

Sincerely,

MARJORIE GRIFFIN,
President. ●

LEO POLK—SELFLESS CITIZEN

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on September 25, 1983, Mr. Leo Polk of Dania, Fla., will donate blood for the 320th time. At age 75, Mr. Polk is our country's most generous blood donor. His donation this coming Sunday will bring his donations to the 40-gallon mark. This is particularly noteworthy in this day and age when many are still reluctant to donate blood.

Mr. Polk's life has been one of giving. He fled Czarist Russia with his parents and began giving blood as a way to serve his adopted Nation when a medical condition kept him out of the military. Not only did Leo Polk give blood, but he assisted in the organization of hundreds of blood drives.

Mr. Polk will be honored on the 25th of this month at the dedication of the new Broward Community Blood Center. His consistent and continued donation of blood is an act which should not go unnoticed. Attaining the status of the Nation's top volunteer blood donor is a symbol of his unselfishness and is a very personal expression of public service to his community and Nation.

The importance of donating blood cannot be overemphasized. Mr. Polk has continued to donate at a time when many would have considered that they had contributed enough to their community.

There is no way to know how many lives Mr. Polk has saved and will continue to save through this invaluable service.

I want to thank Leo Polk for his service and hope that others will follow his example. His valuable service cannot be replaced. ●

THANK YOU MR. WILLIAM BURKHART

HON. LYLE WILLIAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor a man who began his savings and loan career as a messenger boy 47 years ago. This man, Mr. William Burkhardt, is now being recognized by his employees, friends, and family as he retires from the position that for many years he dreamed of holding—president of a savings and loan association, specifically the First Federal Savings & Loan Association in Warren, Ohio.

Mr. Burkhardt joined the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Warren in 1946 as an accountant. He became managing officer in 1962, president in 1965, and chairman of the board in 1975. The career advance that can be so neatly summarized in writing are the direct result of Mr. Burkhardt's hard work, loyalty, and perseverance.

While achieving a succession of advances within his career, Mr. Burkhardt also found time to share his talents and skills with his community and his church. The community formally thanked Mr. Burkhardt by naming him "Man of the Year" in 1969, in recognition of his professional and civic achievements.

Mr. Burkhardt has continued his community service over the years acting as the chairman of the local United Way Campaign in 1975, and through serving on the board of directors of the Trumbull County Chapter of the American Red Cross.

Currently Mr. Burkhardt is a member of the board of trustees of Trumbull Memorial Hospital, and president of the Congregation of Emmanuel Lutheran Church. He will also continue to serve as the chairman of the board at the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Warren.

Mr. Burkhardt, through his quiet and low-key manner, has gained an honorable reputation throughout the business community as a man who gets the job done. His employees, friends, and family are proud to honor him on his retirement. On behalf of the many grateful residents of the 17th Congressional District of Ohio, I simply say to Mr. Burkhardt—thank you for a job well done. ●

A TRIBUTE TO MR. NICK NICHOLS

HON. BARBARA BOXER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 20, 1983

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mark the occasion of the 65th birthday of an individual who has been dedicated for over four decades to both the public service and to the rights of his fellow workers. That man, who deserves our praise and thanks, is Mr. Nick Nichols of San Francisco, Calif.

From 1940 until his retirement in 1973, Mr. Nichols built a superlative record as an employee of the Internal Revenue Service. Through hard work and commitment, he rose from the position of a GS-4 Deputy Collector to an IRS Assistant Branch Chief. In his capacity as a Government worker, Mr. Nichols saved the taxpayers thousands of dollars by uncovering fraud and abuse.

Clearly, whenever Nick Nichols has seen injustice, he has committed himself to right the wrong. That quality led him to become active in the union that represents IRS workers, the National Treasury Employees Union.

As a union activist, Mr. Nichols has unselfishly worked to improve the quality of work life of IRS employees in San Francisco. Even though he retired in 1974, Mr. Nichols has been consistently elected by his fellow workers to serve as the union chapter president.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that our great Nation has prospered because of the tireless efforts of people who simply "give a dam" about their fellow citizens. Nick Nichols is such a person and we wish him a happy birthday. ●