

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE POSSIBLE DREAM OF
TAIWAN

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the former Governor of New Hampshire, Meldrim Thomson, Jr., addressed the council of the John Birch Society in San Francisco on Saturday, November 13, 1982. He addressed the council on the subject of Taiwan, a country he has visited on numerous occasions, and gave a very stimulating speech. In this speech, he traces the major accomplishments of the Republic of China and the history of the errors of U.S. policy in dealing with her. Governor Thomson's speech clarifies the muddy waters that typify our policy toward Taiwan, and is well worth the time it takes to read it. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

THE POSSIBLE DREAM OF TAIWAN

(By Meldrim Thomson, Jr.)

Today's leaders of the Republic of China in Taiwan are a hearty breed of freedom fighters, implacable in their distrust of communism, endowed with the wisdom born of bitter experience, and long-suffering in patience.

Seldom in the history of the world have free people worked with such foresight and industry. Certainly no others have wrought greater material miracles than the people of the Republic of China.

They fashioned impossible dreams for themselves in the late 60's and early 70's. These were called the Ten Major Construction Projects. To the astonishment of the world, they made these dreams come true.

Yet in the November 1st International Issue of Newsweek, the editors did an inaccurate feature derisively referring to the Republic of China as "Troubled Taiwan".

The editors also wrote sarcastically of "the impossible dream of the Republic of China's 'glorious return to the Mainland'".

A vast majority of the nations of the world would love to have the economic troubles of Taiwan today.

While under the pressure of the worldwide recession, Taiwan's annual increase of 9.4 in its GNP during the past decade has been cut in half, still its economy is growing at almost four times that of the United States.

Unemployment on Taiwan is less than 2 percent compared to our record breaking unemployment of 10.4 percent.

Everywhere around the island, where 18 million people live in an area slightly larger than our state of Maryland, construction is booming. Roads, harbors and nuclear plants are being built and homes, factories, and hotels are springing up like the mushrooms cultivated in vast quantities on Taiwan.

The Republic of China has had a breathtaking vision, purpose and record of achievement during the past three decades.

In the 50's and early 60's this small Republic accomplished the greatest land reform in modern times to the benefit of all of the people.

In the years since then the nation has reduced the disparity in wealth from a ratio of 19 to 1 to 4 to 1, thus bringing the dream of self-sufficiency and personal well-being within the grasp of all of its people.

Many developing nations have had their three, five and ten year economic projects, but not one can point to the results achieved by the Republic of China in fulfilling during the decade of the 70's almost all of the Ten Major Construction Projects at a cost of \$7 billion.

To emphasize the enormity of Taiwan's material successes, I would point out that in my state of New Hampshire we began the construction of a two unit nuclear plant of 2,200 megawatts in 1972. We will be lucky if the first unit is finished in 1984 and the second one by 1986.

One of Taiwan's Ten Major Construction Projects for the 70's was to build six nuclear plants. This was changed to four plants with the last two having two units each. Work on the first plant of 600 megawatts began in 1973. The plant was completed in 1976. Four units are now on line and producing 30 percent of the electricity used on Taiwan today. The remaining two are scheduled for completion by 1985.

Thus, the Republic of China will have built six nuclear units with a total capacity of over 5,000 megawatts in two years less time than it will take us in New Hampshire to build one unit of 2,200 megawatts.

In 1974 I visited Kaohsiung, Taiwan's second largest city. There the government had just begun building a way for major ship construction and was clearing an adjacent swamp area for a steel mill.

Recently I visited the same site and saw a modern shipyard with 7,000 employees. In 1977 and 78 it delivered the third and fourth largest tankers in the world, each of 445,000 DWT's. In addition, the yard has turned out a number of bulk carriers and cargo vessels of all types. It is said that a number of frigates and other vessels are being produced there for the ROC navy.

The first blast furnace was operational in the nearby steel mill in 1976. Just February of this year a second blast furnace began spewing out molten iron. In the first ten months of 1982, more than a million tons of iron had been produced by this second blast furnace.

Compared to most nations, Taiwan's economy is on a dead run toward the twin goals of maximum productivity and profitability.

Yet none of these giant industrial strides takes into account a brand new program launched for the 80's of twelve new projects which it is estimated will cost when complete \$10 billion.

Some scoffers say that the people of the Republic of China find themselves in a time of trouble. The marvel is that this government that dares to dream of a greater future for her people still finds the time to execute its dreams with such efficiency and dispatch.

Some critics suggest that despite her material achievements the Republic of China still feels very much alone—and very vulner-

able. Here again, these malfactors of misfortune are wrong.

It is not so much vulnerability that the ROC feels as it is uncertainty about the future actions of those who claim to be her friends and allies.

It is known that the Republic of China now produces large quantities of small but highly efficient weapons. She has produced an excellent cannon capable of firing more than 30 miles, is building small naval vessels and has the capability of producing nuclear weapons.

What ever vulnerability the ROC suffers now is due entirely to the hesitancy of the reagan administration to authorize the co-production by the ROC government and the Northrop Corporation of F-5G fighter planes recommended more than three years ago by our departments of defense and State to insure the ROC's air superiority over the Taiwan straits.

For four decades the Republic of China has had every right to be disappointed and even shocked over the official conduct of the United States toward her.

Considering the long list of defaults, derelictions and defections by the United States since the Cairo declaration in 1943, it would indeed be strange if today's leaders of the ROC were not deeply concerned as to what interpretation the United States will ultimately apply to the Taiwan relations Act which Congress passed on January 1, 1979.

At Cairo Roosevelt and Churchill pledged to support the return of Manchuria, Taiwan and Pescadores to China, then controlled by the Republic of China.

Roosevelt at that Conference said, "We and the Republic of China are closer than ever before, in deep friendship and unity of purpose". Time and events were to prove how inimical to the well-being of the Republic of China that friendship was.

By 1945, at Yalta, Roosevelt and Churchill offered to let Stalin take vast territorial and property interests in Manchuria in exchange for entering the war against Japan, thus pulling the rug from under the Republic of China.

This set the stage for Stalin's arming of the Chinese Communists with the weapons of war surrendered by an invasion force of more than two million Japanese.

There quickly followed the Hurley and Marshall fiascos in which both tried to force communists co-existence on Generalissimo Chiang. George C. Marshall with Truman's backing brought an effective end of U.S. aid to the Republic of China.

General George C. Marshall once referred to by Senator William Jenner as a man whose entire life had been a living lie, was the primary architect of the defeat of the forces of the Republic of China.

Later, the Republic of China which had been a founding sponsor of the United Nations, was driven from the world organization when America failed to take the same strong stand against ejection of the Republic of China that it did when Israel was similarly and more recently threatened.

The list of perfidies by the United States against the Republic of China is long. The ROC in response to our conduct through the years has been patient and forgiving.

She deserved far better treatment from our government.

More humiliations and greater disloyalties at the hands of American pro-communist leaders were to beset the Republic of China.

In the midnight hour of history Jimmy Carter unilaterally abrogated our long-standing Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of China—an action which millions of Americans still believe was morally and legally wrong.

In its stead the congress quickly passed the Taiwan Relations Act which, among other things, guarantees to provide Taiwan with arms of a defensive character, meaning such defense articles and services as might be necessary for Taiwan to maintain a sufficient defense capability.

The big question now in the long-suffering experience of Taiwan in our mutual relationship is will President Reagan, despite the threats and harassments of Red China, act promptly and generously in fulfillment of the Taiwan Relations Act, the latest American commitment to the Republic of China!

We Americans should remember that if we pursue a course destructive to our allies we will eventually destroy ourselves.

Filmsy though the excuse may be, perhaps a naive America deserves some consideration for its failure to grasp the blunt fact of international life that communism in any form and wherever it exists is poison for the human race.

Long ago and after many patient efforts at co-existence with the Chinese Communists, Chiang Kai-shek learned that co-existence, negotiations and peaceful interludes with communists are the tools the communists cynically use to defeat their adversaries.

This prompted the Generalissimo to write in his book "Soviet Russia in China":

"If I could in any way enhance the vigilance and determination of those who are defending the cause of freedom and democracy, and bring home to them the single message that the 'peaceful co-existence' which the Russian and the Chinese Communists ask of any free nation or people is merely a one-sided proposition.

"They want you to accept their 'peace' that they alone can 'exist'."

In his great address before Congress after Truman had dismissed General Douglas MacArthur for his opposition to fighting a no-win war in Korea, MacArthur warned his fellow Americans—

"The Communist thrust is a global one. You cannot appease or otherwise surrender to communism in Asia without simultaneously undermining our efforts to halt its advance in Europe."

For too long our relations with the freedom loving people of the world have been blackened by the false prophesies of leaders like Nixon and their sycophanting lackies such as Kissinger.

We should never have followed their leadership into a treaty with Red China for the benefit of profit-hungry American businessmen.

How can we ever hope to find honesty and decency amongst the leaders of Red China who in the last generation clawed their way to power over the dead bodies of 70 million of their countrymen?

How can we so hypocritically recognize Red China which according to testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has today some 7 million souls in its gulags and at the same time sanctimoniously call on other nations to practice human rights?

Any patriotic American must wonder in horror at the truly treasonous acts of Nixon and Kissinger in promoting our recognition of Red China in view of the loss of American lives at the hands of Chinese Communist soldiers in both Korea and Vietnam.

It must be remembered that we are still technically at war with North Korea and presumably her allies in Red China. And Mainland China is reported to have spent \$20 billion in support of our enemy, the North Vietnamese.

Again, a true patriot must ask why are we busy building up a communist nation like Red China while giving the back of the hand to our genuine friend and ally, the Republic of China.

For example, the Republic of China has built its tremendous new steel mill in Kaohsiung without a cent from U.S. taxpayers, but for Red China, President Reagan found several months ago that it was to our national interest to loan \$68 million to Red China for a new steel mill, with interest at below prime rate. Why?

I suggest that in the best interest of America, we—

1. Terminate our relations with Red China at once.

2. Call upon President Reagan to upgrade immediately our relations with the Republic of China as he promised to do in his 1980 campaign.

3. Encourage the establishment of Chinese American Birch Chapters here in the United States in the hope that through education we might encourage Chinese-American citizens to take a more active role in politics that support the Republic of China.

4. Step up our education of the American people to the evils of communism; and

5. Distribute bumper stickers calling on President Reagan to keep his Taiwan promises.

Let us remember that what a nation can dream, a nation can do.

The Republic of China has its great and possible dream of returning freedom to Mainland China. We Americans should enthusiastically help the ROC realize that inspiring dream. After all they have been one of our oldest and most faithful allies.●

CHILD NUTRITION

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to my colleagues here today the views of two concerned constituents on child nutrition. The first statement, submitted by the Connecticut School Food Service Association, is a thoughtful argument in support of maintaining the Federal leadership role in child nutrition initiatives. The second piece on the child care food program, though brief, is a concise view from a service provider on the importance of the program. I commend to the House of Representatives these insightful comments on child nutrition in my home State of Connecticut:

CONNECTICUT SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION, September 8, 1982.

I am Marge McMahon, Legislative Chairman for the Connecticut School Food Service Association, which represents 1100 schools responsible for feeding 265,000 students daily.

You are aware that President Reagan proposes, as part of his "New Federalism" to repeal all the federal child nutrition programs (except W.I.C.) as of fiscal year 1988, along with a phase out of the Federalism Trust Fund. States may elect to assume the responsibility for child nutrition as early as FY 1985.

My organization opposes the turnback of these programs for many reasons best expressed in the House Concurrent Resolution 384, expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should maintain Federal involvement in and support for the Child Nutrition Programs. This resolution is a bi-partisan effort submitted by Rep. Perkins and Rep. Goodling. We urge you, Congressman Moffett and Congressman Miller to add your names to this resolution and to vote for it when it reaches the floor of the House.

The major arguments for keeping child nutrition at the federal level include:

1. The nutritional requirements of our children are uniform. They do not vary from state to state.

2. Over 80% of the federal funds spent on child nutrition go to support free and reduced priced meals to poor children.

3. Like food stamps, the cost of the program is tied to the cost of food.

4. Medical experts agree, the federal programs have worked well, substantially reducing malnutrition.

5. The USDA Commodity program is an important part of the child nutrition program.

6. Considering the cutbacks in Federal funds for various educational programs many states will be hard pressed and, we fear, unwilling to fund child nutrition programs.

At the point in time when Nutrition Education and Training Programs, a relatively recent federal program, were beginning to see results as part of the total educational endeavor, funding has been eliminated.

Last year, due to the Reconciliation Act of 1982, Connecticut saw participation in all three categories, free, reduced and paid meals, decline by 16% to 18% and some schools dropped out of the program entirely.

Finally, Governor O'Neill has responded to the National Governors Association, his opposition to the turnback of child nutrition programs to the state. His remarks, as well as those of the governors of North Carolina and Colorado are attached.

I thank you for this opportunity to communicate our concerns. Our children are our future.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
Hartford, Conn., May 26, 1982.

HON. RICHARD SNELLING,
Chairman, National Governors' Association, State Capitol, Montpelier, Vt.

DEAR GOVERNOR SNELLING: As you know, for the past two years I have been opposed to block grants primarily due to the fact that the funding level is not adequate to carry on the services presently offered to the citizens of this state.

Recently, I have received several letters from individual citizens and organizations

expressing their concern. Please find attached examples of their concern, i.e. a request from the officers of the Connecticut School Food Service Association and a letter from a Connecticut citizen. Their concern is that President Reagan plans to block grant the School Breakfast Program and Child Care Food Program this year and National School Lunch Program next year.

You certainly are aware of the nutritional benefits that the Child Nutrition Programs have offered our children since 1946. The continuation of these programs also has had a tremendous effect on the agricultural consumption within the United States. The plan to drop the Special Milk Program altogether certainly will further reduce the consumption of fresh milk and add to the storage burden of dairy products, such as nonfat dry milk, cheese and butter, placed on the federal government and the individual taxpayer. These products are available and provide good nutrition for the youth of this nation.

I would greatly appreciate your incorporating these suggestions and concerns in your planning with the federal government. If I can be of any assistance to you on this subject, please feel free to contact me immediately.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. O'NEILL,
Governor.

STATEMENT OF CARLEEN ZEMBKO, COORDINATOR, NANCY BAKER CHAPTER, CONNECTICUT FAMILY DAY CARE ASSOCIATION

The quality child care food program, in conjunction with the USDA, pre-school nutritious food for children, is being realized here among area day care homes. Providers are attending "workshops" on nutrition, and enjoy the publications provided by quality child care. I feel this program is necessary for our youngsters. When the program first started, it was without limitations. Now, with austerity, it is being trimmed. I pray the program will continue.●

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

HON. DAN MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in a tribute to the service in the House of Representatives of Congressman JACK BRINKLEY of Georgia. The senior representative in the Georgia delegation, JACK BRINKLEY will be leaving the Congress this year.

I have come to know JACK BRINKLEY in our capacities as members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. As a member of that committee, he has distinguished himself as an untiring advocate of those who have served in our Nation's military and who have fought our Nation's wars.

JACK BRINKLEY is a senior Member of Congress of stature and accomplishment. I will certainly miss his presence in the House of Representatives in the coming years, and wish him the very best in all of his endeavors.●

SUPERFUND INACTION

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago this month the \$1.6 billion Superfund legislation, designed to begin immediate cleanup actions at the Nation's most dangerous hazardous waste sites, was signed into law.

At that time expectations ran high in the Congress, among environmental groups, and the general public that a serious and thoughtful solution had been advanced to come to grips with this significant public health and environmental problem.

However, rather than taking the action mandated by the Superfund law, the Reagan administration has taken a course characterized by inaction. The result is that our hazardous waste problems have been compounded instead of having been reduced.

The Philadelphia Inquirer published a thoughtful and forceful editorial this week summarizing the administration's failure to implement the Superfund law which I would like to recommend to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Nov. 29, 1982]

EPA PLAYS A CRUEL GAME WITH SUPERFUND DOLLARS

There is \$223 million in unobligated money currently sitting in the Superfund, the special account created by Congress to pay for cleaning up the worst hazardous-waste sites around the nation. By next year that amount is expected to grow to \$400 million, according to an official of the Environmental Protection Agency, charged with administering the Superfund.

Until a flurry of activity just days before the fiscal year ended Sept. 30, the EPA had spent only \$74 million of Superfund dollars for cleanup. Contracts amounting to an additional \$51 million were signed as the fiscal year came to a close, but that work will not begin for some time.

Critics charge that the current administration at the EPA has not assigned hazardous-waste cleanup a high priority. Prompt, aggressive activity is vital.

No place is that surrender of public duty more apparent than in Missouri where as many as 25 sites have been heavily contaminated with dioxin—considered the deadliest chemical known to man. There is no "safe" level of dioxin. As little as one part per trillion is toxic, according to experts. Levels of dioxin in the Missouri soil have been measured as high as 0.9 parts per million.

The EPA's own studies show that adults exposed to levels far below those measured in Missouri face sharply increased risks of contracting cancer, as do children who ingest contaminated soil. If diluted in drinking water, for example, one ounce of dioxin could kill a million people, experts contend.

The dioxin was produced by two companies that went out of business in 1972. About 40 pounds have not been accounted for. Some of it was sprayed by a waste-dis-

posal company on horse arenas and roads for dust control. It also was used for fill, in gardens and for road construction.

Federal and state officials have known about the presence of dioxin since 1974, but took no action until October 1979, when they re-examined the earlier data. EPA officials did not notify residents of the high dioxin levels until last month because, they said, they were unaware of the extent of the contamination.

That delay in acting prompted sharp criticism of the EPA by witnesses appearing before a House subcommittee examining the operation of Superfund. That criticism was directed at Rita Lavelle, assistant EPA administrator in charge of the Superfund.

Miss Lavelle thus far has declined to make any Superfund money available to help with the Missouri cleanup, which is estimated to cost \$30 million. She has said that not enough information has been gathered to establish that dioxin levels pose a health threat to residents. More studies are needed, she said. Those studies will be completed in January, after which time she will decide whether to spend Superfund dollars on the cleanup.

Citing the EPA's own figures on the increased cancer rates to residents exposed to the dioxin, a toxicologist for the Environmental Defense Fund labeled the EPA's failure to act as "ignorance of almost unbelievable profundity. The question must arise: What does it require to convince this EPA that human health is in immediate danger?" asked Ellen K. Silbergeld of the fund.

In an interview last month, Miss Lavelle told Inquirer reporter Bob Drogin that "the name of the game is to get sites cleaned up." And in that regard, she boasted, "we've got a heck of a track record."

The facts do not bear out Miss Lavelle's assertion that the Superfund work is proceeding on schedule. Mr. Drogin, who carefully examined the EPA's own statistics, found that only four hazardous waste sites out of 400 had been cleaned up with Superfund money. Millions of unallocated Superfund dollars have been used temporarily to reduce the Federal deficit, giving the Federal Government little incentive to spend the money as it was designated.

In this year's budget, Congress cut the Superfund appropriation from \$230 million to \$210 million because of the huge surplus in the fund. (Most of the Superfund money comes from a surcharge on chemical manufacturers. The Federal Government makes up about 12 percent of the total.)

In one regard, Miss Lavelle is correct. Her agency has compiled "a heck of a track record" on Superfund. That record, however, is so dismal it cannot go unchallenged. As written, the Superfund legislation provides very little oversight by Congress. Critics of the program have called for a regular reporting requirement so that the EPA can be held accountable by Congress, and the public, for failing to live up to the intent of the law.

That would be a start. But, as Miss Lavelle noted, "the name of the game is to get sites cleaned up." Until that begins in earnest, the Reagan administration is playing a cruel game with the health and well-being of Americans unfortunate enough to be exposed to the deadly chemical wastes.●

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF
DAYTON HUDSON CORPORATION

HON. MARTIN OLAV SABO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, the American business community has a clear responsibility to contribute to the public good, not only through direct philanthropy, but also through good business practices. Private initiatives that benefit public needs also make good business sense.

The Dayton Hudson Corp., one of the largest and most successful retailing businesses in the country, has long been a leader in the area of corporate social responsibility. For 65 years Dayton Hudson has voluntarily contributed financially to the communities in which it is involved. I can assure you that the Twin Cities, the State of Minnesota, and, in recent years, communities throughout the Nation have benefited from Dayton Hudson's programs.

Dayton Hudson was recently honored as the first recipient of the Lawrence A. Wien Prize in Corporate Responsibility from Columbia University. The distinguished panel who selected Dayton Hudson from a host of candidates noted its strong tradition of 5 percent giving, innovative programs, and the quality of its efforts.

I am proud that Dayton Hudson is based in my district, in Minneapolis. I would like to share with my colleagues in the House the address made by William A. Andres, the chairman and chief executive officer of Dayton Hudson, when he accepted the prize at Columbia University on October 27 of this year.

The address follows:

CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY: THE MARK OF
PROFESSIONALISM

On behalf of Dayton Hudson, I am honored to accept this first Lawrence A. Wien Prize in Corporate Responsibility, and to be invited here to Columbia University to address this prestigious assembly.

On this important occasion, I am honored to represent our management and Board—past as well as present—for a number of reasons.

First, because of the important contribution Lawrence Wien has made to the business community's recognition of its responsibilities. Dayton Hudson and Lawrence Wien have both been involved in a long-standing effort to stimulate increased corporate philanthropy. And we're honored to be the first recipient of a prize bearing his name.

Secondly, we are honored because of the distinguished judges who selected Dayton Hudson from a nation-wide field of candidates. When you get the nod from such high-principled and hard-headed businessmen and women as Juanita Kreps, Irving Shapiro and Harold Williams—believe me, it's a bonus.

Thirdly, and most importantly, we are especially honored because Dayton Hudson was chosen not just because of our record of philanthropy, but because, in the opinion of the judges, our corporate responsibility efforts are well run. And because they are part of a well run and successful company.

Let me quote the judges' statement that was, for us, the frosting on the cake: They said, and I quote, "Dayton Hudson has done extremely well in managing its business . . . an indication that successful managements are sensitive to their social as well as economic constituents."

In saying that, the judges hit upon one of the key factors in our success: Corporate responsibility is more than a side-line at Dayton Hudson. It is an integral part of our business.

Indeed, I think it's impossible for a retailer to separate out where business interests end and where society's interests begin. And that, I submit, is just as true for other businesses, as well.

I know I speak for current management at Dayton Hudson when I say we are tremendously indebted to our management predecessors. They had the foresight to recognize that the health of our business is tied—for better or for worse—to the health of the communities where we operate. Our leadership position today, both in community circles and in business circles, owes a great debt of gratitude to their enlightened vision.

My purpose here today will be to share some of that vision with you, and to place it within the context of our business today, and our fast-changing world.

When I'm finished, I hope you'll conclude, as we have, that a well-integrated and comprehensive program of corporate responsibility is not only good for the "bottom line," it is the "bottom line."

Let's begin, however, with a clarification: When Dayton Hudson and corporate responsibility are mentioned in the same breath, most people think solely in terms of "philanthropy." Despite that fact, our definition of the term is much broader, and I will be talking about corporate responsibility in its broadest sense.

In saying that, I don't mean to downgrade philanthropy in any way. It has been, and will continue to be, an important cornerstone of our corporate public involvement program.

Although it is a legacy from past generations of management, the Five Percent Giving Policy is, I assure you, endorsed wholeheartedly by current management at Dayton Hudson.

It has survived the best of times, and the worst of times. During the economic downturn in 1974, the policy was given special scrutiny by both management and our Board of Directors, and it was re-affirmed as a sound business practice, one that's in the best interest of our shareholders. In fact, our officers, to a person, voted to cut other expenses, before cutting out or reducing our Five Percent Giving Policy.

Today, the policy continues to have management's blessing despite economic pressures, and despite the fact that our record growth puts our giving budget at a record level: Over \$12 million dollars this year, including administrative costs.

You may be interested to know, as I was, that from 1966 to 1982 (the period we've been making our financial results public), we've contributed an estimated \$72 million dollars to improve the communities where we do business.

And that doesn't count our first 20 years at five percent giving, when Dayton's was privately held, and didn't report its results. Nor does it reflect the first 29 years of the Dayton Foundation, which began in 1917. So our commitment to philanthropy has been at the very core of our existence for some 65 years.

But the point I want to make is this: We believe that even more important than what you give or how long you have given, is how you give, how you leverage those gifts with other resources and other activities, and how your giving program fits into your total business strategy.

Our giving program is part of a comprehensive program of corporate public involvement. And that program is part of a comprehensive effort to do business responsibly—and responsibly. We think it's an essential element in a professionally managed operation, and that's certainly just as true of retailing as it is of any other business.

The fact that Dayton Hudson is in the retail business means we're in the business of serving the American consumer through fashion and value-oriented quality merchandise.

The key to success in retailing can best be summed up in one phrase: "Managing change."

As the customer's purchasing agent, the retailer must know, well in advance of the season, what the customer wants, and how those wants are changing. Then we've got to respond more quickly—and more efficiently—than the competition, when it comes to serving those needs.

At Dayton Hudson, we call this trend merchandising. It's a systematic process for testing customer reaction to new merchandise, and then identifying and tracking incoming and outgoing trends.

This isn't the time or the occasion to talk about trend merchandising. But what is relevant about the process is that our success in managing change in the merchandising areas has given Dayton Hudson a base for broadening the concept and applying trend management concepts to all aspects of our business—from trends in management styles, to trends in employee benefits, to trends in the overall strategic positioning of our corporation.

For trend management to work, there are two key ingredients: Awareness of change, and responsiveness to change. And that, ladies and gentlemen, is where a comprehensive program of corporate public involvement plays an important role.

When we're thoroughly involved in our communities—when we're investing not only philanthropic dollars, but the time and talent of our people, as well—it heightens our awareness, not only of what the needs of the communities are, but how those needs are changing.

That, in turn, helps us to meet those needs better, and it plays a significant role in broadening the vision of our professional management team. In short, it helps us manage change.

To illustrate how a comprehensive program in corporate responsibility fits in, strategically, let me describe two examples: B. Dalton's literacy campaign, and our recent Hispanic Symposium.

They are separate, unrelated illustrations. But together they will help describe the Dayton Hudson approach to corporate responsibility.

The first example is an effort that's turning into a full-fledged campaign on behalf

of literacy by B. Dalton, our national bookstore chain.

When B. Dalton management researched the needs of its markets, they found some shocking statistics.

More than 25 million adult Americans are functionally illiterate. In fact, some estimates go as high as 60 million.

Some 800,000 kids drop out of high school each year.

And tens of thousands more graduate without achieving basic skills.

What those figures mean for a bookseller is naturally of concern. But what they mean for society is of even greater concern.

Being functionally illiterate means that a person cannot read and write well enough to function in today's society. A person can't read well enough to complete a job application, or decipher signs, or take a driver's license exam, or shop intelligently.

During a 14-month assessment period, B. Dalton examined the issue of illiteracy and evaluated delivery services available to address the issue on the local, state and national level.

Internally, the people at B. Dalton asked themselves what they could do about this serious issue. They decided their response would be two-fold: To get more heavily involved in adult literacy training, with both volunteer time and money; and to get more heavily involved in programs to encourage young people to read.

In other words, B. Dalton decided to get active not only in trying to solve the problem, but in trying to prevent the problem.

As a result, literacy has become the primary focus of B. Dalton's giving programs. In 1982 alone, nearly a quarter of a million dollars will be invested in:

Literacy organizations in B. Dalton's key market communities around the country.

Model programs, long-range planning and management training . . .

And a national literacy network to stimulate awareness of the problem.

But the most important step B. Dalton has taken has been to identify the key component in delivering services to people who can't read, namely, volunteers.

The've begun an all-out campaign to mobilize B. Dalton employees, nationwide, to become individual tutors and community leaders for literacy in their local communities.

At its headquarters in Minneapolis, B. Dalton offers time off from work for training to be tutors, and they purchase the training materials for any employee who's willing to help those who can't read.

Even though the program is only a few months old, already the response of B. Dalton employees had been overwhelming. At headquarters, there's even a waiting list for the training program.

What's especially heartening, is that B. Dalton people at all levels have become actively involved in the tutoring program and other aspects of the literacy campaign.

Everyone from sales clerks, to the maintenance man at corporate headquarters, to regional managers and vice presidents, all the way up to the C.E.O.

What this all adds up to is this: B. Dalton has put together a comprehensive effort that includes some important elements: First, a well-chosen and strategic issue (in a field where they have a special interest, concern and expertise); second, a commitment of financial resources; and third, a commitment of the time, talent and personal resources of their people.

We think it's an excellent example of an effective public involvement program, a pro-

gram that makes sense for the business—and for society.

Incidentally, I might add that each of our businesses has selected its own areas of concentration—areas that make sense for their business.

Dayton's, our Minneapolis-based department store company, sees women as its major customer, so they focus their contributions and involvement in programs for women and girls.

Mervyn's (our California-based promotional department store chain), and Target (our "upscale" discount chain), both serve young families as their primary customer. So issues of concern to that group are the focus of their attention.

Likewise, each of our companies strives to focus its efforts, to maximize the impact of its giving and its community involvement. It's an approach that makes sense to us, and we think every business should choose its own field in which to invest its money, time and corporate expertise.

The second example I'd like to use today is a very recent one: The Dayton Hudson Hispanic Symposium held last month in San Antonio, Texas.

From the sound of it, you might think this was one of those nice image-building public service conferences—sponsored, perhaps, by an enlightened corporate foundation and attended by people who already know a lot about the subject.

Not so, in this case. This was an internal business conference, conceived for business reasons. It was planned by a corporate-wide task force and coordinated by the corporate development department at Dayton Hudson, which is the department that heads up our on-going strategic planning effort.

The symposium was attended by top executives from key areas in each of our eight operating companies, and corporate staff headquarters. Key people from marketing, advertising, personnel, strategic planning and community relations.

Plans for it grew out of our recognition of two facts: First, that the Hispanic population is growing in significance, especially in the strategic "Sunbelt" areas of the country. And, secondly, that Spanish-speaking citizens have some unique needs, not only as potential customers in our stores, but as potential employees and potential partners in the community at large.

Our awareness of Hispanic cultural differences had been heightened, first of all, because of our on-going commitment to be an affirmative action employer. And that commitment includes increasing the number of Hispanic employees beyond the 5,000 we already have.

But our sensitivities were really raised by the Dayton Hudson Foundation's funding of a Hispanic Leadership development program: a quarter-of-a-million-dollar commitment, over a 3-year period, to assist in developing some 500 Hispanic leaders in California, Texas, and Michigan.

Our involvement in that program heightened our awareness, but the numbers really drove home the significance of this population for our business.

If 1980 census trends continue throughout this decade, by 1990 Spanish-speaking people will represent 35 percent of the population in California, 32 percent in Texas, 22 percent in Arizona, and 50 percent in New Mexico.

Those areas are precisely where several of our operating companies are already doing business, and where almost 80 percent of

Dayton Hudson's projected capital commitments for the next five years is targeted to go.

The result of the awareness and the planning was an intensive two-day experience in which some 40 Dayton Hudson executives were the "students," Hispanic leaders were the "teachers" and the San Antonio Hispanic community was the "classroom."

Our people not only listened to Hispanic elected officials and Hispanic community leaders, they toured schools and neighborhoods, as well. They saw for themselves the unique needs and unique traits of this special population.

The participants came away from the meeting with a new understanding of how those needs impact our business, and with a renewed commitment not only to market appropriately to the Hispanic community, but to recruit from there as well.

Apparently, the experience was mutually-beneficial. To illustrate, let me quote from a letter we received after the symposium from Andre Guerrero. He is the director of Ohio's Commission of Spanish Speaking Affairs, who served as a consultant in planning the conference. Even though it was a business conference, paid for as business expense, Mr. Guerrero called the symposium, "a unique gift to the Hispanic Community" because of the extensive involvement of Hispanics in the planning, and because of the openness and receptivity of our people.

"As with all good gifts," he said, "the giver also received from the experience. Dayton Hudson created a working environment with major sectors of the San Antonio community which is usually only developed over a much greater period of time. And the good will and trust established is something that could not have been purchased at any price, however intense a public relations campaign might have been."

My point is this: We gained far more than good will. We gained far more than an entree into the Hispanic community. Our biggest gain was that we broadened the perspective—we broadened the vision—of our management team.

And that, ladies and gentlemen, is absolutely crucial to effectiveness in business. To me, it is the mark of a professional executive, and the hallmark of a thoroughly professional organization.

Although I don't have any hard data to back me up, my personal observation is that the quality and effectiveness of a management team goes up as it becomes really involved in the community, as its members think more broadly about the world around them, and about the issues of the day; and as the corporation backs up that awareness and personal commitment with philanthropic dollars.

The talents we develop, the skills we develop, the special sensitivities we develop, all carry over to help us meet the business challenges that confront us every day. We think they certainly help us to manage better in this rapidly changing world.

At Dayton Hudson, we are thoroughly convinced that involved management is more enlightened, that enlightened management is more effective, and that enlightened management and enlightened giving are two sides of the same coin.

Our experiences in the community and in the business world confirm that view. Furthermore, we think it's a view that holds true for other businesses, besides retailing.

Granted, retailers must be especially sensitive to the total community and to changes in that community. Thus, retailers have a

very real business reason for keeping their finger on the public pulse.

But, in closing, I would also have to ask: Is that not true for any business that depends on the public for its franchise to do business? Is that not true for any business that serves people? When it comes right down to it, is that not true for any industry?

Could it be that some of the problems currently besetting some of this country's major industries (industries now suffering decline)—could it be that some of these problems might have been lessened, had their managements been more involved in their communities, more sensitive to changes in society and more responsive to those changes?

Could some of the unsuccessful efforts to manage change be traced to lack of attention to broader issues, a lack of involvement in addressing the needs of society as a whole, rather than just the business?

Might not many of the changes have been more apparent to management, and management better able to respond, had there been more corporate involvement? More volunteerism, more philanthropy, more strategic planning with an eye toward the changing consumer, and more targeting of corporate resources into solving problems that affect the total society, and thus business?

Based on our experiences at Dayton Hudson, we think the answer to those questions is an unqualified "yes." Our business is healthier because of our efforts to be both responsible and responsive.

And we are extremely pleased that, in awarding us Columbia's first Lawrence Wien Prize in Corporate Responsibility, you have taken note of the connection between the two.

On behalf of the more than 70,000 employees of Dayton Hudson Corporation, on behalf of our management and our board of directors, thank you very much.●

EFFECTS OF INTEREST RATES AT THE GRASSROOTS

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● **Mr. HUBBARD.** Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Rev. Jerry Hopkins, the pastor of Reidland Baptist Church in Paducah, Ky., has written me an excellent letter in which he stresses the adverse effects of soaring interest rates upon persons at the grassroots. Indeed, too many individuals have lost everything due to escalating interest rates—including their businesses, homes, educational opportunities, and much more for which they have worked throughout their lives. I believe my colleagues will be interested in Reverend Hopkins' comments. His letter follows:

REIDLAND BAPTIST CHURCH,
Paducah, Ky., September 17, 1982.

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: There is a matter which I would like to bring to your attention having noted that you serve on the Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee. High interest rates are very disturbing to me. Having

some knowledge as a result of my graduate work at Eastern and the University of Kentucky of the nature of our economic system I find it contradictory to growth and productivity. We live in a consumer oriented economy and when consumption declines you have a dangerous situation. If people do not have money, they cannot buy products. If people cannot buy products, manufacturers are not going to employ or continue to employ people. If people are unemployed they will not have money with which to buy. This is a simplistic view of our situation, but I believe an accurate one. The automobile and housing industries are examples of this very problem. My question—what is being done to bring down these unreasonable rates?

I do not believe those who are financially secure, even wealthy, understand the plight of those at the bottom of society or near the bottom. I find it hard to take President Reagan's words seriously when I see little "cutting" in the White House regarding extravagance. These are not bitter words, but what I have come to feel from observation and listening to folks at the grassroots. It might be more helpful to give the financially oppressed and neglected a forum at which to speak. There are many sad stories of folks who have lost everything through soaring interest rates—businesses, homes, educational opportunities for children and much more.

Perhaps we might be able to talk at some point in the future about some of these issues. The mood of our time seems to parallel that of the 1920's, let's hope and pray that the conclusion will not be another 1929 and decade like the 1930's.

Sincerely,

JERRY HOPKINS.●

IMPACT OF NEW FEDERALISM

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● **Mrs. KENNELLY.** Mr. Speaker, I rise today, to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues some thoughtful testimony presented last September at a forum in West Hartford, Conn., held to discuss the impact of the New Federalism on the children of our State. I was most pleased to join my good friends Representative GEORGE MILLER and Representative TOBY MOFFETT in soliciting a variety of views on this important issue.

State and local officials, service providers, and other interested observers testified at this hearing. Time and again they pointed out the vital importance of caring for this Nation's children. Several of them made another excellent point which is well worth repeating. As we search for ways to slow the growth of the Federal budget, they said, we must be careful to look not only at the bottom line cost of the programs we authorize, but at their structure as well. We must carefully review existing programs to make sure they are structured efficiently. We must review them to make sure they meet the goals we have set for them

and the needs of the people we intend them to care for.

I am grateful to St. Joseph College, host of last September's forum, and to the many service providers who took time out to contribute their thoughtful comments.

I include at this point in the RECORD several statements presented at that forum.

STATEMENT OF MONA FRIEDLAND, DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, WINDHAM AREA COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

The Windham Area Community Action Program, Inc. is a private, non-profit action agency which administers three of the State funded day care centers in Northeast Connecticut.

Day Care budgets have always been tight. Federal funding through Title XX reimbursements to the State have enabled the day care centers to maintain an adequate adult-child ratio. During hiring freezes, which we have experienced several times over the past few years, staff support has been critically low, invariably affecting the quality of care at the centers. Cutbacks to this supplemental funding will force the States to raise additional revenue or reduce the number of day care slots available. Either way the impact will be greatest on those who are on the lower end of the earning scale and therefore have fewer options available to them.

Similarly, cutbacks in the Child Care Food Program in 1982 have resulted in reducing the number of meals which can be claimed and in some cases resulted in an increase of fees to parents.

It has been shown that the CCFP helps to keep the cost of child care down. When providers are reimbursed for the meals they serve, they do not pass this cost on to parents, thereby keeping child care costs at a minimum. For working poor families, particularly single parent families, reasonably priced day care allows them to continue to work and to stay off welfare rolls.

Continued, adequate funding of Federal food programs and Title XX funding will help to maintain quality day care in Connecticut. Please help to keep this vital service working in our communities.

STATEMENT OF ANN HORNE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE SAUGATUCK DAY CARE SERVICE, INC.

Thank you for inviting our agency to your forum on September 8, 1982. We learned a lot and appreciated the chance to become more familiar with other Connecticut agencies serving children.

We strongly support Congressman Miller's resolution to create a Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families (H. Res. 421) in the House of Representatives. Children must be defended against the increasing burden of enormous cutbacks in federal programs. The New Federalism appears to have been brought to us courtesy of the nation's children.

In support of your positions and to emphasize the need for the proposed Committee, here are some facts and figures demonstrating the impact of 1981-82 budget cuts on people served by our organization.

We are a private, nonprofit agency serving families in Fairfield and New Haven Counties, through three programs:

(1) Our Family Day Care Network involves fifteen local state-licensed Family Day Care Providers, who earn their living in

their own homes, caring for children. Providers are chosen, continually trained and supervised by our staff, which enrolls children in care and offers limited financial assistance, funded by donation, to parents in need. (Working couples and single parents should have Federal financial help toward Family Day Care costs.)

(2) A Child's Place is our professionally staffed, flexible-time center serving children eighteen months through six years of age. The program is designed to meet part-time day care, socialization and cognitive needs of young children in a setting that promotes social, emotional, intellectual and physical growth.

(3) Our Nutrition Program serves about one hundred licensed Family Day Care Providers in our Network and in outlying towns. The USDA Child Care Food Program, through the Connecticut Department of Education, reimburses Providers for healthful food served to children in their care. Our agency enrolls, trains, supervises and gets reimbursement for Providers. It is the Nutrition Program which has been hard hit by budget cutbacks. Here are the figures. Reimbursements are never overly generous. For example, the average payment in 1981-82 was: 48 cents for breakfast, 94 cents for lunch or dinner, and 28 cents for snack.

In 1981-82, two installments of cutbacks affected our program. The first, set in motion September 1, 1981, decreases cents amounts spent to reimburse for each meal or snack. Levels varied slightly through both fiscal years, but the average reimbursement drop from one year to next per child per feeding was: minus 5 cents for breakfast, minus 3 cents for midmorning snack, minus 6 cents for lunch, minus 3 cents for mid-afternoon snack, and minus 6 cents for supper.

At a time of galloping information in food prices, a Family Day Care Provider is expected to feed each child on 23 cents less for a full day's food.

The second cutback was even more devastating to our children's nutrition. Beginning January 1, 1982:

(a) Day Care Providers' own children are no longer paid for unless eligible under the School Lunch Income Guidelines. This cuts off payments for food for one hundred twenty-one children of Providers in our program, which serves about seven hundred children each year.

(b) Providers are reimbursed for only two meals and one snack they serve to day care children, instead of three meals and two snacks, the previous maximum. A child in family day care full-time is assured of nutritious food only three-fifths of the time. This arrangement clearly discriminates against full-time day care children in favor of part-time children. It is in fact the children of working parents who are in family day care full-time; part-time day care is more often used by parents with volunteer or part-time work commitments, who may be assumed to be somewhat less in need of financial assistance in feeding their children.

Thanks for your concern for our children and your efforts to help us help them.

STATEMENT OF FRANCES ROBERTS DIRECTOR,
OFFICE OF CHILD DAY CARE, STATE OF CONNECTICUT

I want to commend Barbara Kennelly, George Miller, and Toby Moffett for the excellent forum on children's issues at St. Joseph College last week. Since you indicated that written testimony can be forwarded

to you for inclusion in the record, I am sending these comments along for that purpose.

I am Frances T. Roberts, Director of the Office of Child Day Care for the State of Connecticut, and I wish to add to the testimony of witnesses who appeared at the Congressional Forum on "New Federalism: Its Impact on Connecticut Children" held in West Hartford on September 8, 1982. You have heard excellent testimony on the effects which have already been felt and those anticipated of reduced funding for the programs for children which are so vital to their optimum development. My concern is, that as we seek to regain lost ground, we not lose sight of the fact that what we had before needed improvement. Welfare Reform was a recognized need in the 1970's under both Republican and Democratic administrations, and some of the proposals made at that time should be given consideration along with restoring the funding levels.

Specifically, we need to look at the objectives of the AFDC program, and decide whether the program is really designed to support families or to keep women out of the job market. If it is the latter, then we need to increase the flat grant and stop talking about getting these parents back to work, stop trying to design job training programs for them, and accept the fact that children will be raised by mothers with low self esteem, poor job prospects and little hope for the future. If on the other hand, we truly want to help these families get off of welfare and encourage the mothers to get jobs, we need to provide real incentives in place of the disincentives in the present policies; for example, permit working AFDC mothers to keep 50 percent of what they earn rather than the "30 and a third" formula, for example, \$30 plus one third of earnings each month.

Second, and this applies to programs other than AFDC as well: establish income eligibilities for support services and then separate eligibility from the source of that income; that is, work or welfare. I am thinking of such supports as day care, Medicaid and food stamps which an AFDC mother stands to lose if she is taken off of welfare because she is earning too much; thus she might be motivated to work less or not at all and stay on welfare to keep her benefits.

It seems to me that we have two very serious maladies to combat today. One is the attitude of the current administration in Washington which appears insensitive to the fact that the "safety net" has holes so large that children are falling through it. The other is the despair of the more liberal or progressive sector when it recognizes that the massive social programs of the sixties and seventies did not solve all the problems of poverty, racism, decay of the cities and other societal ills, and has no alternative strategy to offer. This despair must be replaced by a real commitment to reform the system as well as restore it to a humane level. Such a commitment should go beyond the band-aids and prevent the disruption of families and the loss of human potential that are inevitable in the present climate.

A RESOLUTION COMMENDING ST. PAUL'S CHURCH IN MOUNT VERNON, N.Y., FOR ITS ROLE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS.

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to commend St. Paul's Church in Mount Vernon, N.Y., for its significant role in the development of the Bill of Rights. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing St. Paul's, which is noted as the "National Shrine for the Bill of Rights," and is designated as a national historical site, and is part of the National Park System.

The history of St. Paul's parallels the development of our constitutional freedoms. Initially built in 1665, the church and its adjacent village green has been the setting for historical events which have greatly contributed to the development of our Constitution.

The event that made the church most famous, "The Great Election of 1733," led to the establishment of a free press in America.

The 1733 election for Governor of New York was announced by a notice posted on the door to the church. The election was corrupt and unfair, and prompted John Peter Zenger to publish the New York Weekly Journal which ran a full account of the local sheriff's corruption and the misdeeds of other colonial authorities. An attempt was made to suppress Zenger's publication, and the journalist was jailed for 9 months on charges of libel.

The ensuing trial acquitted Zenger and set a precedent in the courts for the establishment of a free press. Indeed, Zenger's trial is considered to be a major impetus for insuring freedom of the press in America.

St. Paul's Church has played other roles in our Nation's history. Ann Hutchinson took refuge in the church from those seeking to persecute her for her religious beliefs. The church served as a hospital for Hessian troops in 1776 and as a courthouse for some of our Nation's most brilliant legal practitioners.

Today St. Paul's Church stands as a living symbol of our freedoms and how they were shaped. I believe Congress should recognize the great contributions that St. Paul's Church has made to our Nation's history, and I urge my colleagues to support the resolution which I am introducing today.

I am including in the RECORD a text of the resolution:

H. RES. 618

Whereas Saint Paul's Church, in Mount Vernon, New York, has, since its founding in

1665, been the setting for historical events that have significantly contributed to the development of the Bill of Rights, including the first amendment guarantees of freedom of religion, separation of church and state, and freedom of the press;

Whereas the election held on the village green adjacent to Saint Paul's Church on October 29, 1733, and the subsequent attempt by the British Governor of New York to suppress the publication by John Peter Zenger of accounts of the corruption involved in such election, resulted in the trial and acquittal of John Peter Zenger and the establishment of a significant precedent for freedom of the press in the Nation;

Whereas Saint Paul's Church has been noted as the "The National Shrine for the Bill of Rights;

Whereas the importance of Saint Paul's Church to the Nation has been recognized by its designation as a National Historic Site in 1943, and its inclusion in the National Park System in 1980; and

Whereas December 15, 1982, the 191st anniversary of the incorporation of the Bill of Rights into the Constitution of the United States, is a particularly appropriate occasion on which to recognize the role of Saint Paul's Church in the development of the Bill of Rights; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the House of Representatives hereby commends Saint Paul's Church, in Mount Vernon, New York, in recognition of its significant role in the development of the Bill of Rights.●

THE DISPOSSESSED

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, in the weeks ahead as we strive to develop an answer to the country's economic crisis, I think it is appropriate that we be reminded of how our actions in this Chamber can affect the lives of millions of Americans.

This article was brought to my attention by a businesswoman from my district, Ann Sheinwald of Rockport, Mass. Ms. Sheinwald was moved by the poignancy of Mr. George Getschow's article in the Wall Street Journal and asked me to share it with my colleagues.

As we debate alternative solutions to the unemployment problem, each of us should consider the suffering of those who cannot find work.

The article follows:

THE DISPOSSESSED: HOMELESS NORTHERNERS UNABLE TO FIND WORK CROWD SUN BELT CITIES

(By George Getschow)

"They's movement now. People movin'. We know why and we know how. Movin' cause they got to. That's why folks always movin'. Movin' cause they want somepin better'n what they got. An' that's the on'y way they'll ever get it."—JOHN STEINBECK, "The Grapes of Wrath." 1939

HOUSTON.—Some 30 miles from the center of this sprawling Sun Belt city, on the banks of the San Jacinto River, is a community that came into existence some six

months ago. It now has about 250 residents, most of whom came from other states, and is continuing to grow week by week.

Its name is found nowhere among real-estate ads. Indeed, it has no official name. Neighbors, however, call it Tramp City U.S.A. because its residents sleep in tents, cook on campfires and collect aluminum cans for a living.

Those who live here deeply resent being called tramps. Most are displaced families from depressed Northern states who have lost their jobs, exhausted their unemployment benefits and trekked south in search of work, only to find such work is no longer available. "We have no job, no money and no place else to go," says William Loveall, whose family drifted to the tent community from Detroit two months ago after their real-estate business collapsed and their savings evaporated.

DIRE STRAITS

Stirring a pot of beans simmering on his campfire, Mr. Loveall surveys the poor and tattered people around him and discusses reports that local merchants and homeowners regard the tenters as a collection of ne'er-do-wells. "A lot of locals think we love it out here," he says. "They don't realize just what a fix we're in."

Across the U.S., tens of thousands of families and individuals are in a similar fix. Not since the mass economic distress of the Great Depression, which drove the nation's destitute into tin-and-tent towns called Hoovervilles, have so many working-class people suddenly found themselves in such dire straits. President Reagan has urged the 11.6 million Americans who are officially unemployed to "hang in there" until the economy recovers. But many of the nation's jobless have nothing left to hang onto.

A recent report by the U.S. Conference of Mayors says thousands of families have been evicted from their homes and are living in cars, campgrounds, tents and rescue missions. The report notes that federal welfare programs that would have once kept such families afloat have been sharply cut back and adds that many more of the nation's "new poor" will spill onto the streets after the 26 weeks of their unemployment benefits expire.

It is a situation that is affecting towns and cities across the country. In New York, officials say the city's five public shelters, now jammed with 3,700 people, won't be able to accommodate the 1,500 more expected this winter. In Detroit, a new 45-bed shelter was filled the first night it opened. In Cleveland, Depression-style soup kitchens that once catered to skid-row loners have been revived and expanded to serve whole families.

BITTER HARVEST

But nowhere is the ugly specter of the homeless poor more shocking than here in the Sun Belt, which is reaping the bitter harvest of unemployment from all over the country. "I swear it looks like 'The Grapes of Wrath' around here," says Virginia Cuvillier, director of Houston's Travelers Aid Society. In the last 12 months, the society has seen 22,000 transients, mostly from Indiana, Ohio and Michigan.

Lured by tales of unlimited employment opportunities and the refuge of warmer weather, the jobless are streaming into the "promised land" in groaning jalopies, packed with bedsprings and babies, in numbers that may exceed even the highest estimates of 50,000 a month. But in an ironic twist from the '30s, when tens of thousands of Okies fled their barren farmlands in the

dust bowl for fruitless vineyards in the West, today's migrants are mostly Northerners headed for the now-sputtering oil fields of Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado and other states.

In Galesburg, Ill., for example, a city of about 35,000 hard hit by an epidemic of plant closings and layoffs, there are at least 900 vacant homes. "Hundreds of families packed up and headed for the oil fields," says Howard Martin, the director of Galesburg's Salvation Army. "They get there and find that the jobs have dried up, but they can't return because they have no homes or jobs to return to."

"DON'T COME HERE"

Some Sun Belt cities have been trying to put out the message that the area no longer is the land of opportunity they once boasted about. "We now say to the unemployed people from Michigan, Ohio and Indiana, 'Don't come here, we don't have jobs,'" says Clyde Cole, director of the Tulsa (Okla.) Chamber of Commerce.

But for many, the message doesn't get through. Tulsa now has several thousand transients stranded in campgrounds or under bridges. Downtown Denver has filled up with so many homeless people that they have begun overflowing into the prosperous suburbs of Lakewood and Arvada. And even in a smaller oil town like Abilene, Texas, whose population is about 104,000, there may be 5,000 people living in tents, abandoned buildings and cardboard boxes, says June Benigno, executive director of the Abilene mental-health association.

Outside Houston, the community called Tramp City U.S.A. was organized with the help of the Rev. Ray Meyer, a local preacher, and is located on state property. With assistance from six volunteers, Mr. Meyer retrieves food that has been discarded by grocery stores and vegetable stands, cleans it up and delivers it to the tent people. Residents provide their own tents.

Newcomers to the community are welcomed by Barbara Tolbert, recently appointed "town greeter" by Mr. Meyer because she and her four children have been residents for four months and she knows everyone well. Mrs. Tolbert offers the new arrivals some food, finds them a space to set up housekeeping and even helps them enroll their children in school. She also gives them a manual entitled "How to Survive in the Out of Doors," written by Mr. Meyer.

A typical newcomer is Dave Johnson, who lost his job and home in Gary, Ind., after the steel mill that employed him shut down. He arrived in Texas with his pregnant wife, Donna, two children and high hopes of finding work. "At home, all you ever hear about are all the jobs down here," he tells Barbara Tolbert. She replies: "I hate to disillusion you, but"—she points to a parking area filled with out-of-state license plates—"that's what everybody else here heard, too."

The problems facing these homeless legions in the Sun Belt grow apace with their numbers. Not the least of those problems is the frontier philosophy pervading much of the region that "you take care of yourself and your own," says John Hansan, executive director of the Washington, D.C.-based National Conference on Social Welfare. Because of that attitude and because the Sun Belt hasn't faced widespread unemployment and poverty before, Mr. Hansan says, public and private philanthropic agencies to help the poor and needy are in desperately short supply in many Sun Belt cities.

And the supply is getting shorter; some cities in the region are closing down private shelters, hoping the homeless will go away.

Phoenix, Ariz., for example, in the past year has condemned three shelters and several soup kitchens and has passed a slew of ordinances that, among other things, make it a crime to sleep in the parks at night or lie down on the sidewalks during the day. The reason for those actions was to make room for downtown renewal projects and to insure that "panhandlers and derelicts," as many citizens call them, wouldn't spoil the success of those projects.

The Arizona Republic, Phoenix's morning daily, and many of its readers supported the city's actions. "We Didn't Tolerate Prostitutes, Why Tolerate Bums?" the newspaper asked in an editorial headline. A letter to the editor from a reader made this observation: "If a stray dog is found wandering the streets, it is picked up and put to sleep. Unfortunately, we cannot put these 'human animals' to sleep, but we surely should not support and encourage their way of life."

According to Louisa Stark, a Phoenix anthropologist, the city's cold shoulder has been to push many of the city's 3,300 homeless out of private shelters and public parks into jails or "cardboard camps" outside the city. Wallace Vegors, assistant park manager of Lake Pleasant Regional Park, a county facility about 30 miles from downtown Phoenix, says that "lots" of people "are permanently camping" in the park and in the surrounding desert.

Others have settled on federal land near the city of Mesa, 17 miles from Phoenix. James Forrest, assistant director of the Mesa Chamber of Commerce, says the city has asked the federal rangers to get the homeless campers to move out, "but they chase them out one day and they come back the next." He adds: "As long as they don't bother anybody, we don't do too much about them."

The problem will doubtless worsen as Phoenix pushes ahead with its downtown redevelopment, Louisa Stark says. As new offices and shops replace cheap hotels and apartments, she says, "more and more people are becoming homeless because they can't find anything else they can afford."

Ambitious urban-renewal projects in southern California are also shrinking the supply of cheap housing. "Lots of longtime indigents are landing on the streets, but so are a whole new class of people—families from Michigan and Ohio that are flooding into the area," says Michael Elias, who operates a family shelter in Orange County.

There is little public sympathy for the county's 15,000 homeless, Mr. Elias says. The city of Irvine, for example, recently voted to build a \$3.5 million animal shelter for stray pets. "But the city won't donate a dime for the homeless," Mr. Elias says, "because they see them sleeping under bridges and assume they must be bums."

LITTLE COMPASSION

Even in Houston, a relatively prosperous city in the heart of the Bible Belt, there is little compassion for the growing horde of economic refugees pouring in from out of state. Kay White, a social worker who has been criticized within her own church for using church funds to aid destitute transients, says: "A lot of churches will help their own people, but as far as the Yankees go, they aren't welcome."

Joseph Williams, a laid-off landscaper from New York's Long Island, knows the feeling. Stranded on the steps of the Catholic Charities relief agency with his wife, Cor-

nelia, and their four young children, Mr. Williams, a Catholic, says the family has no shelter for the night. "The agency," he says, "told us if we were foreign refugees they could help us; otherwise we'd have to go someplace else. But where can we go? We don't have a car or money to pay for a hotel room. There's no work, and there's no family shelter here." (There is one free shelter for men; but most nights, it's so crowded that it has to turn away as many people as it can take in. The other shelters charge as much as \$5 a night, an impossible sum for many.)

So after dark, when the downtown has been deserted by those more fortunate than they, the homeless drift in, filling the parks and fighting for space in abandoned buildings. One dilapidated downtown building is so full, in fact, that its tenants have hung home-made doors with padlocks to protect their occupancy.

The increasing presence of these ragged vagrants panhandling on the streets and loitering in the library (where they go to clean up and read their hometown newspapers), has aroused fear and anger among downtown shoppers and office workers. But the police say there is very little they can do about the situation. "How can you control it?" asks Patrolman Thomas Joyner. "The city is overflowing with these people, and it's getting worse every day. Besides, it's kind of hard to crack down on them when all they're trying to do is survive."

Patrolman Joyner adds that "there's been an upswing in petty crime in the downtown area," such as stealing food from grocery stores and breaking into vending machines. "If someone doesn't have a job or any money, and they've got families to feed," he says, "they're going to steal if they have to to feed them."

The problem is particularly acute here and in other Texas cities because what welfare assistance there is in the state is limited to "unemployables"—and most homeless adults, regardless of their circumstances, are considered employable. Furthermore, the homeless can't even get food stamps because they don't have a local address. "It's a horrible Catch-22," says David Austin, a professor of social work at the University of Texas. "Many of these homeless people are half-starved, yet they aren't eligible for stamps."

One such "employable" is Ronald Larson, a 30-year-old plumber from Chicago who a few months ago lost his job, his car, his savings and, finally, his home. His family moved in with relatives, and he hopped freight trains looking for work. Now he finds himself standing in a church-sponsored soup line in Houston with 200 other homeless men, women and children, suffering from hunger and depression and starting into a future that he sees as hopeless. "If it weren't for my family," he says, "I probably would have pulled the trigger long ago."

Some of Houston's homeless survive by scavenging garbage bins in the back of fast-food chains. Others sell their blood at prices of about \$7 to \$10 a pint. Two such donors are Kenneth Harris, a 48-year-old laid-off hotel manager from Portland, Ore., and his wife, Mary. "We can't find work. We don't qualify for any assistance. So what else can we do?" asks Mr. Harris as he stands in a waiting room with at least 300 other donors. To survive, he says, he has sold his car and even his wife's wedding ring. He adds: "My blood is all I got left."

The plight of the homeless has caused some to turn their children over to county

welfare agencies. "It really pulls at your heart to see these parents give up their kids in order to provide a better life for them," says Carl Boaz, who runs Harris County's Child Welfare Emergency Shelter.

VIOLENT BEHAVIOR

Others turn to alcohol, violent behavior and even suicide. "They see new skyscrapers and shopping centers going up, and they think there's plenty of work here," says the Rev. George Grant, a minister from nearby Humble who has dealt with five suicides in a local tent community. When the homeless don't find work, Mr. Grant says, they react like a little child who has planned a magnificent birthday party but no one shows up. "It just blows them away," the minister says.

Another source of anxiety for the homeless is the threat of local vigilante groups who chase them off with shotguns and sirens. With local unemployment rising, Mr. Grant says, the vigilantes fear that they too might come to share the fate of their tent neighbors.

In "Tramp City U.S.A.," residents constantly feel the disdain of the local population. Some children refuse to go to school, having been called "river rats" by their more prosperous peers. Many of the families have also refused to go to church after one family in the community was turned away at a local parish for wearing dirty clothes.

The Rev. Ray Meyer tries to bring the Gospel to the homeless. But it isn't easy, he says, explaining: "These tent people are mostly middle-class people who've suddenly lost everything they've worked for, and they're angry at God." So rather than preaching, he sings songs, accompanying himself on his guitar. "Trouble has tossed you here and there, so now you don't even care," he sings. "You look for help at every place, but now there isn't anywhere else to go. Ah . . . but it seems like you're living in so much hell." ●

VOTE NO ON GARRISON

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the House will very shortly take up the fiscal year 1983 energy and water appropriations bill. At that time, we will have a clear-cut opportunity to demonstrate our willingness to cut unnecessary and wasteful spending. As we all know, there are many items and projects funded by the energy and water appropriations bill which are worthwhile and important expenditures. And, there are other items in that bill which are simply a waste of the taxpayer's dollar.

One of those unnecessary and wasteful items is the Garrison diversion project in North Dakota. Garrison, as you undoubtedly recall, is a Bureau of Reclamation project, designed primarily for irrigation purposes. Since we first authorized that project nearly 20 years ago, a number of serious, unanticipated problems have come to light.

We know now, for example, that the project will have a disastrous environmental impact on Canada. The Government of Canada and its citizens have been—and remain to this day—clearly opposed to construction of Garrison.

And since Garrison was authorized in 1965, we have learned that the environmental impacts—particularly the impacts on wildlife—will be profound and devastating. North Dakota, as we all know, has a rich and varied wildlife and waterfowl population. The State's special system of shallow lakes and wetlands provides critical breeding grounds for birds. I understand that North Dakota produces more ducks each year than any State except Alaska. And North Dakota provides a critical and ideal stopover for migratory birds. But much of the area the wildlife depends on could be destroyed or harmed if the Garrison project is built as authorized.

Mr. Speaker, we know that Garrison is a destructive project. We know it will cause great harm to the environment here and in Canada. We know it will cost the American taxpayer \$1 billion—and probably a lot more than that—to build. Knowing what we know, there is absolutely no reason at all to proceed with construction. Garrison is only 15 percent complete. If we stop funding now, we can limit the amount of destruction and harm to the environment. Moreover, we can save the taxpayer a substantial sum of money.

I am not opposed to looking at alternatives to the authorized project. We may well find an alternative which is environmentally and internationally acceptable. I think we should look for one and while we do, we should not spend another dime on construction of any features of the Garrison project. We all know that these water projects sometimes gain a life of their own and that construction momentum precludes modifications or honest discussion of alternatives. This is not the case with Garrison—yet. Construction has begun again in North Dakota. This year we must act to alter the course of events for we may not have the same opportunity again.

I am going to vote to delete funding for fiscal year 1983 for Garrison. I urge my colleagues to do the same. ●

CHALLENGES FACING POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

HON. E. THOMAS COLEMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, in order to meet the challenges facing higher education in the 1980's, the Congress needs a clear understanding

of the demographic, social, and economic trends which will affect our colleges and universities. Last month, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ERLBORN, delivered a speech addressing those factors.

Mr. ERLBORN's speech reflects the deep understanding he has developed of the problems and challenges facing higher education. We are indeed fortunate to have Mr. ERLBORN as a member of the Postsecondary Education Subcommittee and as the ranking Republican of the full committee.

Mr. ERLBORN's speech to the Association of American Publishers follows:

I am happy to be here today to discuss the factors affecting postsecondary education policymaking in Congress. These factors have placed Federal postsecondary policymaking in a new context and have created new challenges for the postsecondary education community to address.

Let me outline briefly what I consider to be the major economic factors. Then, after discussing each of these factors, I will give an assessment of the direction I feel Congress' response should go.

The first economic factor is the continuing need to reduce the Federal budget deficit. As we meet here today the Congressional Budget Office projects a deficit of \$155 billion for fiscal year 1983. The size of this deficit means that even assuming a sharp upturn in the economy and other deficit reducing actions on the part of the Congress, pressure to reduce or freeze the cost of Federal programs will continue. This pressure is particularly important to consider in that other economic factors suggest that there may be a need for an expansion of Federal support for postsecondary education to address certain other economy-related needs, such as science and technology education.

The second economic factor is the increase in the cost of education. For the 1982-83 academic year, the average cost of a college education has risen by 11 percent. For community colleges, the increase has been 10.4 percent.

It now costs an average of \$7,475 to attend a 4-year private institution, \$4,388 to attend a 4-year public institution and \$3,562 to attend a typical 2-year public institution. As these increases have occurred, Federal student financial aid has either been frozen or reduced.

Preliminary indications for the 1982-83 academic year suggest that minority and low-income enrollment will be below projected levels. Similarly, a shift in enrollment from 4-year to 2-year institutions also seems to be occurring.

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges is projecting a 4-percent enrollment increase for the academic year just begun. The commonly offered explanation for this increase is that tuition hikes and cuts in student financial aid are leading many students to pursue relatively inexpensive credit hours at community colleges before transferring to complete their degrees at 4-year institutions.

Such a response to tuition increases is often unfortunate because the actual availability of student aid continues to be high. Harvard University, for example, reported a sharp drop in minority applications last year despite the fact that it continues to be able to admit all students regardless of financial need.

One obvious response to this trend of declining minority enrollment would be to reopen the floodgates of Federal spending for student financial aid. In increasing the aid available to all students, aid to needy students would be assured. Unfortunately, we can no longer afford such a blanket approach. Instead, Congress must target aid to meet specific objectives.

The first objective of Federal student aid must be to assure basic access to low-income and minority students. For these students grant aid in the form of Pell grants, supplemental educational opportunity grants and State student incentive grants has been of prime importance. The college work study program, which provides a Federal subsidy to institutions providing campus jobs for students, has also assisted these students. In fact, Census Bureau statistics show that the percentage of black high school graduates enrolling in colleges increased by a full 5 percent between 1967 and 1980.

Much of this progress is directly attributable to the creation of Federal loan and grant programs to assist students. In recent years, however, Congress has either frozen or reduced spending for grant programs for low-income students despite the fact that educational costs were escalating rapidly.

Coinciding with this no-growth policy for grant programs, was a literal explosion in Federal appropriations for student loans. The guaranteed student loan program, for example, received \$945 million in appropriations in fiscal year 1979. By fiscal year 1982, the bill had risen to \$3.07 billion. The effect of this situation, which reflects the greater political popularity of student loans over grants, is that the Federal commitment to promote choice among middle-income students apparently became a higher priority than promoting basic access among low-income students.

These facts suggest a direct linkage between the guaranteed student loan program and appropriations for grant aid. Clearly, Congress must continue to seek savings in the GSL program in order to provide greater support to low-income students.

The 1981 amendments to the GSL program, which require all students with adjusted family incomes above \$30,000 to undergo a need analysis to qualify for a loan, was a much needed step in the right direction. These relatively minor changes saved the government over \$500 million in the fiscal year just ended. This fiscal year, approximately \$900 million more will be saved. I believe that additional savings proposals should now be investigated to reduce the growing annual cost of the loan program.

In approaching amendments to the guaranteed student loan program, Congress must be cautious. Legislative changes must be structured so as not to discourage students needing assistance for applying for loans. Similarly, any changes made affecting the repayment burden students must bear should be sensitive to the problem of unintentionally encouraging defaults.

A third economic factor is the likelihood of a reduced ability on the part of States to provide direct assistance to public institutions. Across the Nation, State funding for higher education as a percent of State budgets is decreasing. The Wisconsin State University system, for example, received about one-quarter of all State generated revenues a decade ago. Today, the system receives only 18 percent.

The trend of static or shrinking State budgets is nationwide. The National Association of State Budget Officers reports

that 16 States have already revised their initial 1982-83 budgets by enacting across-the-board cuts ranging from 4 to 10 percent. An additional five States may make similar reductions in the next few weeks.

It is obvious that postsecondary institutions are going to experience continuing strains on their budgets for the next few years. How severe the pressure of institutions will be will depend in large measure on increases in utilities and other physical plan costs, the need to purchase new laboratory and computer equipment, and rising faculty salaries.

In several States, schools have had to look to tuition increases to meet these expenses. In Pennsylvania, an 18-percent tuition increase was announced for the 1982-83 academic year after a State court ordered a salary increase for faculty. The University of Missouri system has enacted a 11.2 percent tuition and fee surcharge for each student next semester to offset State budget cuts. Other States are attempting to develop greater pools of institutional grant and loan funds to help low-income students meet tuition costs.

The significance of these trends is that tuition costs are likely to continue to rise at a rate at least equal to inflation. With State funding limited revenue sources such as alumni giving will become increasingly important. In fact, gifts to colleges reached an all time high of \$4.2 billion in 1980-81. While this report is encouraging, this record level is less than 6 percent of the total cost of postsecondary education in the United States.

A fourth factor influencing the future of higher education is the changing nature of the student body. The projected decline in the number of youth aged 18 to 24 over the next decade has been well publicized. This demographic change means that there will be 4.3 million fewer potential students in this age category, a drop of 15 percent. The National Center for Education Statistics estimates that the result could be a drop in college enrollment of 1.1 million in 1990.

Partially offsetting this decrease in traditional students are the changing characteristics of students attending college. Institutions are reporting an increasing number of so-called nontraditional students. These students are likely to attend 2- and 4-year public institutions and average 30 to 40 years in age. A large number of these students are married and are supporting families of their own. A large percentage is enrolled in less than full-time courses of study.

Many of these nontraditional students are pursuing additional education in response to disappointments in the job market. The education pursued ranges from programs to establish basic literacy to advanced courses in data processing. This education is job oriented and is ultimately beneficial both to the individual and to society as a whole. The students involved, however, often have very low incomes and a resulting high dependence on student aid. A recent study by Dr. Jacob Stampen of the University of Wisconsin indicates that over two-thirds of self-supporting or independent students have incomes below \$6,000 and 94 percent have annual incomes below \$12,000.

From a Federal policy perspective, Congress must assess the likelihood of two possible developments resulting from these last two economic factors. First, as tuition costs increase and the total number of students decrease, will some institutions be unable to survive? That is, will many small, mostly private institutions be forced to close as the

decreased pool of students seek out higher quality or less expensive educations? Second, will public institutions, faced with less State money and greater student resistance to tuition increases, be forced to reduce the quality of their programs?

I believe both of these developments will become increasing Federal concerns in the next few years. What responses Congress will be able to make will be determined in large part by the shape of the overall Federal budget.

A fifth economic factor relates not so much to the monetary effect of the economy on higher education but to how higher education can help spur economic growth.

The current high rates of unemployment in the economy are overshadowing a fact that will become readily apparent once the economy recovers. This fact is that the nature of job skills called for by employers in our economy is changing. Even today a severe shortage of engineers, scientists, and technicians exists. This shortage could impede economic growth in those industries where we are currently most able to compete, such as aerospace technology and computers.

Consider the following statistics:

The number of Ph D's awarded in 1980 in physics and astronomy was 985—almost identical to the number awarded in 1965 and only 57 percent of the 1,740 awarded in 1971.

The number of Ph D's employed in the United States who actually practice physics in 1977 was 18,000, down by 10 percent from the 1970 peak.

Of the 2,379 Ph D's awarded in engineering in 1980, a full 49 percent were awarded to foreign citizens. Similar statistics would also apply to the fields of chemistry, math, and physics.

In sum, these figures suggest that the educational system is failing to provide the human resources needed to maintain or enhance the ability of U.S. business to compete in the world of technology. A similar situation exists in what is fast becoming a fundamental skill in international business—foreign language skills.

In order to maintain our position in the world economy we must match the existing efforts of our competitors in product quality and innovation as well as marketing abilities. To achieve this goal, our educational institutions on all levels must begin addressing the task of improving science, math, and language education.

In accomplishing this task many States may benefit from a Federal leadership role in the form of a new Federal program. Such a program may include direct assistance to State and local educational agencies and increased assistance to postsecondary students pursuing degrees in selected fields.

Meeting the challenge of improving science, math, and language will cost money. When combined with the existing education budget of over \$14.6 billion, the increased strain on the Federal budget that would be created by a new program is obvious. There is no doubt in my mind that we must reexamine some existing programs before we embark on any new program such as I have just described.

In summarizing the five major economic factors affecting higher education over the next 5 years, it is obvious that the debt over the proper Federal role in education is likely to continue. The economy is making higher education both more expensive and more necessary.

As a nation, we will have to determine how best to help our postsecondary educa-

tional institutions meet the challenges there factors have created. In our Congress, a wide range of legislative responses will no doubt be offered. In reviewing these possible options, I believe the following principles should be followed.

First, the Federal commitment to assist students and their families meet the cost of obtaining a college education should be continued.

Second, because of the unprecedented pressures on the Federal budget, existing student aid and other Federal higher education programs should be reviewed for possible amendment to increase their efficiency and effectiveness.

Third, any policy decisions taken should be sensitive to the need to maintain the existing diversity among postsecondary institutions. New national programs should not be predicated on federally mandated curriculum or other similarly restrictive requirements.

Fourth, to the largest extent possible, the private sector should be encouraged both to support postsecondary institutions directly and to assist them in developing educational programs suitable to address the employment needs of the 1980's and 1990's.

Thank you. I would be happy to respond to any questions. ●

DOMESTIC SPECIALTY STEEL INDUSTRY

HON. STAN LUNDINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation in the House, which has previously been introduced in the Senate by Senator JOHN HEINZ, to address the serious problems being encountered by specialty steel firms in our country as they try to deal with unfair trade practices being utilized by foreign specialty steel producers to capture larger and larger shares of our domestic market.

Our domestic specialty steel industry is fighting for its very survival. This is in spite of the fact that the Office of Technology Assessment has confirmed that our domestic specialty steel industry is modern, competitive, and efficient. This year, several major specialty steel producers in our country have been forced to stop producing specialty steel; others have been forced into bankruptcy. Unemployment in the specialty steel industry is as high as 50 percent in some areas.

The specialty steel industry has provided ample and convincing documentation that a good part of its current problem is being created by unfair trade practices on the part of its international competitors. The industry has diligently and in good faith sought redress through our international trade laws, but the bureaucratic red-tape and the political complexities of our troubled international trading system have thus far failed to give way

to any serious attempt to retaliate for the damage done to domestic specialty steel firms from unfair trading practices.

In recent weeks, however, we have seen an encouraging sign that some action from the administration may finally be forthcoming to address the needs and concerns of our specialty steel industry. On November 16, President Reagan announced that he has asked the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative to oversee an expedited investigation by the International Trade Commission under section 201 of the Trade Act of 1974 to determine the extent of injury caused to domestic specialty steel producers from unfair trade practices, to initiate talks between the United States and Europeans aimed at eliminating unfair trade practices that are causing that injury, and to carefully monitor specialty steel imports. In taking these actions, the President also indicated that if specialty steel imports continued to undermine the health of our domestic specialty steel industry, he would use authority to restrict these imports.

This Presidential declaration is indeed welcome by specialty steel producers. At the same time, it is critically important that effective and timely actions be taken to implement these intentions. It is therefore important that everyone recognize that our specialty steel industry cannot tolerate additional delays or ineffective policy actions to address the concerns of our domestic producers. To delay effective action any longer is to insure the demise of this critical industry in the United States.

The legislation I am introducing today, which is already pending in the Senate, hopefully will not be needed by virtue of swift and effective action pursuant to the President's announcement of November 16. It establishes firm quotas on specialty steel products and requires that the Secretary of Commerce announce these quotas at the beginning of each fiscal year for 6 months and then again in January for the remaining 6 months of the fiscal year. These quotas would be based on strict market shares for categories of specialty steel. The act would remain effective until Congress acts to modify or revoke the import limitations.

In the past, I have not adhered to a protectionist trade philosophy. But, I believe we must acknowledge that while the United States has continued to practice what we preach in terms of free trade, we have lost many, many markets to our international trading competitors who are utilizing specific strategies to advance the interests of their own domestic industries in the world marketplace. Many times these strategies have involved unfair and protectionist trading practices.

The United States cannot sit idly by while industries such as specialty steel

which are so important to a strong industrial base and an adequate defense capability are slowly destroyed by unfair competition and foreign industrial strategies. We must begin to develop our own strategies for counteracting efforts to undermine our competitive capability.

Because we currently lack the resolve and commitment to the development of an industrial strategy for our country, and because I am convinced that we must allow our specialty industry to disappear by virtue of an ineffective response to unfair trading practices, I will diligently pursue congressional action to assist specialty steel in the remainder of the 97th and throughout the 98th Congress. If an effective program is not forthcoming in the very near future from this administration to address the needs and very legitimate concerns of our specialty steel producers this Congress must act to approve legislation I am introducing today. ●

UNEMPLOYMENT DEMANDS IMMEDIATE ACTION

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, the national unemployment figures released today represent a human tragedy of enormous proportions. Twelve million Americans are now out of work, and that does not even include the millions who have simply given up looking for work or have been forced to work only part time.

In the Pacific Northwest, we are particularly hard-hit, due to our traditional dependence upon the timber and wood products industries. Unemployment in the construction industry is well above 20 percent nationwide, with disastrous consequences for our local logging industry and lumber mills. Without immediate action, analysts predict Washington State's unemployment rate this winter may exceed even last February's record level.

It is a cruel joke for the administration to claim its economic policies are working when unemployment continues to worsen and there is no real recovery in sight.

Certainly inflation and unemployment have come down somewhat, but almost all of these so-called gains are attributable to the prolonged downturn in the economy. The severity of this recession has created enormous distortions in our economy, and we will feel the effects for years to come.

With the administration unwilling to address the problem, Congress must make unemployment and economic recovery its top priority. The Democrat-

ic House leadership has outlined a comprehensive and cost-effective program to stimulate the economy and get people back to work. The leadership's plan calls for building and repairing our Nation's vital infrastructure, a short-term public works program to get people on the job immediately, and a housing stimulus program that would be a real boost to the Northwest.

I think this sort of comprehensive program is long overdue.

In addition, we must take steps now to bring about a strong and lasting recovery. That means reducing the Federal deficit and holding interest rates down. Unless the White House is willing to compromise on its enormous Pentagon budget increases and modify last year's loaded-down tax package, there is no way we are going to sustain a strong recovery. ●

A SAD ANNIVERSARY IN EL SALVADOR

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today marks the second anniversary of the murders of the four North American churchwomen who worked among the refugees in El Salvador. This sad occasion provides us with an opportunity to reflect upon the current situation in El Salvador.

Unfortunately, violence continues to be a way of life in El Salvador. It is estimated that there have been over 30,000 noncombatant deaths in El Salvador since 1979. Particularly alarming has been the pattern of violence directed against the church in that country. This violence has included repeated threats to church workers, the disappearance of others, and the murder of several priests and lay religious workers. These attacks have come at a time when the church has made repeated appeals for dialog among the warring factions in El Salvador in the search for a nonviolent solution to the conflict.

The case of the four murdered North American churchwomen whom we remember today is a reflection of the tragic, pervasive violence that engulfs the people of El Salvador. While five former National Guardsmen have been detained by Salvadoran authorities in connection with the murder of our citizens, the prospects for investigating the possible involvement of high level officials in the crime are not encouraging. The origins of the systematic terror in El Salvador remain impenetrable.

For the Government of El Salvador to receive U.S. military assistance the administration will have to certify in

January that the human rights situation is improving. At this time, the facts simply do not support such a certification. It is my hope that the administration will carefully and honestly appraise what is really going on in El Salvador when it considers certification.

For the benefit of my colleagues, two recent articles which appeared in the New York Times follow. The first is an opinion editorial by John B. Oakes and the second is a Times editorial concerning the present situation in El Salvador:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 26, 1982]

CENTRAL AMERICAN FOLLY

(By John B. Oakes)

"Pay no attention to the rhetoric; just pay attention to the deeds," pleaded a State Department official defending the Administration's Central American policy the other day. The remark was exquisitely if unintentionally ironic. In Central America, more than anywhere else, this Administration's confrontational actions are totally consistent with its militant rhetoric.

The policy did not, of course, begin with President Reagan. Its roots go back a half-century or more, when United States Marines fought the Nicaraguan nationalist hero Augusto César Sandino and paved the way for the Somoza regime. But President Reagan and his former Secretary of State, Alexander M. Haig Jr., raised it to new heights of doctrinal folly. There is reason to hope that Secretary George P. Shultz will modify both words and deeds when he gets around to it—but by then it may be too late.

The dangerous bankruptcy of Mr. Reagan's rhetoric and action in Central America is becoming clearer every day:

1. In El Salvador—a "no win" situation reminiscent of Vietnam—Washington is committed to a military-controlled Government attempting to suppress an indigenous revolution growing out of social, political and economic chaos.

2. In Nicaragua, the United States is endeavoring to subvert a radical Government with which we refuse to negotiate except on our terms. In the best Soviet style, we are now encouraging a potential armed invasion from Florida and Honduras in order to overthrow it.

3. In Guatemala, we are edging toward support of another right-wing military dictator, who is unable or unwilling to stop the endemic massacres of Indian peasants.

4. In Honduras, the United States is building a military machine as our surrogate in the effort to overthrow the left-wing Sandinists of neighboring Nicaragua. We thereby run the risk of embroiling these and other countries (if not ourselves) in an unwanted, unnecessary and unconscionable war.

In stubborn adherence to his Central American policy of sterile anti-Communism, Mr. Reagan spares no effort to hoodwink Congress and the public.

The recent rhetorical flap over El Salvador's system of "justice" is a case in point. It was good theater when Ambassador Deane R. Hinton suddenly denounced in public—for the first time—the right-wing death squads and the "rotten" judicial system under which they have been operating with impunity.

It was good theater when the White House immediately threw a damper over his harsh words without repudiating them.

It was good theater when five national guardsmen, arrested several months ago for the vicious murder of four churchwomen from the United States, were instantaneously dredged up for a speedy trial and, doubtless, a speedier conviction.

It will be even better theater when Mr. Reagan and Mr. Hinton are able to point to this trial in the nick of time to certify (in January) that the human rights record of the Salvadoran Government really is improving enough to qualify it for continued military aid.

Yet there is still no evidence that Salvadoran courts dare proceed against the political and military higher-ups allegedly involved in daily murders in the streets and alleys. How could they when, as one State Department official has noted, "the night before a decision, someone tells a judge that we know your children and they're dead at noon if you act against a defendant." Will a carefully timed show trial of five low-ranking national guardsmen in January, with no effort to follow leads to higher authority, demonstrate respect for human rights?

"There is currently no serious investigation of the possible involvement of Salvadoran officers in ordering the killings or covering them up," says the New York-based Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights in a letter sent this month to the State Department. The committee, which has meticulously followed the case of the four murdered churchwomen from its beginning in December 1980, recently uncovered new evidence suggesting that "superiors" ordered the killing.

"We are unable to discover any lawyer in El Salvador willing to pursue a vigorous investigation of all leads in this case. This is, in part, because lawyers there do not believe that the United States Embassy is willing to support such an investigation," writes the committee. No answer as yet—not even a rhetorical one—from Washington.

Meanwhile, things go on much as before—though at a slower tempo (2,427 murdered so far this year compared to 5,331 in all of 1981). Late last month, it was reported that 15 more leaders of the political opposition had disappeared from Salvadoran streets. Eight have turned up in the hands of the military, charged with terrorism. The other seven—if there were seven—are unaccounted for.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 18, 1982]

PROGRESS, OF SORTS, IN EL SALVADOR

It says a lot about El Salvador that a decision to try anyone for murder is news. Nearly two years have passed since four American churchwomen were raped, murdered and buried in a makeshift grave; five accused killers—all former National Guardsmen—are soon to stand trial. The question is whether this constitutes enough progress on human rights to pass muster in January, when it again comes time for Congress to ratify El Salvador's eligibility for aid.

It is pretty meager progress. The guardsmen contend they were acting under orders, but inquiry into that proposition is being actively discouraged by their superiors. Indeed, the victims' relatives say they have been warned by Salvadoran lawyers that the only way to guarantee conviction of the accused is "to refute the claim that others were involved." To all appearances, the five are sacrificial offerings.

But even this semblance of progress required a vocal American threat, an overt charge by Deane Hinton, the United States Ambassador, that Salvadoran justice hardly

exists. He called attention to the unpunished slaughter of 30,000 civilians. The Ambassador was rebuked by unnamed White House sources, but he was left at his post, a powerful witness when Congress next inquires into Salvadoran rights.

Real progress will come only when an immune officer caste is finally held accountable for its part in the killings. The Reagan Administration cannot plausibly certify Salvador's eligibility for aid under American law if its courts do nothing about the higher-ups who ordered the murder of two American land reform advisers and a peasant leader in 1981. It was the release of a key suspect, a crony of Assembly President Roberto D'Aubuisson, that broke Mr. Hinton's patience.

More than American moralism is at stake. In a bitter civil war, many crimes will go unpunished. But when a government proves incapable of curbing the worst excesses of its own forces it converts its own population to the guerrilla cause. For El Salvador's sake, no less than ours, progress on human rights is a valid touchstone for aid. ●

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to say a few words on behalf of one of the most distinguished Members in the House of Representatives, my friend and colleague, JACK BRINKLEY.

It has been my pleasure to serve the last 14 years with JACK. During that time he has proven to be a brilliant and dedicated legislator. His work on the Armed Services Committee, where he has chaired the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, and on the Veterans' Affairs Committee has been exceptional and he has driven himself to produce legislation of lasting benefit not only to his constituency but the entire Nation.

I know how much time and effort JACK devoted to the American people through his untiring efforts in fulfilling his committee responsibilities. He has been forthright and forceful when stating his positions. All those who understand the workings of Congress will agree the JACK is one who truly represented his constituents and got things done.

Through my position as chairman of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, I have a personal knowledge of the good job JACK has done for the people of Georgia. Of particular notoriety has been JACK's continued involvement in the development of Corridor-Z in Georgia. This highway, which was designated as a priority primary road and thus became eligible for Federal aid in 1981, stretches approximately 250 miles from the city of Columbus to the city of Brunswick—which is situated on the Atlantic Ocean. It has been

JACK who has kept a close eye on Corridor-Z all these years and has shepherded its development. The project has become a great asset to the State of Georgia and its residents—thanks to JACK BRINKLEY.

When the 98th Congress convenes in January, you can be sure that JACK's presence and friendly disposition will be greatly missed by all of us who have had the pleasure of serving with him. JACK has been a good friend of ours through the years and he has shown enormous wisdom in understanding the needs which face the people in the State of Georgia as well as the other 49 States.

My wife, Lee, joins me in saying farewell to JACK, and we wish him and his wife, Alma, and their two children, Jack, Jr., and Fred, all the best in their future endeavors. ●

**RUSSIANS ARE READY,
AMERICANS ARE NOT**

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the new national newspaper, USA Today, conducted an interview with Dr. Edward Teller, the father of the H-bomb, which appeared in its November 3, 1982, issue. In response to questions, Dr. Teller discussed the need for more defensive weapons for the United States, such as a better civil defense, and weapons to defend against attack by nuclear missiles. These are life and death matters for the United States. We need to stop throwing up our hands and saying nothing can be done. As he points out, we avoid war by deterring it, not by disarming.

The interview from USA Today follows:

[From USA Today, Nov. 3, 1982]

RUSSIANS ARE READY, AMERICANS ARE NOT
(Edward Teller, 74, is known as the principal architect of the hydrogen bomb. Teller, who studied with Neils Bohr, worked on the Manhattan Project in 1949 at the Los Alamos Laboratory, which developed the atomic bomb. He coauthored *The Constructive Uses of Nuclear Explosives*. Teller was interviewed by USA Today's Wallace Terry)

USA TODAY. Do you really think mankind is stupid enough to start a nuclear war?

TELLER. There is nothing in the world that is as clever or as stupid as people.

USA TODAY. Why do you believe the Russians would win a nuclear war if one occurred today?

TELLER. Because they are prepared, and we are not.

USA TODAY. How do we stop other nations from developing nuclear weapons? Isn't the world becoming more dangerous with that kind of proliferation?

TELLER. I have tried to emphasize that the best way to avoid war and create peace is not by control of the instruments of war, but by the control of the cause of war.

USA TODAY. What is your basic objection to the bilateral freeze approach to arms control?

TELLER. It makes no sense. It talks about a purely imaginary situation. It makes just as much sense as praying for rain.

USA TODAY. Do you think the public can and should effectively participate in the nuclear arms debate?

TELLER. The public should participate in every important debate. But the public should also be informed. As long as the information is not available under the rules of secrecy, participation by the public will do much more harm than good.

USA TODAY. With enough nuclear weapons in the U.S. arsenal alone to destroy the world, why do you advocate a stronger arsenal to protect us against the Russians?

TELLER. You say there are enough weapons in our arsenal to destroy the world? That is a myth. I am advocating more defensive nuclear weapons. And defensive nuclear weapons so far, practically, do not even exist in our arsenal. The distinction between weapons of destruction and weapons for defense, between weapons of crude power and weapons that are sophisticated—this is an exceedingly important distinction we should make.

USA TODAY. If we have more nuclear weapons and greater accuracy in delivering them than the Russians do, then why aren't we in better shape than they are?

TELLER. I don't know that we are better able to deliver.

USA TODAY. You have spoken of a new secret weapon in early stages of development which can prevent a successful Soviet attack. Doesn't that kind of development simply encourage the Russians to scramble for more weapons?

TELLER. I have spoken of several new defensive weapons, which can prevent a Soviet attack. It might encourage more Russians development. And they may even succeed in countering ours, provided they spend 10 times as much on offensive weapons as we are spending on defensive weapons. But they won't be able to afford to do that.

USA TODAY. You have urged the CIA to release information about Soviet civil defense systems. If it did, what would we learn, what would we do as a result?

TELLER. We would understand why the Soviets have spent more than \$1 billion every year on civil defense, and why the Soviet people are safer than the American people. We should be able to evacuate our cities when we see that the Soviets have started to evacuate theirs. I don't believe the Soviets will dare attack us without evacuating part of their population. But we have a strong economy. We certainly have many more cars. If we are organized, then we can start the evacuation later and finish it earlier than the Soviets. If we don't have this system of counter evacuation, then the Soviets may evacuate and attack. If we do have it, the Soviets will not try.

USA TODAY. If, as you say, the cobalt bomb is a figment of the imagination, can there be a weapon more powerful than the H-bomb?

TELLER. The cobalt bomb is not supposed to be more powerful. It is designed to increase the radiation hazard—not for a military purpose, but for the specific purpose of maximum, lasting death. In its very conception, the cobalt bomb is an absurdity. Only people who are trying to make nuclear weapons appear absurd even talk about the cobalt bomb.

USA TODAY. How do you make a nuclear war safe?

TELLER. By avoiding it. And I avoid it partly by agreement with the pastoral letter not to start it, and partly by urging the kind of defenses which will dissuade the Soviets from starting it.

USA TODAY. The anti-nuclear lobby always dwells on the enormous destruction that nuclear war would mean, beyond the impact of the explosions.

TELLER. That is an exaggeration of a terrible damage. They paint pictures of the end of the human race, or even the end of life on Earth. Now there is something in most grownups that makes us listen to horror stories. Many of the old fairy tales bear witness to that. The horror movies do. It is to these instincts that the anti-nuclear crowd caters. I don't think it is realistic to frighten Americans away from war.

USA TODAY. But they say that life would be unbearable after a nuclear war. Could you live in such a world?

TELLER. One of the basic laws of life is that it wants to continue. You and I have the choice of ending our lives, and we don't. Everybody has gone through periods of despair and survived. If the Soviets were to win, I may not want to live. But I prefer to think that even under those circumstances, I would like to find a way to stay alive and work for the future.

USA TODAY. What is your idea of a safe world?

TELLER. I know how an unsafe world looks, because I am from a part of Europe caught between the Nazis and the Communists. For me a safe world, relatively speaking, is the United States. But anything like absolute safety does not exist. I cannot imagine it.

USA TODAY. When the first bomb was tested, Robert Oppenheimer recalled that a few people laughed, a few cried, most were silent. How did you react?

TELLER. I was impressed.

USA TODAY. In Oppenheimer's mind there floated these words from the Bhagavad-Gita in which Krishna says, "I am become death, the shatterer of worlds." Do you consider yourself one of the creators of our destroyer?

TELLER. Robert Oppenheimer and I were certainly very different kinds of people.

USA TODAY. In 1954, you opposed granting Oppenheimer security clearance during a hearing before the Atomic Energy Commission. That caused him great damage and you great hurt because many of your colleagues shunned you. Later you supported his nomination for the Fermi Award, but he didn't recover his full reputation before his death. Should more be done to restore it?

TELLER. Oppenheimer did a wonderful job as director of Los Alamos, a job which I have never seen equaled. What he did after the war, I disagreed with. It is far beyond my understanding why he would have done such things. He was so complicated as a person that I did not understand him. And where I cannot understand, I have to stop talking.

USA TODAY. Have you fully recovered from the controversy, physically and mentally?

TELLER. Whether I have recovered, I don't know. And it doesn't matter. I believe the United States has not recovered. The Oppenheimer case introduced a deep division among scientists: the majority which will not work on military problems, and the minority—to which I belong—who do.

USA TODAY. Why do you object to being called the father of the H-bomb?

TELLER. I don't care what I am called. But the H-bomb has never sent me a Father's

Day card. To mix biological metaphors with the serious questions of war and peace is not only inappropriate, but in horribly bad taste.

USA Today. Dr. Teller, here are two last questions.

TELLER. I am objecting to two last questions. There seems to be a problem there in mathematics and logic.

USA Today. Agreed. What would you like to be remembered for?

TELLER. I am not interested in being remembered.

USA Today. This is the last, last question. What would you insert into a capsule to be sent into space so that life elsewhere could understand our civilization? A book? A work of art? A piece of music? An invention?

TELLER. I will give you an answer I haven't given you yet: I don't know. You are asking me how to talk to some entity, which might possibly exist, which probably exists, but of which I don't have the slightest conception. You are talking of things of which science fiction is made. As a very young man I played with the idea of writing science fiction. I found that science is so much more interesting than fiction. Rather than thinking about your space capsule, I'd rather think about the real problems of science and other fields. And that doesn't leave me any free time at all.●

MY COLLEAGUE—ED DERWINSKI

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1982

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I would be less than candid if I did not acknowledge the outstanding talents which my colleague from Illinois, Congressman ED DERWINSKI, has brought to this great legislative body. As the ranking member on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and as a prominent minority member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressman DERWINSKI has made major contributions to the legislative product and the policy decisions of our Nation during his 24 years of exemplary service. ED DERWINSKI's colorful debate on the floor of the House of Representatives has always commanded the attention of his colleagues as he exploited his special talent for interspersing good humor and inoffensive sarcasm in the arguments which he advanced. The results were generally consistent with the position which he held and I was normally one of those who followed ED DERWINSKI's lead.

The partisan and unjust congressional redistricting which is the principal reason for ED DERWINSKI's and my demise from further congressional service involved some unfortunate disagreements. While there is some chance that the Illinois General Assembly might adopt a congressional redistricting plan which would supersede the map developed individually by the Democratic leader of the Illinois House, it appears that ED DER-

WINSKI and I have come to the end of our long service in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I wish my colleague ED DERWINSKI every success in his new and important role as Counselor of the Department of State. His services, particularly on the Foreign Affairs Committee and as the leading Member of our Congress in the affairs of the Interparliamentary Union where he and I have served for many years, combine to provide ED DERWINSKI with exceptional experience, wisdom, international contacts and other qualities which can enable him to continue his public service in behalf of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish also to take note that ED DERWINSKI and his wife, Pat, as well as my wife, Doris, and I have had cordial social relations during our years together in the Congress and particularly as we have participated in the numerous Interparliamentary Union conferences in various national capitals around the world. Congressman ED DERWINSKI's service is deserving of high commendation and appreciation as he transfers his talents and energies from this House to the Department of State.●

A NEW ROLE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by C. Nelson Grote, district president of Washington Community College District 17 in Spokane, Washington. In his editorial, published in the Community and Junior College Journal this month, Dr. Grote points out that this Nation's community colleges could play a significant role in developing a Federal policy for disseminating Federal technological research and development. I have known Dr. Grote for numerous years, and know that when he was president of Schoolcraft College in Livonia, Mich., his opinions were highly regarded. I proudly present the following editorial to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in hopes that my colleagues will give serious consideration to Dr. Grote's ideas.

The article follows:

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER EXTENSION SERVICE

Billions of dollars are being spent annually in federally sponsored research and development. Just as in higher education, dissemination of research results is often ineffective. Technology transfer (the transfer of the technology resulting from research) has the potential of increasing our productivity as a nation, yet it is difficult to disseminate the technology to local users, especially small business. While federal R&D can and should affect the business and industrial community at the grass-roots level, the

R&D community is not responsive to local needs. It is focused in Washington, D.C., because of funding sources. What is needed is a delivery system that interfaces the R&D community with people and problems at the local level. Such an interaction has the potential of making a substantial contribution to our sagging economy, putting America back to work, and repositioning the United States in the field of technology.

Most of us are familiar with the Morrill Act of 1862 that established land-grant colleges in America—the beginning of the agricultural and mechanical arts in higher education. The need for agricultural research in the new country where agriculture was dominant became increasingly apparent in the nineteenth century. The pressure grew until Congress again responded in 1887 with passage of the Hatch Act. This act authorized the establishment of an agriculture experiment station in connection with one of the colleges in each state established under the Morrill Act of 1862. Many programs were developed involving the federal government, state government, and local groups and agencies. Out of this period of 1887 into the early 1900's grew a concept that was formalized with passage of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which authorized cooperative extension work. The purpose of the act states, in part: "... provide educational and technical assistance to 1) farmers, producers and marketing firms on how to apply new technical developments emanating from agricultural research..." (italics added for emphasis). The name "Cooperative Extension Service" was derived from a tripartite arrangement of cost-sharing by federal, state, and local units of government. The term "Cooperative" is used to describe the special relationship between the Department of Agriculture and land-grant universities that was further enhanced by the passage of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. The term "Extension" denotes the process of extending educational resources of the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant universities to all citizens in the United States. The term "Service" has come to connote the educational role. It is interesting to note, even in the enabling legislation of 1887 (Hatch Act), the term "diffusing" was used in the following manner: "... in order to aid in acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects connected with agriculture..." (italics added for emphasis).

There is a lack of societal balance in the federally sponsored R&D enterprise and a concomitant imbalance in the redistribution of the "knowledge of technology"—the application of technology in local business and industry. The same situation was true of agricultural research prior to the passage of the Smith-Lever Act. Therefore, the act talked in terms of "... successfully communicating relevant research findings to the people in all walks of life." While the land-grant university was both the source of research and the "broker" of research through the experiment station and the extension services, the transfer of technology also required a broker.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DELIVERY SYSTEM

A potential "broker" for a national delivery system of technology transfer is already in place, with some variations among the states. There is no need to create a new system—another potential bureaucracy. Instead of the Cooperative Extension Service

based at a land-grant college with counties as its substructure, a cooperative technology extension service based at community colleges, using college districts as its governmental units, has already been created. Just as the Cooperative Extension Service is a grass-roots operation, the community colleges are community-based. We are already providing programs and services to meet the unique needs of local business, industry, and government. Community college resources, both material and human, are already made available and accessible to local business and industry. It would be only natural for the community colleges to become more involved in technology transfer.

It is important to point out that the delivery system should not just serve as an "agent" but as a "catalyst." In other words, not only is it essential that federally funded technology be "looped" back into the free enterprise system but that problems of business and industry, especially small business, be identified as a target area for future research. One of the great strengths of the Cooperative Extension Service was not only to establish the relationship between services and research, which provided channels for the new knowledge, but also to allow human needs and problems to be transmitted to the scientists.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION NEEDED

It is appropriate and timely that the leadership within the community college movement enter into meaningful dialogue with representatives from Congress and representatives from the many federal agencies to share in the development of a cooperative technology extension service. It is hoped that an agreement can be reached that it is in the best interests of this nation that federally funded research and development be brought to bear on the problems of business and industry on an equitable basis and at a minimal cost. Just as the Hatch Act was the way Congress responded to an agricultural economy, Congress needs to recognize the need for industrial research in a technological society by passing a new act, almost 100 years later.

Because states differ, a national system of technology transfer will need to recognize those unique characteristics of the states. While some states have community colleges, others have senior colleges and universities with branch campuses. Highly structured state systems of higher education exist side by side with "non-systems." Some states have a system of area vocational-technical schools while others combine state-operated postsecondary institutions—local and regional colleges within a single state. However, all states have postsecondary institutions, both public and private, which serve major population centers if not the majority of an entire state. Therefore, the common denominator is the availability of postsecondary educational institutions.

It is clear that a cooperative technology extension service must be educationally based. It is also clear that States that have comprehensive community colleges already have a potential delivery system—a structure into the grass roots of their respective service areas and communities that could be used immediately. Just as the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges has provided the vehicle for State land-grant institutions to work with one another and with the Department of Agriculture, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges not only has the ability to bring together the more than 1,200 community colleges throughout the

nation, but could also serve as the liaison with appropriate Federal agencies in Washington, D.C.

The responsibility for technology transfer could not only serve as our challenge in the eighties, but could enhance our relationships with the business and industrial community and contribute to the economic development of our respective States as well as the Nation. In addition, this could be another way for community colleges to play an important role in high technology. ●

NUCLEAR ARMS RACE—A THREAT TO HUMANITY

HON. HAROLD WASHINGTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues a petition signed by 3,300 college and university faculty in the Chicago area, protesting the continuation of the nuclear arms race.

These thoughtful men and women were quick to understand the dangers inherent in an unrestrained arms race. They have recognized the threat posed to densely populated areas such as Chicago, which are likely to be among the first targets in any nuclear exchange. And they are equally mindful of the drain that unrestrained military spending places on the civilian economy.

I was very pleased to accept their petition, which reads as follows:

We, members of the higher education and research community, believe this is the time to take action.

Our work of teaching and research is directed to the future, but the mounting risk of nuclear holocaust puts the future in doubt.

Nuclear weapons offer no solution to the political, economic, and ideological conflicts between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Spearheaded by the nuclear arms race, world military expenditures now total \$550 billion per year, while global economic, social and environmental problems go unremedied.

Therefore, we call on all members of the higher education and research community in the United States and other nations to press all governments for an immediate and complete freeze on all further testing, development, production and deployment of nuclear weapons:

And, as Americans, we call on our Congress and President to propose to the Soviet Union and all other governments an immediate and complete freeze on the nuclear arms race.

Following are excerpts from my remarks to the Council of the Chicago Area Faculty for a freeze on the nuclear arms race (CAFF) made after receiving the petition from Dr. Ronald Williams, president of Northeastern Illinois University:

President Williams, I am happy to receive from you these petitions to the Congress, signed by 3,300 faculty members of the Chicago area higher education community, that

call for a mutual freeze on the U.S.-Soviet nuclear arms race. I also want to thank Professor Truman Morrison of the McCormick Theological Seminary and chairperson of C.A.F.F., for inviting me to speak before this concerned and responsible group of educators.

What you have done is most impressive as well as reassuring for our common future. Starting in January, you have already gained more than 700 faculty members and brought the nuclear freeze campaign to 40 college and university campuses in the Chicago area. During my years in Congress, I have been a wholehearted supporter of efforts to slow down and completely halt the further building of nuclear weapons by the nations of the earth. I can report to you that the movement which has caught fire this spring throughout the country has also caught fire in Congress—we are no longer a small and lonely band.

But the forces that propel the nuclear race are still very formidable, and the pioneer work you have started in higher education must continue and grow if we are to overcome these forces. I know that you are as fully aware as I am that a mutual halt to nuclear weapons building will not only enhance our chances for survival but will also free up billions of dollars to meet such vital needs as education, health, housing, mass transportation, and environmental protection, among others.

I urge you to continue your efforts; the vigorous and expressed support for the freeze proposal by the American academic community can have a marked influence on many Members of Congress. ●

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

HON. DAN DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1982

● Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, most of us, had the choice been ours, would not be here on this particular day. Given a say in the matter, we would not have returned to Washington until the beginning of the 98th Congress.

But we are here. And in one respect, at least, it is a good thing, for it provides us an opportunity to recognize publicly those of our number who will not return.

Today we are saying publicly what most of us have said privately for years now regarding our valued colleague, the Honorable ROBERT MOLLOHAN.

BOB MOLLOHAN is a man for whom the adjectives of virtue were invented. He is a wise man, never pushing his views on you, but always willing to share his good judgment. He is a conscientious man, as reflected by his able service in the Congress, on the Armed Services Committee, and in a number of public capacities over a lifetime.

Congressman MOLLOHAN's advice and counsel has been invaluable to me, and I, like all who have known him these

past 14 and more years, will miss him when we convene again.●

TRIBUTE TO MEMBERS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION WHO ARE CONCLUDING THEIR SERVICE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. WILLIAM J. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, when the 98th Congress convenes in January, three able Representatives from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will not be among its number. Their contribution to this Congress, and others before it, was such that we most surely will feel their absence.

Representative ALLEN ERTEL made his mark as district attorney in Lycoming County before he came to Congress in 1977. Elected as a Democrat, against great odds, in Pennsylvania's 17th Congressional District, he courageously took up his party's standard in an uphill race for Governor in 1982. Again, against great odds, he did extremely well. ALLEN was always willing to assist new Members of Congress, including myself, in learning the ways of the House of Representatives. His public service, I know, is not yet at an end.

Representative DON BAILEY of the 21st District is typical of western Pennsylvania residents. An excellent football player at the University of Michigan, DON is also a veteran of the Vietnam war. He has made the needs of veterans of that conflict among his top priorities since coming to Congress in 1979. Well-liked by his colleagues, he has made a major contribution to this body.

Congressional redistricting contributed to Congressman BAILEY's leaving the House. It also eliminated a congressional seat on the eastern side of our State, depriving us of the service of Representative JOE SMITH. JOE's past elected positions in Pennsylvania government made him very effective during the all too short period of time he served in the Congress. A real gentleman who knows well the governmental and political process, and acts accordingly, JOE will be missed.

Each of these men added to the dignity and knowledge of this body. They will contribute in like manner in whatever endeavor each chooses. Their colleagues in that work will be, as we have been, the better for their association with Representatives ALLEN ERTEL, DON BAILEY, and JOE SMITH of Pennsylvania.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, HON. PAUL FINDLEY, HON. ROBERT McCLORY, AND HON. TOM RAILSBACK

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1982

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to acknowledge the achievements of four of my fellow Republican Congressmen who will be leaving us at the end of the 97th Congress. On small consolation we other Republicans can take in our loss of these four fine Members from Illinois is that the two sponsors of this special order, Mr. MICHEL and Mr. ERLBORN, will be continuing their fine work in the 98th Congress.

ED DERWINSKI and I entered the Congress together in 1958. Since that time, Ed has done a fine job representing the people of Illinois' Fourth Congressional District and, unfortunately, the redistricting of Illinois have cost us one of our most compassionate and knowledgeable Members. A high-ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Ed has been the most outspoken advocate for human rights for those behind the Iron Curtain. The people of this Nation whose families were able to flee Soviet oppression owe Ed great debt of gratitude for having served as a watchdog of russification efforts by the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe. As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Ed has worked diligently to insure the existence of an efficient, competent Federal work force, and a national mail service second to none in the world. Ed's many talents, as well as his affable nature, will be sorely missed in the next Congress.

Fellow Congressman PAUL FINDLEY has been a man of strong convictions who has faithfully served the 20th District of Illinois and the Nation since 1960. His work on the Agriculture and Foreign Affairs Committees has been diligent and sensitive, and the expertise he has developed over the past 22 years will not be easily replaced. I wish him all good fortune in whatever endeavors he chooses to pursue.

Retiring after 20 years of service to Illinois' Third District, is my colleague BOB McCLORY. During his tenure in the House, BOB rose to the position of ranking minority member of the House Judiciary Committee, and played an important role in that committee's Presidential impeachment hearings in 1974. He has also served with distinction on the Select Committee on Intelligence, where his integrity and fairness have been exemplary.

At this time, I would also like to laud the accomplishments of the Congressman from the 19th Illinois District, TOM RAILSBACK. TOM joined our ranks in the election of 1966, and for many years was a stalwart of my Republican baseball team. His concern for maintaining the integrity of this body manifested itself in the formulation of the Obey-Railsback bill, which would have gone far to reduce the influence of special interest groups in the Congress. His expertise in this field will be greatly missed, as the cost of campaigns climbs ever higher. I hope that TOM knows he is welcome back on my bench at any time.●

H.R. 6514

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6514, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1982, has been called a balanced and fair approach to immigration reform. I do not believe that H.R. 6514 is either balanced or fair. I appreciate the hard work that the authors have dedicated to this bill. However, the bill is not balanced and can not be fair until it includes provisions considering foreign policy aspects of immigration reform. It would be potentially disastrous for the United States to restrict itself blindly to the domestic results of immigration. U.S. domestic and foreign policies have become intertwined.

The newly installed president of Mexico, Miguel de la Madrid Hurato, has called the economic state in Mexico an "intolerable . . . emergency situation." There exists a delicate economic relationship between the United States and our Latin American and Caribbean neighbors. We must be responsible and not ignore the basic causes that drive people to leave their families and homes and emigrate to America.

Editorial boards across the Nation have inferred that H.R. 6514 is a legislative compromise that enjoys universal support. This is not true. H.R. 6514 barely survived a vote in the House Judiciary Committee to recommit the bill for further consideration. And groups across the country have urgently called for revisions to the Simpson-Mazzoli bill.

I submit below a paper by the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States. The council represents churches and religious leaders from all parts of the United States. H.R. 6514 does not have the support of the Council of the Churches of Christ. H.R. 6514 does not hold the support of many of the American people. I hope my colleagues read the

points made in the paper. And then, together, we can act responsibly and refine H.R. 6514 to acknowledge the great importance that foreign policy holds in immigration reform.

NATIONAL COUNCIL
OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Since Congress began debating H.R. 6514, we in the religious community have maintained certain reservations:

(1) The bill will not accomplish its stated objectives of protecting the rights of American workers;

(2) It does not adequately solve the problem of illegal immigration;

(3) The bill does not protect the rights of minority communities in the United States.

While much in the Simpson/Mazzoli revision is to be commended—implementing a legalization program, improving the asylum procedures by creating an independent Immigration Board—we strongly feel that our reservations have not been well considered and that should this bill become law the result will damage the interests of the American worker and of American foreign policy.

We appeal for a more generous legalization. While we are pleased that the bill provides a legalization program for some undocumented aliens already in this country, this bill falls significantly short of addressing the situation comprehensively and fairly. We encourage consideration of the following:

(1) The 1980 cutoff date leaves exploitable a group of hundreds of thousands of undocumented workers who arrived after 1980;

(2) Elimination of the "Temporary Resident" status, giving all aliens the status of "Permanent Resident". A two-tiered approach complicates an already difficult program and at the same time creates a subculture of "second-class" residents;

(3) Full rights and privileges as granted by current law to Permanent Residents should be retained for all those legalized. H.R. 6514 limits significantly the eligibility for federal benefits to those legalized as both permanent and temporary residents. It is important to note, as did Representative Rodino, that undocumented aliens have been contributing to the federal benefit programs through their taxes for years.

(4) Persons eligible must be granted one year from the actual start of the program to apply for legalization.

In sum, the legalization program in its present form will not accomplish the desired results. Both illegal immigration and the wider community of citizens will be harmed by maintaining a large number of illegal aliens who are easily victims of exploitation.

Our organizations oppose the employer sanctions provisions in H.R. 6514 and we urge adoption of the Schroeder amendment as a complete substitute for the current provisions. The sanctions as drafted in H.R. 6514 will result in discriminatory hiring and recruiting practices. The Schroeder substitute targets only those employers with a pattern and practice of hiring undocumented workers, thereby:

(1) Eliminating an unnecessary burden for the vast majority of innocent employers;

(2) Reducing the incentive for ethnic discrimination among employers;

(3) Permitting closer supervision of employment practices by the Attorney General since a smaller number of employers are covered.

We oppose the proposed changes in the H-2 Temporary Foreign Worker Program. A temporary worker program must respect the rights of U.S. citizens and permanent residents. The H-2 program does not show that fairness. Enlargement of the H-2 program permitting up to 300,000 foreign workers to take jobs in the U.S. at a time when unemployment is at a post-war high of 10.4 percent is clearly unfair to the 11 million unemployed workers in this country. The temporary worker program is equally unfair to migrant workers who have struggled for many years to achieve more humane living quarters and better wages.

We strongly support the House Judiciary Committee's proposal for the creation of an independent and Presidentially-appointed U.S. immigration Board to serve as the appellate administrative body and to be responsible for the appointment of the newly authorized "administrative law judges" and their specialized training to hear asylum cases. We further agree with the Committee that "exceptional protections are in order in asylum cases since they quite literally involve matters of life and death." For that reason, we believe that other measures of the bill, intended to speed the hearing process, must be reviewed against this consideration.

Specifically we fear that:

(1) The non-adversarial, summary exclusion provisions (Sec. 121) do not adequately take into consideration the fact that bona fide refugees are usually unable or unwilling to articulate the specific fears of persecution necessary to trigger the asylum process and its accompanying due process protections. It is imperative that they be uniformly informed of both the rights to counsel and of the rights to request asylum prior to exclusion proceedings. Frivolous claims would fail at a hearing on lack of evidence.

(2) By precluding the possibility of bringing class actions before the district courts to challenge widespread errors, the asylum process will result in unnecessary delay and expense as hundreds or even thousands of cases are first processed individually through all administrative remedies, after which, circuit courts could require a complete re-hearing.

CONCLUSION

The religious community is fully aware of the need to revise the current immigration laws and we support efforts to do that. We are concerned, however, that the Simpson/Mazzoli bill ignores international and U.S. foreign policy considerations. Immigration cannot be viewed in isolation. Rather it must be analyzed in a global context, with appreciation given to the conditions of poverty, political repression, and economic deprivation which force people to leave their homes. Long-term immigration policy planning should have as its goal not only the immediate U.S. domestic response, but also U.S. international interests in an increasingly unstable world. Failure to do just this will lead us into crisis situations for which we have no response.

On behalf of:

Mary Anderson Cooper, Associate Director, National Council of Churches.

Dale de Haan, Director, Church World Service.

William L. Weiler, Director, Episcopal Church.

James Schultz, Associate Director, Jesuit Social Ministries.

Ingrid Walter, Director, Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service.

Robert Tiller, Director, America Baptist Church.

Edward R. Killackey, Director, Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers.

Ralph Watkins, Legislative Associate, Church of the Brethren.

Robert Z. Alpern, Director, Unitarian Universalist Association.

Ms. Joyce V. Hamlin, Executive Secretary for Public Policy, Women's Division, United Methodist Church.

Alfonso Roman, Chairperson, United Church of Christ Immigration Working Group.

Harold Penner, Director, U.S. Program for the Mennonite Central Committee.

Mary Jane Patterson, Director, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.●

MONTGOMERY COUNTY HISPANIC SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, the Montgomery County government has honored 12 Hispanics for their outstanding service on behalf of Hispanic senior citizens. They are: Roberto Anson, Maria Theresa Arias, Irene Bailey, Mary Berkey, Vicente Guerra, Rafael Hakim, Emilio Perche Rivas, Elsa Pimental, Pedro A. Porro, Miryam Posada, Rogelio Quincoses, and Inez Williams. I want to share with my colleagues the following article from the Montgomery Journal newspaper on this event:

[From the Montgomery Journal, Sept. 22, 1982]

HISPANIC SENIOR CITIZENS HAVE THEIR OWN SPECIAL PROBLEMS (By Roberto Anson)

The popular picture of the Hispanic family is: mother, father, children and grandparents, all living under the same roof. Therefore, why should public and private agencies serve the Spanish speaking elderly since most of them are cared for by relatives?

This is a myth, and it is the most pervasive barrier to serving the special needs of this underserved segment of the county. The Census Bureau reports that only 9.7 percent of Hispanic elders live in an extended family situation and fully 60 percent live in husband-wife arrangements and another 30 percent live alone.

Hispanic and minority elders are widely recognized as exposed to multiple jeopardy due to age, race, ethnic origin, cultural and language differences, discrimination and widespread stereotyping. Hispanic elders are characterized by diversity, rapid growth, Spanish language dominance, low income and poorer health.

Older Hispanics are more than twice as likely to live in poverty as other aged members of our population. The average life expectancy for Americans in 1900 was also 47. The life span of Hispanic elders is between 55 and 59, contrasting with that of 73 years for the average person today.

In contrast to most Hispanics nationwide who are Mexican-American, those living in Montgomery County and in the surrounding region are primarily Central and South

American with large concentrations of Cubans and Puerto Ricans.

Data on Hispanic elders is scarcer than water in a desert, which perhaps mirrors the attitude of the rest of society toward this group. The precise number of Hispanic elders living here is unknown, but their size can be estimated by recognizing the fact that elderly Hispanics 55 and over nationwide more than doubled from 4 percent in 1970 to 9.8 percent following the 1980 census. During this same period the Hispanic community swelled by 60 percent nationwide and 37 percent in the northeast. Maryland's Hispanic elders 65 and over number over 3,000. About 60 percent of Maryland's Hispanic community lives in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties with Montgomery having the largest Hispanic concentration with almost 23,000 by government sources or 30,000 by other estimates.

The demographic growth of the Hispanic presence is beginning to evoke a response. For example, an awards ceremony honoring the outstanding contributions of Hispanic elders to the community was scheduled to take place today at the Holiday Park Multi-service Senior Center in Wheaton (3950 Ferrara Dr.) from 1-2:30 p.m. This appears to be the first government organized recognition of Hispanic elders and as such seems to represent a new awareness by local officials.

The increase in the Hispanic community and in the senior population must be matched by an equally vigorous approach to addressing their needs and problems. Some solutions to serving our Hispanic elders include funding Hispanic agencies to serve the minority elderly, public and private groups engaging in aggressive outreach services using bilingual-bicultural staff, establishing linkages with Catholic and religious institutions as well as maintaining contact with stores and events frequented by the Spanish elderly. The only Spanish radio station in the metro area is Radio Mundo (AM) in Wheaton, which is another effective method for reaching the Hispanic community.

Rogelio Quincoses, a tireless worker who helps the Hispanic elderly by volunteering his time with the Spanish Speaking Community of Maryland based in Silver Spring and who serves on the County Commission on Aging, believes that one way to improve the quality of life for the Hispanic elderly is for service providers to seek out and inform the elderly of available services. Elsa Pimental, a respected civic activist and a worker at the TESS Center in Takoma Park, states that "the most urgent need is to supplement the meager income of Hispanic elders and to better meet their health, housing and transportation needs."

Hispanic elders struggle to survive under triple jeopardy: they are old, poor and they are members of a minority group. The elderly symbolize our future selves. Hispanic elders, like all of us, desire to become managers of their own destiny.

The central question remains whether we Hispanics, young and old alike, will continue to grow in number but not in prosperity. The answer depends on the humane and ongoing response of the community. ●

WHEN WILL JUSTICE BE SERVED FOR FOUR AMERICANS MURDERED IN EL SALVADOR

HON. WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, it was 2 years ago today that four American religious workers were abducted and murdered after leaving the airport near San Salvador to return to their work in the countryside. In the 2 years that have followed this tragedy, the families of the four murdered women have kept alive the hope that those involved in this crime would be brought to justice. Regrettably, their hopes have been dashed, and their sorrow has been compounded with bitterness toward the treatment they have received not only from Salvadoran authorities, but from officials of our Government as well.

Two years later, the families have little more than a promise that five underlings who may have taken part in the executions may be brought to trial early next year. Two years later, their pleas for an investigation into upper level involvement in the murders have fallen on deaf ears. Two years later, instead of getting answers to the questions they have asked our Government, they have been shunned, lied to, and threatened.

The fact that there have been no answers—that justice has not been served for these crimes—should give us pause when considering whether to send El Salvador further military assistance. The picture becomes even worse, however, when the story behind the delays in the investigation is brought to light.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing Michael Donovan of my hometown of Danbury, Conn. Michael Donovan's sister, Jean, was one of the religious workers slain 2 years ago. The Donovan family's story—and it's a story shared by the kin of the three other murdered women—since the murder of their loved one makes her death even more tragic.

After the deaths of the four women, the families asked the U.S. State Department to launch a full investigation into the murders. The Salvadoran Ambassador at the time expressed concern that more was involved in the slayings than met the eye. Tragically, the question of involvement of higher officials was at best ignored by Salvadoran and American officials when new faces took over here in early 1981. The questions raised by the families put large holes in the contention that only the five accused Salvadoran national guardsmen were involved. Those questions, however, have largely been ignored or answered with distortions by our own Government officials.

Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy that 2 years after the deaths of Jean Donovan, Ita Ford, Maura Clarke, and Dorothy Kazel, we can stand in this Chamber and say that justice has not been served in this case, and that the murder of four Americans in El Salvador has been ignored for the sake of political considerations. There is no way we can ever restore for the families the loss they have all experienced over the last 2 years. There is a time, however, to say "enough is enough." I think we are well past that point. It is high time to rethink our support for a government that has no concern for our own people. ●

NUCLEAR POWER IS NOT SCARY, THESE REACTORS ARE

HON. STEPHEN L. NEAL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a refreshingly candid article about the U.S. nuclear energy industry which appeared in the Washington Post last Sunday. The author, Mr. S. David Freeman, Managing Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, is singularly qualified to speak on the subject. TVA is the single largest user of nuclear power in the United States.

Mr. Freeman contends that nuclear energy critics should not be blamed if the nuclear industry collapses. Rather, its demise would be the fault of the industry itself, which has stubbornly clung to a fundamentally flawed technology. Lightwater reactors, which provide almost all nuclear power in this country, according to Freeman, are unreliable, inefficient, and dangerous. The American public's fears about nuclear energy, says Freeman, are well-founded.

Although severely critical of the nuclear industry, Mr. Freeman still believes we should not "throw out the baby with the bathwater." Rather than simply scrapping nuclear power, safer and more efficient nuclear technologies should be pursued. The Swiss PIUS concept and the high temperature gas-cooled reactor are but two examples of promising technologies. Mr. Freeman argues they should be given more serious consideration by the U.S. nuclear industry and the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, for too long we have depended on the "experts" in the nuclear industry to guide our national nuclear energy policy. It is time that we admitted we got bad advice and took a fresh look at this source of energy and the Federal role in promoting it. There are many who believe nuclear energy should be abandoned and

many who would have us forge ahead on our present course. Mr. Freeman offers a balanced alternative. I urge my colleagues to seriously consider his proposal.

The article follows:

WE IN THE INDUSTRY AND OUR CRITICS HAVE
BOTH BEEN WRONG

(By S. David Freeman)

As the last militant neutral on the subject of nuclear power, and as a managing director of the nuclear industry's best customer—the Tennessee Valley Authority—I want to tell the industry's advocates that their basic argument these days is wrong.

Both the industry and its critics agree that the nuclear option is in serious trouble. Where the industry goes awry is in the cause of its demise. What's killing it is not the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or the media or Ralph Nader or Jane Fonda. It is their product itself. The nuclear industry is stonewalling the hard evidence that they need to change the design of their reactors.

The litany of nuclear reactor cancellations throughout the United States is a long one. Between October 1980 and June 1982, plans for 21 were abandoned—more than one a month. When I joined the TVA in 1977, 14 large ones were under construction, the nation's most ambitious nuclear power program. Over the past four years, we completed two reactors, but halted work on eight others because the cost of making them safe was simply going to be too much.

The nuclear industry will lose credibility altogether if it persists in trying to blame its problems on an emotional public and a regulatory process overreacting to ill-founded fears.

It's time to confess that we went too far too fast in deploying large-scale designs of a reactor type we knew too little about. Right now, we are in the midst of a de facto moratorium on new reactor orders induced by energy conservation, a stagnant economy and the skyrocketing and unpredictable cost of nuclear power.

This period should not be used simply to apply more Band-Aids to existing designs that seem incapable of meeting safety concerns at a price electric consumers are willing to pay.

The last three nuclear units TVA halted were going to produce electricity estimated to cost about 13 cents per kilowatt-hour, more than triple our present average cost of about 4 cents per kilowatt-hour. Furthermore, the number of changes required appears open-ended, since many safety issues are still not really solved. Indeed, in a sense TVA has not really "completed" any of its nuclear plants. At our Browns Ferry nuclear plant in northern Alabama, which has been commercial for years, we still have more than 600 people at work making backfitting changes.

In short, the cost of a new nuclear plant isn't just high, it's unpredictable. No sane capitalist is going to build something for which he can't derive a cost/benefit ratio because the cost is unknowable. That's why the nuclear industry is in the doldrums.

Therefore, what we should be doing is fundamentally reexamining the nuclear option. The central question is: Is there an inherently better technical option than the apparently "unforgiving" reactor design we have today? I believe the answer may very well be yes.

A lot of people, of course, would say why bother? Conservation can substitute for nuclear power and solar can be expanded in the future.

We at the TVA are second to none in our commitment to conservation and alternative energy sources. Since I joined the TVA in 1977, we have conducted energy conservation surveys of more than 600,000 living units. We've issued low-interest loans for insulation, weatherization, heat pumps, solar, and wood heaters for more than 300,000 living units. We estimate that we've recently passed the 1 billion-kilowatt mark in energy saved each year as a result.

But despite—or maybe because of—our extensive experience with these technologies, I am convinced that they are not the whole answer to our energy problems.

For the next few decades, I don't see any realistic way that less nuclear power will mean anything other than more oil and coal. And the marginal dangers of more nuclear plants of a safer design seem to me less of a threat than the added risk and economic ruin from greater reliance on imported oil, not to mention the problems of acid rain and the global threat of carbon monoxide build-up in the atmosphere associated with coal.

So let's acknowledge a few things about our present nuclear reactor designs and move on.

No matter how much we rebuild and retrofit these light-water reactors, the Three Mile Island accident has revealed that the then-existing nuclear technology was capable of self-destructing. The problems that NRC regulations are attempting to correct were real. The doubling and tripling of construction lead-times only reflect the chaotic state of nuclear plant design as the industry scrambles to retrofit safeguards that experience has shown to be necessary.

An improved standardized version of these current light-water reactors would still be overly dependent on the skill of operators. The exposed piping would still be subject to leaks and, consequently, to loss-of-coolant accidents.

While risks to the public can be and are being reduced as a result of all these retrofits and design changes, we cannot be sure that accidents wouldn't result in a melt-down and a destructive release of radioactivity.

Of course, the reactor itself could be crippled, causing the kind of disaster that has, in fact, already cost over \$1 billion in immobilized equipment and necessary cleanup. Obviously, that kind of risk is just unacceptably high—not only for the public, but for the utilities and the financial institutions that provide the capital to build the things.

A recent Swedish modification of the basic light-water reactor design addresses this problem in an imaginative way. The Swedes, paying homage to the American penchant for acronyms, call the concept PIUS (Process Inherent Ultimate Safety). This design puts all of the major components, along with the piping that connects them, inside a single, large, pre-stressed concrete vessel. The long-term cooling for the nuclear fuel is provided in a fashion that is not dependent on switches and pumps. Instead, the cooling comes from natural circulation of a large pool of water contained inside the concrete vessel itself.

This "passive" approach eliminates the need for conventional electrical and mechanical "active" safety systems and the reliance on operators to prevent an accident. It can provide cooling for about one week without external emergency cooling systems, without the use of electricity, and without operator action.

Based on its design concept, the plant should be able to tolerate operator error

and multiple failures of almost all the active systems. The American experts who have examined this concept can find no basis for challenging the designers' claim that it is incapable of having a melt-down.

No technology can be absolutely safe. But clearly a design that has the potential of being melt-down-proof deserves the necessary funding to be pursued in a thorough research and development effort.

However, neither the nuclear industry nor its critics seem interested. The industry has too much invested in the current technology, and the nuclear critics don't want to face up to the risks of expanded use of coal and imported oil in the pre-solar era.

Another alternate reactor concept is called the High Temperature Gas-cooled Reactor (HTGR). It also holds promise of greater safety and efficiency. It is far less likely to melt down because it has far greater ability to withstand and hold heat. This is made possible by the use of helium as the coolant. Unlike water, helium is already a gas. Therefore, it cannot turn into explosive steam.

This reactor is also aided by the use of graphite in the manufacturing of the reactor itself. Graphite has excellent characteristics for withstanding high heat, even if an accident were to cause the heat to head way above normal.

Helium also has fewer impurities than water, which means it doesn't corrode the pipes. And it has a lower tendency to become radioactive. As a result, an HTGR would have lower in-plant radiation levels, making maintenance easier, less hazardous and less expensive.

Finally, this reactor design uses uranium more efficiently than our present reactors do, and it could be designed to use thorium, a very abundant fuel.

The problem with HGTRs is that 10 years ago, when everybody thought light-water reactors would be commercially successful, HGTR development was halted. The Ft. St. Vrain plant in Colorado is the only operating, high-temperature, gas-cooled reactor in the country. Granted, like all other pioneering efforts, it encountered problems.

But the biggest problem is that while a number of improved designs exist on paper, there is no program, either from the federal government or from industry, for research, development, and a demonstration plant that could determine the real worth of this obviously promising approach.

The issue is whether we need a much better nuclear product or whether the current designs are adequate.

Is the problem with nuclear power an hysterical public and a weak-kneed Nuclear Regulatory Commission? Or is the problem that we should be looking for alternatives to the very product itself, when we are not?

My own opinion is that the fears of the public—now that we have seen a nuclear reactor self-destruct—are very real. They are not going to go away. We have a statement. The industry is trying in vain to prove that the fears of the public are unfounded. As we say in East Tennessee, "That dog won't hunt."

We ought to realize that with nuclear power, we are still experimenting. We are still developing a very complex technology. We stopped the research and development effort much too soon.

But we can't allow ourselves to be locked into the errors of the past. The nuclear critics—who say that no nuclear plants can work—and vested business interest—who refuse to consider changing a fundamental-

ly flawed product—may both be wrong. Obviously, therefore, we should not and cannot let either of them totally control our future nuclear policy for us.

The existing technology is just not good enough. But the national interest will be harmed if, in the pre-solar era, we become inextricably tied to imported oil or polluting coal.

Therefore, the nuclear option must not be allowed to die. If the administration is indeed as pro-nuclear as it claims to be, it must make the necessary investments in exploring different systems and new technical advances.

And if the nuclear industry does not support such an effort, then it—and not the nuclear critics—must bear the ultimate responsibility for the death of nuclear power.●

FIRST LADY BESS TRUMAN

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has been bequeathed a special gift by our former First Lady Bess Truman who passed away on Monday, October 18, 1982 at the age of 97. Mrs. Truman was one of the most loved and respected First Ladies in our Nation's history, and she left as her legacy to the American people the home and grounds of former President Harry S. Truman.

Today, I am introducing legislation to facilitate the transfer of the Truman home from the estate to the administration of the United States Park Service. Once this is accomplished, the American people will be able to explore the character of Missouri's most distinguished citizen, Harry S. Truman, in the very personal setting of his own home.

This historic site is most certainly a valuable and treasured national asset, and I urge my colleagues to join me in seeking expedient passage of this legislation.●

STRIKING A BALANCE: THE ECONOMY AND DEFENSE

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, next week, the House is scheduled to take under consideration the fiscal year 1982 DOD appropriations bill. In this bill, we will have before us incalculable sets of numbers, but during our consideration we must not lose sight of another number—a triple-digit deficit in fiscal year 1983 that will probably exceed \$150 billion. It is with that number in mind that we must then consider another pair of numbers: 7 percent real growth over 5 years in defense spending, totaling \$1.6 trillion.

This 7-percent real growth target was actually agreed upon (without much dissent) 2 years ago, at a time when we thought we would achieve a balance budget in a few short years. We now realize that goal will take much longer to reach and, if we do not reconsider that \$1.6 trillion commitment, we may never bring the deficit down to economically manageable proportions.

This 7 percent represents a target in defense growth that was arrived at without first determining, on a line-by-line basis, what exactly we should be spending our money on. The net effect is that, like the failed great society programs of a previous era, we are throwing money at the problem, without considering the economic ramifications or applying sound military doctrine consistent with our economic interests and stringent management policies. This has the effect of not only increasing the deficit, but actually encouraging waste on the part of the Defense Department.

In addition to the damage to the economy, the American people have become increasingly wary of huge defense increases combined with out-of-control deficits. If quick action is not taken, the resulting backlash could bring in dangerously sharp reductions in defense spending at the expense of manpower, training, ammunition and other essential components of our readiness capability.

Murray Weidenbaum has recently made the point as follows:

There seems to be little justification offered of the economic feasibility of this sharply upward movement . . . intensive analysis should be given to the military budget, comparable to the tough-minded attitude quite properly taken toward many civilian spending activities of the Federal Government.

The fact is our present economy simply cannot sustain this projected growth in the defense budget. We cannot lose sight of the fact that a strong defense demands a healthy economy. Meanwhile, most would agree that neglect of basic conventional defense capabilities and the requirements of modernization of weapons systems will not allow us to return to the 3 percent real growth rate that was utilized by previous Congresses.

Consequently, we must strictly order priorities to allow for growth within fiscally responsible limits. I believe the necessary balance can be achieved by establishing a limit of 5 percent real growth and this should be done immediately, with the bill before us next week. Therefore, I plan to offer an amendment which will bring total spending in the committee bill—which allows for about 6.7 percent real growth—down to 5 percent by reducing spending in the fastest growing account in the bill—procurement.

An examination of the data is persuasive: In fiscal year 1980, procure-

ment constituted 25 percent of all defense spending. In fiscal year 1981, it was increased by 35 percent—24.4 percent in real terms—and was 26 percent of all defense spending. In fiscal year 1982, procurement was increased by another 36 percent—27.3 percent in real terms—and it became 29 percent of the defense budget. The committee bill allows a further 24 percent increase in procurement—15.6 percent in real terms, bringing it to about 33 percent of overall defense spending. It bears noting that 61 percent of the overall growth in defense spending under the bill is dedicated to increases in procurement.

This is particularly disturbing when you consider that operations and maintenance—which makes up the very center of our deterrence capability: Our daily readiness effort—is only increasing by 7 percent—a real growth of a mere 1.8 percent, absorbing only 16 percent of the overall increase. Funding for personnel is only increasing by 5 percent, representing 9 percent of the overall increase.

The growth which has already occurred in the procurement account must also be viewed in light of the staggering increases in procurement spending which have been projected for future years. This is primarily because, once new weapons systems are initiated, they take on a life of their own by forcing expenditures in future years which cannot be controlled, becoming similar in form to the entitlement programs appearing elsewhere in the Federal budget. The Congressional Budget Office has recently estimated that, as a result of these commitments, the procurement account will have grown from 26 percent of the Pentagon budget in 1981 to 38 percent in 1987.

There is a compelling case that we can and should protect the readiness components of our conventional deterrent capability while slowing the growth in procurement. We can bring overall defense spending down to 5 percent this year and still achieve significant growth. First of all, the real growth of 12 percent that has thus far been achieved in defense spending over the past 2 years cannot be ignored. Furthermore, the 25 percent real growth that has already occurred in procurement over the same time frame must be recognized. My amendment would still allow 10.3 percent real growth in procurement. This is a clear indication to our adversaries that we remain committed to a strong defense.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment so that we can achieve the necessary balance between a strong defense and the needs of our economy.●

NATIONAL PTA OPPOSES CHILD
LABOR PLAN

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, when the Secretary of Labor proposed in July of this year to revise the regulations dealing with child labor, to permit employment of 14- and 15-year-old children in occupations previously determined to be hazardous, and to extend the number of hours in which these children could be employed, there was an immediate outcry from a broad spectrum of individuals and organizations concerned with the education, the health and the welfare of children. Among the most articulate and forceful of the statements received by my Subcommittee on Labor Standards at our hearings on the proposal was that of Ms. Manya Ungar, vice president for legislative activities of the National Parent-Teachers' Association (PTA).

The PTA was founded, nearly 90 years ago, to fight the abuse of child labor, and has, through its history, been aggressive and tireless in promoting the education, the sound development, and the welfare of children. At our hearings, the PTA questioned the wisdom of stimulating the employment of young children. It was concerned about their educational progress, their health, their ability to concentrate on their studies while engaged in long hours of employment, and the effect of such working hours on family life and adolescent development.

The National PTA Board of Directors has very recently reviewed its longstanding position on the question of child labor and has rearticulated its views. The PTA encourages meaningful work/study programs and vocational education which help young people to develop skills and prepare themselves for working life. But the PTA understands that such programs are different from simply expanding unsupervised employment of schoolchildren in a manner which encourages them to reduce their attention to their studies, which interferes with their growth and development, and which permits their exploitation. It is clear that the PTA remains as committed as ever to the health, well-being, and education of our youth, who are, of course, our future.

I ask would like that the position statement of the National PTA on child labor be reprinted, at this point, in the RECORD.

POSITION STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL PTA
ON CHILD LABOR PROTECTIONS
(Adopted, August 6, 1982)

As early as 1900, the National PTA was in the forefront of those seeking to protect the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

health, welfare and safety of children through strong child labor laws. This commitment was based on three fundamental standards:

1. A basic minimum age of 16 for employment;
2. A higher minimum age in identified hazardous occupations; and
3. A provision that the minimum wage for minors be the same as that established as the federal minimum wage standard.

The opportunity to work, to relate work to learning experience and to instill good work habits in vitally important to the development of young people and the economic future of our country. Meaningful life employment, however, is dependent on quality education, effective study habits, and positive school experience. The national PTA has forcefully supported supervised work/study programs, fostered career education, and defended vocational education. In addition, the National PTA has encouraged schools and businesses to work cooperatively in establishing productive work, training and career opportunities for children.

The National PTA has also a legitimate concern that children, especially those below the age of 16, not be tempted to spend more time in the work place and less in school and on homework, that adequate protections for children related to minimum hours, minimum wages, appropriate work supervision and identified hazardous occupations be maintained, and that the National PTA continue to monitor child labor practices which would endanger the safety, health or welfare of children.

Children should have a sufficient time for their schooling, their healthful development and their recreation. To the extent that the workplace can enhance and supplement the healthful development of children, it should be supported. To the extent that the workplace would affect the healthful development of children, exploit an unprotected and more vulnerable segment of our society, or interfere with the educational process, it must be resisted. The ever-changing labor market and newly developing occupations require that the National PTA continue to monitor new laws or regulations that reflect those changes and be continually diligent in recommending only those which will protect children in the work force and work place.●

FARMINGDALE HIGH FOOTBALL
TEAM TAKES CONFERENCE
TITLE

HON. GREGORY W. CARMAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. CARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to note an accomplishment by one's very own high school. On November 13, Farmingdale High School's varsity football team of Farmingdale, N.Y., took the American League Conference title (division A of conference 1 of Nassau County) with an 8-0 record. Under the direction of Mr. Don Snyder, head varsity coach, and Assistant Coaches Mr. Bob Mulligan and Mr. Irv Apgar, the "Dalers" hold an undefeated record this season in league competition. Perhaps, even

December 3, 1982

more important than the remarkable skills of the Farmingdale football team is the outstanding demonstration of sportsmanship displayed by the players and coaching staff.

Varsity team players include: Mike Ihm, Jim Carman, Rick Van Wickler, Bob Schellhorn, Joe Rzempoluch, Ed McMahon, Vin Parella, Mike Wildes, Drew DeTroia, Mike Freshour, Andy Donovan, Phil Bellia, Glenn Keith, Joe Panariella, Ron Pimental, Greg Gordard, Mike Erickson, Bob Heuskin, Mike Travis, Andre Gomez, Paul Zarodkiewicz, Chet Levitt, Carl Curriera, Jim DeTommaso, Brian Contarino, Bob Burgan, Tom Sacco, Tom Kirk, Billy Recce, Frank Soldano, Mauro DeBenedetto, Ed Theal, Jim Valenti, Jerry Romanelli, Mike Ross, Jerry O'Sullivan, Mike Carbonaro, Neal O'Sullivan, Rich Raymond, Mike Hill, John Campbell.

And, without the support of managers Chris Masone, Sheri Barlow, Patti Pasquariello, and Russ Gulotta; Statisticians Lynda Heller, Terry Volberg, Ann Volberg, and Len Moore; Cheerleaders Ellen Berkowitz, Janet Cast, Elise Gannon, Paula Guidice, Debbie Lang, Pan Perratto, Jeanne Pucciarielli, Maureen Rooney, Margaret Studdert, Maureen O'Connor, Karen Scheel, Corinne Barret, Debbie Klenozich, Patti Rooney, Linda Cardito, Stephanie Emde, and Liz Flynn under the squad's director, Ms. Rosalie Lebinich, this victory would not have been possible. And special recognition is in order for the Farmingdale Hawk program and for Junior Varsity Coaches Mr. John Corio and Mr. Pete Cerrone and Junior High Coaches Mr. Ed Balboni and Mr. Bob Guarino who have all played a role in training the "Dalers." My heartiest congratulations to all of you for a fine job and a well deserved conference title.●

DAD OF SLAIN MARINE WRITES
LETTER TO PRESIDENT REAGAN

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, last month Frank and Rosina Staniszewski came to Washington to attend the dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. The monument bears the name of their eldest son, Wladyslaw, who was killed in action in Vietnam while serving with the U.S. Marine Corps.

Wladyslaw Staniszewski emigrated to the United States just 18 months before he was inducted into the service. He died before he could fulfill the residency requirement for naturalization as a citizen of this country. Yet certainly by his service in the Marine Corps and by his death on the battle-

field, he demonstrated his full devotion to this country. His family asks only one thing in return for such a great sacrifice, that he be recognized by our Government posthumously as a citizen of the United States.

I strongly urge my colleagues to read the following article published in the *Enterprise of Brockton, Mass.*, and to join me in working to see that their modest and reasonable request is granted.

DAD OF SLAIN MARINE WRITES LETTER TO
REAGAN, CONGRESS
(By Kent S. Jones)

BROCKTON.—Frank Staniszewski struggled for nearly eight hours last week in his Drew Avenue home to put his feelings into words. The letter he composed to President Ronald Reagan and the Congress of the United States expresses his simple wish that his son be granted citizenship—nearly 16 years after he was killed in Vietnam.

His son, Wlasyslaw, born in Scotland, was a British subject when he enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps in 1966. He turned 20 on June 22, 1967, two weeks before he died in action in Vietnam.

Because Scotty, as he was known to his family and friends, had been in the United States for only 18 months when he enlisted, he was not eligible for citizenship.

Now, U.S. Rep. Brian Donnelly has filed legislation in Congress to grant posthumous citizenship to Scotty, but the bill has been stalled in a subcommittee. Frank and his wife, Rosina, would not receive any money or benefits if the legislation were passed.

"We only want our son to become a citizen of the country he died for. We do not want anything for ourselves," said Mrs. Staniszewski.

Frank Staniszewski, a native of Poland and a naturalized American citizen, sat in the living room of their modest single-family home and read the letter he has written to President Reagan and Congress:

"The flag raising, marching and unveiling of the memorial to Vietnam veterans in Washington, D.C., was emotionally inspiring and satisfying for many Americans including us.

"Mothers, fathers, relatives forgot for a moment their sorrow until they returned home and discovered that really nothing has changed. Memories of sons, brothers, fathers still linger on now as ever. But for my family, there is double the sorrow.

"My wife, my daughter and my youngest son became American citizens in 1970. My oldest son, Wladyslaw could not achieve his goal because he was drafted into the service in 1966 and was killed in 1967 at the age of 20. He was in the United States for only 18 months and, according to law, you must be a resident of the United States for five years to become a citizen.

"Our son, Corporal Wladyslaw Staniszewski, U.S.M.C., who fought and died for America is still a British subject and a foreigner. We, as his family, cannot understand why.

"We have had many inquiries and letters from people asking what they can do to help us obtain posthumous citizenship for my son. I thank all of them with all my heart. Cong. Donnelly had introduced the bill in Congress, H.R. 4086, more than a year ago, but as usual some Congressmen are for it and some are against it and my son's citizenship has become a political yo-yo.

"When our son was killed in Vietnam, we received many letters from the White House, the Senate and Congress and from the military. To them it was their duty but for all those families and us it is a deep sorrow and pain we will feel until we die.

"We believe the country must be strong and must be defended at all times. But those men, who fulfilled their duty to their country, should not be forgotten and forced to crawl on their knees and beg for scraps.

"A country which prides itself for humanitarian rights and laws should recognize this misunderstanding and correct it. We believe strongly, as Americans, that our son, Corporal Wladyslaw Staniszewski, U.S.M.C., is entitled to his posthumous American citizenship because he was killed in the line of duty for his country on the highest executive order. Only the highest executive order can resolve all the complications.

"Mr. President. You hold the highest elected office in our country. All my family pleads with you to be gracious and grant our son his last wish. We, as parents, do not want, and are declining all money and benefits. We do not want anything except the recognition for our son and nothing else.

"President Teddy Roosevelt, said, 'Any man who is good enough to shed his blood for his country is good enough to be given a square deal afterwards. Less than that, no man shall have.'

In his letter to the president and the Congress, Mr. Staniszewski expressed his appreciation to Brockton Veterans Agent James I. Malone, Congressman Donnelly and The *Enterprise* for helping his family seek citizenship for their son.

Frank and Rosina Staniszewski were among the thousands of parents from around the nation who journeyed to Washington Nov. 20 to attend the dedication ceremonies of the Vietnam-era Veterans Memorial for the veterans killed in Vietnam.

They were able to share their grief and painful memories with other families, but the couple felt an added burden because their son was the only member of the American armed forces killed in Vietnam who was not a United States citizen.

Scotty joined the Marines in 1966 after he learned he was eligible for the draft although he was still a British subject. He could have left the country and returned to Scotland, but he decided instead to enlist.

When he left for service, Scotty told his mother, "Mum, a country worth living in is a country worth fighting for."

"For us to see the Memorial was just stunning. For a minute or so you just couldn't talk," said Mrs. Staniszewski, "It took my breath away. You know there are close to 60,000 men who died in Vietnam but when you see their names all in rows . . ." Her voice trailed off for a moment.

"It was so hushed. Everyone was looking for a name," she continued. "We could get up close and touch the memorial. Everyone was just crying and looking for their own. When you look at the memorial, it is just unbelievable.

"It was almost like it was his grave, even though I knew it wasn't actually. But near him were the names of the men he knew and died with in Vietnam.

"On the ride back, everyone was quiet for awhile. As we got closer to home, the tension began to ease and we started up singing. We sang through all the old songs. We sang a few Christmas songs, too. It is like when you come home from a funeral and everyone goes home. It really hits you again.

"It was the realization there were all these young men with their lives cut off.

They did not know the thrill of being married and having children and all the problems of life which go along with it," said Mrs. Staniszewski. ●

EXPORT TRADING COMPANY ACT OF 1982

HON. SILVIO CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the "Export Trading Company Act of 1982," I am pleased that on October 8, 1982, the President signed this important job-creating legislation. During this period of high unemployment—when the jobless rate has reached an all time postwar high at 10.4 percent annually—legislation such as the Export Trading Company Act is a concrete step toward economic recovery.

The Commerce Department estimated that over 30,000 jobs are created for every \$1 billion of export sales. In addition, one out of every eight jobs in the manufacturing sector is related to export sales while in the agriculture sector one in every three jobs is connected with American exporting. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, a U.S. Commerce Department survey concluded that about 20,000 U.S. manufacturers and agriculture producers offer goods and services which could be highly competitive abroad—even though only 10 percent of U.S. manufacturing entities, slightly over 30,000 firms, participate in exporting products. It is also generally accepted that the great untapped export resource is small- and medium-sized businesses. The Export Trading Company legislation will promote this unused potential.

Mr. Speaker, the new law addresses two areas that have previously discouraged U.S. firms from exporting: financing and antitrust regulations. Title I allows bank holding companies to invest directly in export trading companies. Local banking resources can now be used to finance exports, thereby increasing American competitiveness with our foreign trading partners. Title III and title IV of the new law addresses the antitrust issue associated with small firm exporting. This provision will allow, in certain regulated cases as supervised by the Department of Commerce, several firms to pool their resources for the purposes of exporting. This feature is crucial to encourage the participation of small and medium sized businesses.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of the Export Trading Company Act is not completely measurable at this early date, but the initial estimates look promising. In 1980, the value of New England exports was \$11.5 billion an-

nually. Massachusetts produced 39 percent of New England's exporting business. This translates into 52,000 jobs in Massachusetts—people directly employed as a result of exports, not including the "ripple" effect associated with exporting.

Given the tradition of Massachusetts exporting—and exporting potential, the New England Congressional Institute estimated that the recently enacted Export Trading Company Act will result in the creation of almost 4,000 jobs. For a bill that expends no additional funds—just easing regulations—4,000 in a period of 10.4 percent unemployment is a good deal. The export Trading Company Act is not a panacea for the problems faced as a result of the current recession, but this export promotion law will help ease this distressing situation. It's surely a step in the right direction. ●

ADDITION TO HOPKINS FAMILY

HON. JAMES A. COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, just before the recent election, I dropped by the Sixth Congressional District of Kentucky to visit my good friend and colleague, LARRY J. HOPKINS. At the airport, I happened to glance through one of the local Lexington papers when a bold headline caught my eye. It said: "Vote for Grandpa, He's Too Old To Work." I knew immediately this referred to our own Mr. HOPKINS.

But, there was greater significance in the headline for, just days before, LARRY HOPKINS had become the very, very proud grandfather of Haley Hopkins Martin. This second granddaughter was born to Shae and Jim Martin on October 3, at 4:14 p.m., at Central Baptist Hospital in Lexington.

At this time, though a little belatedly, I would like to, in particular, congratulate Congressman HOPKINS, his charming daughter and her husband on the arrival of this beautiful addition to their family. I would also like to put in a good word for the physician, Dr. Randall S. Jones, who not only safely delivered Haley, but who also made certain the grandfather survived the waiting room. ●

NUCLEAR FREEZE AND DETERRENCE

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, no issue is more important than preserving the peace and currently a furious debate is

underway on how best this can be accomplished.

A significant contribution to this debate has been made by John Gofman and Egan O'Connor in the November 29 issue of the Washington Times, and I herewith share it with my colleagues:

[From the Washington Times, Nov. 29, 1982]

NUCLEAR FREEZE AS "MORAL BLACKMAIL"

(By John Gofman and Egan O'Connor)

Americans are experiencing "moral blackmail," as the Catholic bishops and other advocates of the nuclear freeze say in essence:

1. All good people want to prevent nuclear war.

2. The only way to do so is to halt and then reverse the nuclear arms race.

3. Therefore, if you are a good person, you must support the nuclear freeze.

Statement No. 2 is false and dangerous. The only way to prevent both nuclear holocaust and nuclear blackmail is the way we have done it successfully for 20 years already: by keeping the Soviet rulers convinced they will pay an unacceptable price for either attack or blackmail against us. The nuclear-freeze campaigns encourage both nuclear holocaust and nuclear blackmail by undermining all four essentials of America's deterrent against them.

1. An emphatic "fight-back" policy is essential to deterrence at any level of weapons (reduced or increased, nuclear or non-nuclear). Weapons have no power to deter war or to preserve freedom if aggressors think their intended victims would never use them. Does the freeze movement call for fighting back? No. It claims that fighting back would be immoral, or sure suicide. This makes it a movement for unilateral nuclear disarmament, for a nation is unilaterally disarmed, no matter how many nuclear weapons it still possesses, if it is unwilling to use them.

2. Successful deterrence requires the Soviet rulers to know that the United States would have enough surviving retaliatory weapons under any conceivable circumstances to inflict unacceptable damage. The freeze movement is deceiving the public by pretending that our 30,000 nuclear warheads represent "overkill," instead of explaining that what matters is the number after the United States has suffered an attack. Today that number is about 3,000; they are concentrated on about 20 survivable submarines. Just 20 objects stand between us and holocaust or enslavement. This is as close to "underkill" as we can imagine, since the Soviets are working on anti-submarine warfare techniques (not banned by a freeze).

The first principle of military prudence is never to put all your eggs in one basket. We need a variety, of survivable retaliatory systems so even if the Soviets invent ways to cripple some systems, we will still have a fearsome retaliatory capability. Variety prevents the dreaded launch-on-warning and "hair-trigger" situations. Variety creates stability. Instead of explaining this simple principle, freeze leaders and the bishops support measures which would prohibit the United States from restoring the survivability of its retaliatory traid.

3. Successful deterrence could be vastly stabilized by defensive weapons, including anti-ballistic missile systems. Freeze leaders deceive the public by calling ABM "destabilizing" when, in fact, the ability to stop 50

percent (or perhaps 95 percent), of Soviet intercontinental missiles "on route" would virtually guarantee that no Soviet rulers would ever dare launch them in the first place. And ABM would fortify deterrence (the true goal) in another way: by making it clear that it would not be sure suicide for Americans to resist enslavement.

It seems both cruel and hypocritical for freeze leaders to terrify American children by saying that nuclear missiles are likely to vaporize them before they reach adulthood, while consistently opposing any defenses against those missiles.

4. Successful deterrence requires constant upgrading of our weapons with new systems, as old ones become useless. For instance, our retaliatory bombers were rendered nearly useless as a deterrent when the Soviets built an in-depth anti-aircraft defense, but our invention of Cruise Missiles and Stealth Bombers can restore our bombers as fearsome retaliatory weapons. The freeze would deprive us of these valuable deterrents, and also destroy one of America's most precious resources: its teams of dedicated and experienced weaponeers.

No top talent would stay in, or seek, a dead-end career in weapons research and development (R&D) in the United States after a freeze. Yet after a freeze, Soviet weaponeers might be given greater incentives than ever to succeed with their antisubmarine, anti-missile, and anti-satellite research. By crippling our weapons R&D but not Soviet R&D, a freeze almost guarantees our eventual enslavement.

Since the campaign against America's nuclear weapons leads straight to holocaust, surrender, or both, "all good people" will reject the freeze and its underlying moral bankruptcy. The price of freedom is neither immoral nor too high, for deterrence has worked and there is every reason for confidence that it will continue working provided Americans start campaigning in favor of the four defense essentials.

In the eternal choice between yielding to oppression or resisting it, the moral high-ground still belongs, as it always has, to those who take realistic actions to resist oppression successfully. ●

IMMIGRATION REFORM NEEDS FURTHER CONSIDERATION

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Wall Street Journal, there was an article on potential labor opposition to H.R. 6514, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1982. The thrust of the opposition centers around bringing temporary workers into the United States.

The AFL-CIO is seeking restrictions on the H-2 program, as the temporary workers program is called, that requires certification by employers that they could not find U.S. workers for jobs to be filled by the H-2 laborers. The union also supports guarantees that H-2 workers would have adequate wages and working conditions while in the States.

I applaud the AFL-CIO's position on this issue. As I have said before, how can we complain about immigrants taking jobs from U.S. citizens, and at the same time try to expand our pool of temporary workers? This is an obvious paradox.

The article also mentions the opposition of church groups to the elimination of the legalization program for undocumented persons already residing in the United States. I also applaud this action by these organizations. The legalization program is crucial to the Hispanic community.

What seems to be unraveling is that H.R. 6514 is not ready to be considered by the House. Establishing a new, realistic, and effective immigration policy is one of the most important issues to be considered by this Congress.

It is certainly too important an issue to be taken up during a "lame-duck" session. We need a new immigration policy. H.R. 6514 is a start, but let us consider the issue further, ironing out all real and potential problems, before deciding on what our new immigration policy should be.

I submit the Wall Street Journal article for the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 2, 1982]

BILL TO TIGHTEN IMMIGRATION LAW SET BACK BY LABOR PUSH FOR CURB ON FOREIGN HIRES

WASHINGTON.—Organized labor struck a blow at the prospects of a major immigration bill only two days after support from a House leader appeared to give the measure a good chance of becoming law this year.

Ray Denison, chief lobbyist for the AFL-CIO, disclosed that the labor federation will oppose the bill unless it's assured that the Reagan administration and a majority of the House endorse proposed restrictions on U.S. hiring of foreigners as temporary workers.

On Monday, House Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill (D., Mass.) told backers of the bill that he intends to bring it to the House floor for a vote. Several supporters and opponents of the bill contended that the move made passage of some version of the bill probable during the current lame-duck session of Congress.

But the AFL-CIO long has been the prime backer of the bill's main element, which would make the hiring of illegal aliens by U.S. employers a federal offense.

The restrictions sought by the AFL-CIO on temporary workers were approved yesterday by the House Education and Labor Committee on a series of close, party-line votes won by Democrats. But opponents of those limits said they thought they could easily defeat them on the floor.

Peter Allstrom, an AFL-CIO lobbyist, said the labor group will oppose even bringing the bill to the House floor unless the Reagan administration guarantees that the restrictions will win approval there. This would put the AFL-CIO against Speaker O'Neill, usually one of its strongest allies.

Backers of the bill say that it would provide jobs for unemployed Americans by denying them to illegal immigrants. But the AFL-CIO fears that the Labor Department's "H-2" program, designed to import workers might be expanded under the pending legis-

lation to as many as 300,000 jobs from about 15,000, according to Mr. Allstrom. "It's the one section (of the bill) where jobs are most seriously jeopardized," Mr. Allstrom said.

If the AFL-CIO sticks by this position, it could kill the legislation for this year. David Hiller, the Reagan administration's chief lobbyist in its drive for passage of the bill, was surprised to hear of organized labor's switch. "That's a real stunt," he said. "We can never speak of a majority of the House members; we can't even have a majority of the House," he said. "It seems like an extraordinary request."

Rep. Romano Mazzoli (D., Tenn.), chief House sponsor of the bill, said the legislation must at least be scheduled for House consideration by the end of next week to have a good chance to pass before the session expires. "Asking for all this when the time is ebbing away makes it very difficult to get a bill," he said. But he added: "I don't know if it is a fatal thing."

Other groups also have been splitting from the coalition that has supported the bill. Growers of fruits and vegetables in the southwestern U.S. bitterly oppose the AFL-CIO's restrictions on the H-2 program, and are working against the bill.

Several church groups also have defected into opposition, largely because the House is expected to limit, or eliminate, the pending bill's amnesty for millions of illegal aliens who have lived in the U.S. for years. The AFL-CIO also is opposed to any narrowing of the bill's amnesty provision, in part because legal workers are much easier to organize than illegal ones.

The AFL-CIO seeks restrictions on the H-2 program that would make it more difficult and time-consuming for employers to receive certification that they couldn't find qualified U.S. workers. Such certification is a precondition for hiring foreigners.

The labor federation also wants administration of the program kept in the Labor Department, eliminating a role given the more pro-employer Agriculture Department in versions approved by the full Senate and the House Judiciary Committee.

And the AFL-CIO would add new wage and working-condition protections for the imported workers, and would bar any expansion of the program unless the administration certified that it could be fully enforced.●

TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR RICHARD LOUIS WALKER

HON. GREGORY W. CARMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. CARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give special commendation to Ambassador Richard Louis Walker, an exceptional member of the U.S. Foreign Service. Ambassador Walker acted as my host during a special fact-finding mission on behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives Banking Committee to promote international trade.

I was very impressed by the organization of the American Embassy in the Republic of Korea. Through Ambassador Walker's efforts, my meetings with trade officials in the public and private sector in the Republic of Korea were very successful.

Sharing with you a little of the Ambassador's history is my pleasure. Mr. Walker was born on April 13, 1922, in Bellefonte, Pa. He holds degrees from Drew University, the University of Pennsylvania, and Yale University. Mr. Walker has served as an adviser and consultant for many educational and professional organizations. He presently serves as a member of the academic advisory council of the Center for Strategic Studies and on the board of directors of Research Consultants for the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis. Mr. Walker presently serves as the U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Walker's exceptional efforts bring credit to himself, the American Embassy in the Republic of Korea, and to the United States. We are truly fortunate to have Ambassador Richard Louis Walker as a member of the U.S. Foreign Service.●

THE IMMIGRATION REFORM AND CONTROL ACT OF 1982

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1982 is based upon the work product of the Select Committee on Immigration and Refugee Policy, the findings of three successive administrations, and extensive hearings by both the House and Senate Judiciary Committees.

The bill represents the most comprehensive reform of U.S. immigration laws in three decades. It seeks to curb illegal immigration, improve the immigration adjudication process, and legalize the status of some illegal aliens with ties to the United States. I believe this bill represents a realistic and just approach to controlling immigration.

I would like to share a New York Times editorial of December 3, 1982. The editorial recognizes the essential balance between enforcement and legalization in the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1982.

WHY BREAK THE IMMIGRATION CLOCK?

There's a bargain built into the immigration reform bill inching through the House. On the one hand, the bill would make it much harder for illegal workers to enter the country. On the other, it would provide limited amnesty for those already here, living with a fear of discovery that subjects them to exploitation. It's a humane bargain—and also a practical one. The Simpson-Mazzoli reform bill, as delicately balanced as a clock, could never have gotten so far without it.

But now, within sight of triumph, the bargain and thus the bill are suddenly in jeopardy. Speaker O'Neill, to his credit, has promised to bring up the bill during this lame-duck session. Meanwhile, some House

members, by wanting things both ways, threaten to break the clock. Though happy to have tougher enforcement, they want to strip amnesty out of the bill. The effort dishonors the implicit immigration bargain and misunderstands what amnesty would accomplish.

Hundreds of thousands of illegal workers would probably seek amnesty. To some nervous members, amnesty sounds like blanket legalization for a flood of "crooks, Comies and welfare cheats," as one House staff member says ironically. But the reform bill would provide no blanket legalization; it requires case-by-case treatment. Aliens have to have been here for three years to win temporary status, six for permanent status. Undesirables are excluded. Eligibility for welfare is denied or delayed.

More important than exaggerated fears are the benefits, which is why the Reagan Administration vigorously supports the entire package. Amnesty for old aliens would enable the Immigration Service to focus its threadbare enforcement efforts on keeping out new ones. And it would eliminate a fearful, servile underclass.

How can it be good for a democratic society when employers or landlords or merchants prey on illegal aliens' fear of deportation? How can it be good for illegal aliens to shrink from ever going to the police, or to be taxed unfairly? Tolerating such an underclass is cruel to them and unhealthy for the rest of us. The immigration reform bargain—tough enforcement coupled with sensible amnesty—deserves to be honored. ●

THE JUDICIAL REFORM ACT OF 1982

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful and effective Members of Congress is the junior Senator from North Carolina, JOHN EAST.

He has just introduced the Judicial Reform Act of 1982 which is well described in the following editorial from the November 2, 1982 edition of the Washington Times. Because this bill is of such great importance I urge its close study by my colleagues:

RESTORING THE CONSTITUTION

Sen. John East has fired the first resounding shot in what promises to be one of the most important congressional battles of the century. A few days before the election recess he introduced the Judicial Reform Act of 1982. This is no half-hearted attempt to redress this or that example of overreaching by the federal courts. The bill's 12 parts propose nothing less than to return the U.S. Constitution to its original "uninterpreted" state.

The several provisions would strip the federal judiciary of the legislative and executive authority it has usurped from Congress and the executive branch. It addresses every issue raised by the irrepressible judicial activism of the last several decades. The fight will be a glorious one.

The proper role of the federal judiciary has been one of the most intensely debated issues in this nation's history. Where, out of political cowardice, Congress has defaulted on its responsibility to resolve difficult and

controversial disputes, federal judges have stepped into the vacuum. The result has been that too much of the most important "legislation" of the 20th century has been written, not by elected representatives, but by appointed judges.

Although some parts of the bill overshoot the mark, the Judicial Reform Act gives Congress the opportunity to reassert its unquestioned, if little-used, powers to shape and control the jurisdiction of the federal courts. Led by the Supreme Court, federal judges have redrawn political boundaries, taken over school boards, directly interfered in prison administration, punished police by excluding completely reliable evidence, taken religion out of the schools, and even told doctors when they may—and may not—perform abortions. It is the premise of the East bill that Congress could—and should—accept its legislative responsibility to debate and decide these issues itself.

But it is not only Congress that will benefit from once again having the constitutional power the bill would retrieve. State governments will find themselves freed of the large and onerous burden of federal judicial second-guessing which has been grafted into the Constitution by every-broader interpretations of the 26 amendments. The powers reserved by the Founding Fathers to the states and to the people will be theirs once more.

Sen. East legislation also includes provisions which would greatly improve congressional oversight of the federal judiciary, which would make the Supreme Court's membership geographically representative—as it was at the beginning, and which would in other ways reduce the tremendous power of the federal courts.

The State Judiciary Subcommittee on Separation of Powers, chaired by Sen. East, will schedule hearings after the 98th Congress convenes in January. We'll have more to say before then. ●

WATCH JAMAICA

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, on June 22, 1982, I submitted an extension of remarks into the RECORD title "High Hopes for the Caribbean" and complimented the Jamaican private sector group for their fine work in presenting the Caribbean Basin Initiative to the Congress. Now I am pleased to note that the American Friends of Jamaica, at their annual ball in New York City this coming Saturday, will not only honor Prime Minister Edward Seaga but also the Jamaican delegation who so effectively worked with the Congress on this critical issue.

Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, we will have a chance to vote on the trade provisions of the CBI in this special session. The importance of this legislation to the entire Caribbean and Central American region cannot be underestimated.

Prime Minister Seaga recently chaired the Caricom Conference which was held in Ocho Rios, Jamaica,

November 14-19. Caricom is actually a Caribbean common market group interested in promoting trade to improve the economies and stabilize the governments of this region. Fortunately, we have a distinguished and able leader in the Prime Minister of Jamaica, Edward P. G. Seaga.

At this point, I include an article, "Watch Jamaica," from the November issue of Reader's Digest.

"WATCH JAMAICA!"

(By Smith Hempstone)

After a disastrous decade of socialism, Jamaica is betting everything—including a hefty stack of U.S. chips—on free enterprise.

"Jamaica—a native word meaning "land of wool and water"—conjures up images of reggae and limbo, of sunburned tourists and Rastafarian cultists with braided hair, of gilded resorts and backwoods settlements where Maroons, descendants of runaway or freed slaves, still follow many tribal customs of their African ancestors.

But the sun-drenched island—the Caribbean's most populous English-speaking nation—is much more than this: Jamaica is the proving ground for democracy and free enterprise in the Caribbean. If the country can solve its pressing economic and political problems, it will show other nations in the region that there is a middle way between the reactionary authoritarianism of a Guatemala and the drab totalitarianism of Castro's Cuba.

Discovered by Columbus in 1494, Jamaica was ruled by Spain until an English fleet sailed into Kingston harbor in 1655 and took over. English planters dabbled in cocoa, indigo, coffee, bananas and spices, but sugar was the economy's mainstay before the island's vast reserves of bauxite, the source of aluminum, were first tapped in the 1950's. Today, Jamaica is the world's third-largest producer of bauxite and the United States largest supplier.

Jamaica's first decade after achieving independence in 1962 was relatively uneventful. But in 1972 socialist Michael Manley was elected prime minister, and Jamaica's economy was soon a shambles. Manley slapped a 700-percent tax increase on bauxite exports. The levy contributed to a drop in Jamaica's share of the world market from 21 percent to 15 percent.

Then the Manley government acquired eight of the country's sugar factories, and in three years production dropped 34 percent. Bad weather, blight and mismanagement led to a stunning 60-percent fall in banana production. Of 24,000 private trading outlets in rural areas, 11,000 went out of business under the Manley reign.

To make matters worse, in 1975 Manley initiated a costly friendship with Cuba's Fidel Castro. Cuban doctors, engineers and security experts poured into Jamaica, while some 1400 Jamaican youths were sent to Cuba for political indoctrination and paramilitary training. On their return, the *brigadistas* became Manley loyalists, employing strong-arm tactics for him and his party. The Cuban embassy, under Ambassador Ulises Estrada, the former deputy chief of Castro's American Department and a key figure in the Marxist takeover of Nicaragua, quickly became Kingston's major center of communist intelligence operations.

Investor confidence collapsed, and economic conditions worsened. Unable to

obtain hard currency to buy raw materials, Jamaican factories closed. Unemployment shot up to 33 percent, prices climbed 78 percent between 1977 and 1980, and the standard of living dropped precipitously. Crime and violence caused the once-lucrative tourist trade to fall by more than a third in two years. A \$1.6 billion foreign debt drained the treasury, and state-owned enterprises ran up huge deficits.

With the approach of the 1980 election race between the pro-Cuban Manley and pro-American Edward Seaga, political violence flared. More than 850 Jamaicans were murdered that year alone. Even as Jamaica went to the polls, the bipartisan electoral commission staff was pinned down by gunfire in its offices.

Despite the violence, an astounding 86 percent of the electorate voted—and when the ballots were counted, Edward Seaga had won 59 percent of the popular vote, and his Jamaica Labor Party had captured 51 of 60 house seats, the most lopsided political victory in Jamaica's history. Commenting on Manley's defeat, Radio Moscow mourned the loss of "a valuable ally."

Before President Reagan's inauguration, Seaga made two visits to the United States to confer with Secretary of State-designate Alexander Haig and Reagan aides Edwin Meese and James Baker. Seaga's message: Jamaica understands it must work, not just borrow, its way out of its economic difficulties. But Jamaica will need help, particularly from the American private sector, in getting back on its feet.

Reagan was well aware that Seaga's victory represented a significant reversal of the pro-Castro, anti-American tide that had been flowing throughout the Caribbean since the Marxist takeover of Nicaragua in 1979. And it did not go unnoticed in the region that Seaga was the first national leader invited to the White House after the new President took office.

The aloof, intellectual Seaga seems an unlikely political leader for a country noted for its mellow attitudes. The prime minister, who is of mixed Lebanese, Scottish, French and African descent, is Boston-born and Harvard-educated. He is married—to a former Miss Jamaica—and has three children. In 1962 he was elected to the Jamaican House of Representatives from West Kingston, a poor and tough district that had never reelected anyone; Seaga has now represented it for 20 years.

When Seaga took office, Jamaica was in trouble. "The country was without funds," recall Arnold Foote, chairman of Kingston's *Daily News*, and without hope." Hours before Seaga's election the Jamaican government literally spent its last dollar, and Seaga—who serves as his own finance minister—faced a foreign-exchange gap of \$96 million.

Seaga's first priority was to float emergency loans totaling \$86 million from commercial banks and the American and British governments. The new prime minister also held discussions with the North American bauxite companies, dissolved the sugar cooperatives, restructured the debt-ridden banana marketing corporation and announced his intention of selling or leasing many enterprises (including eight luxury hotels) taken over by the Manley government. In addition, he created incentives for domestic and foreign investors, removed some restrictions on imports and encouraged exports to earn desperately needed foreign exchange.

Problems persist. Bureaucratic bottlenecks, exacerbated by the departure of

many technicians during the Manley years, still frustrate local and foreign investors. Shortages of raw materials, uncertain power supplies and labor disputes still are distressingly frequent. Unemployment, which stood at 27.9 percent when Seaga took office, has dropped only one percent, and 290,000 workers still lack jobs.

But Seaga's first two years in office have included some notable successes. He has improved Jamaica's credit rating. The rate of inflation, 23.2 percent for the first nine months of 1980, was down to 4.9 percent last year. Violent crime has decreased dramatically. In 1981 Jamaica's economy registered a 2-percent advance—the first in eight years. Tourism has also rebounded. "People have hope now," observes journalist Hector Wynter. "So their attitude toward each other and toward foreigners is much more positive."

Jamaica's efforts to attract new investment have enjoyed a degree of success as well. Among the American corporation betting on Seaga to succeed are Control Data, which has established a joint venture with a Jamaican company for training services for small and medium-sized Jamaican businesses, and United Brands, which is investing in new agricultural projects.

What Seaga is trying to do—by deregulating economic activity, reducing government ownership, increasing competition, emphasizing exports—is give free enterprise a chance. If he succeeds, the Caribbean will have an alternative role model to Fidel Castro.

In a December 1981 survey of 30 key American business leaders, 16 rated Jamaica the most promising area for investment in the Caribbean Basin. And when President Reagan met last year with Prime Minister Trudeau of Canada and President López Portillo of Mexico, he summed up a vital aspect of his Latin American policy in two words: "Watch Jamaica!" Now the nations of the Caribbean are doing just that.●

BON VOYAGE, JACK BRINKLEY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, JACK BRINKLEY of Columbus, Ga. will depart our ranks with the ending of this Congress. He will be especially missed by those of us in the Georgia delegation, and in particular, by myself, since he and I have served together on the House Armed Services Committee where JACK has been chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities so successfully. On the full committee, JACK has been a very senior member and a tower of strength for national defense. I have greatly appreciated his wise and patient counsel in that regard. JACK was certainly a key mover and shaker in successfully beating back the recent attack on the C-5 aircraft procurement, and in that respect, he will be sorely missed.

One thing should be particularly noted, and that is the fact that JACK was an Air Force pilot during the Korean war. There was a time when

nearly every Member of Congress had performed some military service and could bring this background to bear on defense matters. This is no longer true and the number of Members who have so served, is getting smaller with each Congress. Therefore, the benefit of JACK's advice will be even more sorely missed in House Armed Services Committee work during the next Congress.

JACK has had a full career as a lawyer, State representative, Air Force Pilot, teacher, and Member of Congress. These careers need not be re-described now, but what needs to be re-stated is how much we will all miss his wisdom and quiet smile. A friendlier and more patient person cannot be found in these Halls, and I will miss him. Goodbye, and good luck to you in the future, JACK, and come back often.●

TRIBUTE TO THE CINDY SMALLWOOD FOUNDATION AND DR. CARLTON GOODLET

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the work of the Cindy Smallwood Foundation, an important institution devoted to improving the quality of life of residents in the bay area community of California. The foundation was founded in 1973 upon the untimely death of a young black teenage woman, Cindy Smallwood. Cindy's short life was committed to the alleviation of human suffering and inequalities. It was upon this humanitarian basis that the Cindy Smallwood Foundation was founded.

The Cindy Smallwood Foundation promotes community and individual health care through medical education and counseling. It is particularly interested in the problems of trauma resulting from aging, terminal illness and death, and has a unique program which provides grief counseling to those in need. In addition, the foundation provides direct financial aid to low income and minority students seeking a medical education, with its priority being assistance to minority women.

It is fitting that an organization of this stature is presenting its special award at its fundraising dinner December 3, 1982, to Dr. Carlton Goodlet, champion of human rights, justice and world peace. Dr. Goodlet was born in Chipley, Fla., July 23, 1914. He attended Howard University, the Meharry Medical School and the University of California where he received a Ph. D. in psychology. Currently, Dr. Goodlet is president of the National Black United Fund, a member of the

board of trustees of Talladega College, a trustee of the historic Third Baptist Church in San Francisco, and a member of numerous prestigious boards of directors. He has been the editor and publisher of the Sun Reporter newspaper since 1948. Dr. Goodlet has been a practicing physician since 1945, resides in San Francisco and is the father of one child, Dr. Gary Goodlet, Jr.

Dr. Goodlet is a man of national and international reputation in the area of publishing, education, quality health care and world peace. He has been a front runner in civil rights and international affairs. I commend the Cindy Smallwood Foundation for having the vision to present this year's award to a human being of such significant involvement and commitment.

Mr. Speaker, the Cindy Smallwood Foundation continues to reflect in its philosophy and programs the humanitarian efforts of the young person for whom it was named. I am honored to have had the opportunity to bring the work of this institution to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, and will continue to support it in its noble efforts.●

JOBS PROGRAM NEEDED IN THIS SESSION

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, Thanksgiving is not end for all turkeys. In fact, this Thanksgiving gave birth to a great turkey of an idea—the proposal once, and apparently briefly, under consideration by the Reagan administration that we increase the tax burden on unemployment compensation in order to reduce unemployment. Perhaps we should fight crime by punishing its victims; they are easier to locate.

The proposal to fight joblessness by increasing the tax burden on those who experience unemployment was absurd.

Unemployment stands at a 42-year record. I ask the President to identify the jobs by which 11 million unemployed Americans may cast off the joys and carefree existence of unemployment. I urge my colleagues to join with me in the serious business of enacting a program to create jobs, and not engage in schemes to punish the jobless.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SOCIAL SECURITY IS FACING SURE CHANGE

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House an editorial which appeared in the November 6 edition of the Lincoln Star. The commentary reveals a good understanding of the problems facing the social security system and of the politicizing of this issue.

I commend its wisdom to my colleagues.

[From the Lincoln Star, Nov. 6, 1982]

SOCIAL SECURITY IS FACING SURE CHANGE

We have no faith at all in Democratic congressional claims that the Reagan administration is planning some kind of clandestine attack upon the nation's Social Security system. But we do believe that the system will very possibly be changed in the 1983 session of Congress.

In saying this, we anticipate little basis for fear on the part of the elderly or for pessimism on the part of younger people. What we think will happen is much along the lines discussed in Lincoln this week by Robert A. Beck, chairman and chief executive officer of Prudential Insurance Co. of America, who delivered the fourth annual E. J. Faulkner lecture at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

We saw nothing in Beck's reported remarks about benefit reductions for anyone currently receiving Social Security. We saw nothing in his remarks about drastic changes for those who will be receiving Social Security in the coming five to 10 years.

He did make the point, however, that the rate of improvement in Social Security benefits needs to be modified, and we agree. It is absolutely essential that the integrity of the system be established, once and for all, regardless of the level of benefits.

This is what we urge Congress to do and what we hope will be the position of this state's congressional delegation. The Social Security system absolutely must become a bird in the hand, not in the bush.

We cannot go on with a system as vital as this one is with the skepticism of the young and the terror of the elderly as talked about by Beck. Today's young working people are entitled to have a firm idea of about what the level of their benefits will be when they become eligible and the elderly desperately need to know, for sure, that their benefits are not going to be reduced.

Beck talked about simply changing the criteria for increasing benefits to a more realistic basis such as increases in wage levels rather than the faulty cost-of-living index. He talked about the entire work force, including the federal government, being brought under Social Security and advancing the age for retirement at full benefit from 65 to 68.

The latter change would, perhaps, need careful thought given to surviving spouse benefits and, for the sake of equity, would need a graduated implementation, but it is certainly a practical notion in view of constantly improving longevity figures. None of these things would have to be done to affect current recipients or those soon to be eligible for benefits.

December 3, 1982

But a new benefit schedule could be devised to apply on a graduated basis back from some arbitrary current age level to a much younger age. In other words, the benefit schedule could be very little changed for those now 60 years of age, curtailed a little for those around 55, a little more for those down to 40 and so on to an age of around 35 or so.

This would not destroy the planned financial security of those now at an age where they could not make up for the reversal and would give younger members of the work force a clear and dependable picture of what their benefits would be and what else they might need to do for the sake of their security in later life.

We simply cannot conceive of this system in total collapse, as some skeptics like to believe, but we do think it needs intelligent and bipartisan analysis and refinement. Further, we believe it can be done and the system put on a permanently reliable basis with relative ease if Congress and the administration forego their posturing on the subject.●

HEALTH PROGRAM CLARIFICATION

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues a matter crucial to health care in the Native villages of Alaska. In requesting funding for the Indian Health Service, the Appropriations Committee has wrongly assumed that the community health aid program is the same as the community health representative program and has cut out money for our community health representatives in Alaska.

The language reads:

Because the community health aide program is still in operation and adequate funding is provided for it under the clinics and hospitals line item, none of the community health representative funding should be allocated to Alaska.

This is not the case—they are not provided for in this way. To eliminate the field or community based health efforts and leave the resources entirely to the direct provision of medical services I am sure is not the intent of the committee. However, a misunderstanding of these separate programs has caused this situation to occur. I expect the matter to be remedied in the Senate but wished to make this known for the record.●

HELPING STUDENTS HELP THEMSELVES

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would help those remaining students who continue to receive social security student benefits to earn the money they need to continue their education.

As you know, last year in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act, the Congress heeded the administration request to eliminate the social security student benefit. Prior to that action, students enrolled in colleges or universities, whose families were eligible for social security because of retirement, death, or disability of the primary wage earner, received a student benefit until they reached the age of 22. The Omnibus Reconciliation Act included a provision to phase out this benefit. The last class of eligible students enrolled in a college or university in September 1981. Summer benefits were eliminated, and this year, beginning in September, all students receiving social security student benefit experienced a 25-percent reduction of the benefit they receive.

In addition, new regulations of the Pell grant program require school financial aid officers to consider social security student benefits for the purposes of determining eligibility for this form of financial aid. The natural result is that students who formerly relied on the social security student

benefits to help finance their educations have had to earn more money through work.

However, students are subject to the same earnings limitation which is applied to retirees under social security. For every dollar over \$4,400 which a student earns toward his or her tuition, he or she experiences a 50-cent reduction in social security student benefits. Since the accounting of earnings takes place at the end of the year, many hundreds of students around the country will have to repay social security for any benefits they received in excess of the earnings limitation provision. If the student has to borrow from the next semester's tuition savings to refund overpayments to social security, that student may be forced to defer education plans.

I think this is a serious problem. For that reason, I am introducing legislation which will raise the earnings limitation for students to \$10,000, to be effective this year. This new earnings limitation, which would apply only to students, would help working students to earn the money they need to continue their schooling.

Mr. Speaker, eliminating the earnings limitation entirely would cost the social security trust funds \$30 million over 4 years. This provision would not have the same price tag, but it would really get at the problem these students are experiencing in financing their education. I think it is the least we can do to further the educational opportunities of the remaining students who are receiving social security student benefits, and I hope the Congress will give this bill prompt attention.●

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS R. REYNDERS

HON. GREGORY W. CARMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 3, 1982

● Mr. CARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give special commendation to Mr. Thomas R. Reynders, an exceptional member of the U.S. Embassy in Paris. Mr. Reynders recently assisted me during a special factfinding mission on behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives Banking Committee to promote international trade.

I was very impressed by the organization of the U.S. Embassy in Paris. Through Mr. Reynder's efforts, my meetings with trade officials in the public and private sectors in Paris were successful.

Sharing with you a little of Mr. Thomas R. Reynders' history is my pleasure. He was born on April 27, 1937, in Worcester, Mass. Mr. Reynders holds degrees from Princeton University and Harvard Law School. He has served as a member of the NATO Defense College in Rome, as a senior watch officer for the U.S. Department of State, and as a lieutenant of the U.S. Army. Mr. Reynders presently holds the post of Chief General for Economic Policy at the American Embassy in Paris, France.

Mr. Reynders' exceptional efforts bring credit to himself, the American Embassy in Paris, and to the United States. We are truly fortunate to have Mr. Thomas R. Reynders as a member of the U.S. Foreign Service.●