

exploding a living body with compressed gas is not acceptable to those who oppose the use of cold harpoons on humane grounds.

There have been experiments with killing by electrocution, but this requires that the whale first be harpooned and dragged by a cable back to the catcher boat so that the electrodes can be implanted, during which time the animal is conscious.

It is clear that the cold harpoon is the most inhumane way of killing and that high technology "humane" killing weapons that have been developed are not reliable. These devices are usually tested under ideal conditions which fall to simulate the worst case conditions.

Cold harpoons should not be used on any species of whale. Given the level of technology possessed by many IWC members, it should not be difficult to develop a humane alternative. The complete ban on this archaic and inhumane hunting weapon should be enforced and nations that have objected to the ban should agree on a date to stop using the cold harpoon and withdraw their objections.

LEE NAMED INTERIM FAMILY COURT JUDGE

HON. JOHN L. NAPIER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1982

● Mr. NAPIER. Mr. Speaker, I come from the small town of Bennettsville, S.C., in the northeastern part of the State. Bennettsville is located in one of the smaller counties in the State in terms of population.

Until I was elected to Congress, Marlboro County had not been the home of a Congressman in this century. Congressman John L. McLaurin served in the Congress just prior to the turn of the century, and later served in the U.S. Senate.

Likewise, until recently, Marlboro County had not been the residence of a State judicial officer for over 100 years. Last week, however, Bennettsville attorney Jamie Lee was selected to fill the vacancy on the Fourth Circuit Family Court to succeed Judge LeRoy M. Want of Darlington who died in November.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Jamie Lee on his selection and wish him much success as he approaches his new assignment. His new position is an extremely important one in the South Carolina judicial structure. His court has jurisdiction over domestic matters and include divorces, adoptions, termination of parental rights, juveniles, and support and other such matters—matters which go to the heart of our family institution.

As one who has practiced law on the opposing side from Jamie Lee, I feel extremely comfortable as he assumes this important post. Jamie Lee has the temperament of a judge. He is knowledgeable. He is extremely fair. He is firm. He is compassionate.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Marlboro County are proud of Judge Lee for his accomplishment, and I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the

House a recent news account and an editorial in the Marlboro-Herald Advocate of December 2, 1982, which detail the announcement of his selection, his background, and his accomplishments.

LEE NAMED INTERIM FAMILY COURT JUDGE

Bennettsville attorney Jamie Lee has been selected to fill the vacancy in the 4th Circuit Family Court. That vacancy occurred when Judge LeRoy M. Want of Darlington died in November.

Lee, 52, learned of his interim appointment on Monday from S.C. Gov. Richard Riley. Lee will still have a couple of obstacles to hurdle as any opposition that would file against him has until Friday to do so. Lee's interim term lasts until the legislature acts in 1983 to fill the unexpired term, which ends March 1, 1984.

"It is a great honor for me. I am very grateful for the appointment and confidence that has been shown in me by the governor and the Chief Justice," Lee said.

"I realize that Judge Want's shoes will not be easy to fill, but I will do the best job that I can," Lee said. Want had served as Family Court Judge since 1977 and died on November 9 after a long illness.

FIRST IN 105 YEARS

Lee will be the first state judge to come from Marlboro County in over 100 years.

Judge Joshua H. Hudson was the last to be named in 1878. "I hope that I can be a credit to the county and to the community. This is my home and it is an honor to have the chance to serve," Lee said.

Coincidentally, Jamie Lee is a great-great nephew of Judge Hudson, as is Fourth Circuit Solicitor DuPre Miller, also of Bennettsville.

Lee has been a practicing attorney here since graduating from the University of South Carolina Law School in 1959. Lee and his wife, the former Mary Breeden, have three children.

Lee served in the S.C. House of Representatives 1962-1966 and is a veteran of the Korean War. He currently holds the rank of Lieutenant Colonel in the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

Lee has also been an active member of the Marlboro community as a Shriner, Mason, in Boy Scouts and the United Way.

Lee has also served as attorney for the City of Bennettsville and also for the Marlboro County School Board. He has also been chairman of the Marlboro County Board of Elections.

Lee has informed the Herald-Advocate that he will resign from these jobs and also will close his law practice. Work on that had already started on Wednesday morning.

"Whenever you receive a Judgeship you have to close down your practice and also remove yourself from all other duties," Lee said.

His new position would mean, Lee said, that as a Family Court Judge he would have jurisdiction over all domestic claims like divorce, adoption, support and juvenile cases.

"This means anyone under 17 years old and would include anything from not going to school to robbing a store," Lee said.

Lee said that he would be the resident judge in Marlboro County and his work would take him to the four counties in the district (Marlboro, Chesterfield, Darlington, and Dillon) and wherever else he might be assigned by the Chief Justice of the S.C. Supreme Court.

DIFFERENT FEELING

After so many years of being on the other side of the courtroom, how will it feel to be behind the bench?

"It will be a different feeling to be sure, but an awful lot of people have made the

adjustment and I am looking forward to it. I would like to say thanks to all the people that helped me and I will try to do my best," Lee said.

A CREDIT TO US ALL

The "Marlboro Herald-Advocate" hails the appointment of Bennettsville attorney Jamie F. Lee to an interim appointment as Family Court Judge for the Fourth Judicial Circuit.

Lee's appointment by Gov. Richard W. Riley this week is a historic one in that it has been more than 105 years since the last Marlboro County attorney was named to a state bench.

In 1878, Joshua Hillary Hudson of Bennettsville was named Fourth Judicial Circuit Judge on Feb. 14, 1878, succeeding another Bennettsville attorney Charles Pinckney Townsend, who sat as circuit judge since 1873.

This is not the first time that Lee's name has surfaced for consideration for such a judgeship. When the family court system was inaugurated in S.C., Lee was then considered a likely candidate for such a seat, but was not then named.

It seems very appropriate to us that he should be named to fill the interim for the late Judge Leroy Want of Darlington, who died in office last month.

Lee's credentials are many, illuminating his career: State Champion B.H.S. Basketball Team member, honor guard to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, University of S.C. and USC Law School graduate, former member of the S.C. House of Representatives, attorney in private practice here as well as serving as attorney for the Marlboro County Board of Education and City of Bennettsville, and election commissioner for Marlboro County.

We congratulate Jamie Lee on this signal selection and express to him our appreciation for bringing this coveted position home to Marlboro County once again.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1982

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the House on official business on Monday, December 6, 1982. I am using this opportunity to indicate my positions on some of the votes conducted on that day in relation to H.R. 6211, the Surface Transportation Act.

Rollcall No. 416, "no"; rollcall No. 417, "no"; rollcall No. 418, "no"; rollcall No. 419, "no"; rollcall No. 420, "aye"; rollcall No. 421, "aye."

On rollcall No. 422, on Tuesday, December 7, I would have voted "aye."

TELECOMMUNICATIONS FOR THE DISABLED

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1982

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Energy and Commerce has unanimously reported S. 2355, the Telecommunications for the Disabled

Act of 1982. This bill accomplishes two vital purposes. It changes an intrusive and ill considered Federal regulation that would prevent telephone companies from supplying equipment to deaf and other handicapped individuals under the approval of State regulatory commissions. Second, the legislation resolves a longstanding dispute within the telephone industry by directing the Federal Communications Commission to establish a technical standard for the manufacture of telephones that are compatible with hearing aids.

The regulation that S. 2355 modifies is scheduled to become effective on January 1, 1983. Unless Congress acts this session, disabled Americans will be unable to obtain tariffed new terminal equipment after that date. Many disabled persons rely on this equipment to lead productive, self-sufficient, and independent lives. Therefore, I am pleased that the major telephone carriers—and unaffiliated manufacturers of telephone equipment—have joined with the handicapped community and State utility commissions to support this consensus legislation. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a selection of their letters, which explain the urgency of this legislation.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D.C., September 23, 1982.
Hon. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH,
U.S. House of Representatives, Chairman,
Subcommittee on Telecommunications,
Consumer Protection and Finance, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WIRTH: I am writing to you in response to the legislation you are proposing that would amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide reasonable access to telephone service for persons with impaired hearing and enable telephone companies to accommodate persons with other physical disabilities.

Quite frankly, the Disabled American Veterans has supported efforts to improve the lives of all American citizens with physical and mental disabilities, particularly, those disabled while in the wartime service to the United States.

A review of the legislation which you are proposing reveals that essential and frequently used coin operated telephones will be made compatible for specially equipped hearing aids utilized by the hearing impaired.

As equally important, your bill will finally permit telephone companies to make special telephone communications equipment available to the seriously handicapped at affordable costs.

Chairman Wirth, the DAV believes that your proposal will, if enacted, go a long way towards improving the quality of life for millions of hearing impaired and physically handicapped Americans.

On behalf of the 687,000 members of the Disabled American Veterans, I am pleased to strongly endorse your proposal and thank you for your endeavors to enable handicapped citizens to gain greater free-

dom and access to the mainstream of American society.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD G. GALLAN,
National Commander.

PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA,
Bethesda, Md., September 22, 1982.

Hon. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH,
Chairman Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Consumer Protection, and Finance Committee on Energy and Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WIRTH: On behalf of the 11,000 members of Paralyzed Veterans of America, I want to express appreciation for your efforts to promote access to the telephone communications system for individuals with physical impairments. Your recognition of the importance of improved and available communications for disabled citizens and the essential role modern communications play in assisting disabled people to achieve maximum independence is gratifying.

Your legislative proposal clearly addresses many problems presently facing disabled citizens regarding the acquisition and payment for specialized communications equipment. The recent Federal Communications Commission decision, Computer II, would preclude many individuals from obtaining this necessary, and often only means of contact with other people including vital medical and emergency personnel. Additionally, this FCC decision serves to retard technological innovations which benefit disabled people by drastically restricting their use and potential market.

Under the Computer II decision telephone companies would be prevented from subsidizing special and unique equipment which meet the needs of handicapped individuals. This not only will sever their primary means of communications but will also, in certain cases, prevent their gainful employment. This decision is unduly harsh and restrictive as it applies to devices for disabled people and presents a great hardship and peril to many of the most catastrophically disabled citizens.

Again, thank you for your recognition of this issue. If I or any member of my staff can further assist you in securing passage of this legislation, please contact us.

Sincerely yours,

R. JACK POWELL,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL EASTER SEAL SOCIETY,
Washington, D.C., September 27, 1982.

Hon. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Consumer Protection and Finance, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WIRTH: I am writing of behalf of the National Easter Seal Society to express support for the "Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982". We believe that this bill, H.R. 7168, amends the Communications Act of 1934 so that the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) will address two issues of critical importance to persons with disabilities. With respect to individuals with hearing impairments, the bill provides for reasonable access to telephone services. Moreover, H.R. 7168 provides states with the flexibility needed to allow telephone companies to continue to meet the unique needs of individuals with disabilities.

The National Society has consistently promoted efforts to provide persons with disabilities every opportunity to achieve fully productive and independent lives. For this reason, efforts by the Bell System and other

telephone companies to render the telephone network accessible to persons with disabilities have been viewed very favorably. In the past, these companies have readily developed and distributed special telephone equipment for private and public use. By incorporating the costs associated with special terminal equipment into the regular rate structure, telephone companies have enabled thousands of individuals with hearing, speech, vision or mobility impairments to purchase telephone service at a reasonable cost.

The National Easter Seal Society is concerned, however, that recent action by the FCC to deregulate terminal equipment will jeopardize access to the telephone network for persons with disabilities. The FCC's Computer II decision prohibits state communications commissions from allowing telephone companies to subsidize terminal equipment. We believe that this ruling, although apparently not directed at the equipment used by persons with disabilities, could, nonetheless, have a devastating impact on their access to the telephone system. Unless states are once again allowed to permit telephone companies to recover a portion of the development and distribution costs of special terminal equipment, individuals with disabilities may soon be confronted with exorbitant telephone equipment costs. Disabled consumers will be forced either forego the use of the telephone or pay charges considerably higher than those borne by the general public.

The National Society believes that H.R. 7168 provides the necessary statutory flexibility to permit telephone companies to continue to meet the unique needs of persons with disabilities at a reasonable charge to the disabled consumer. Access to the telephone system is crucial to the lives of persons with disabling conditions and should not be threatened.

Furthermore, the National Easter Seal Society is fully supportive of provisions within the "Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982" ensuring reasonable access to telephone services for person with hearing impairments. Telephones provided for emergency use or that are used frequently by persons with hearing impairments should be made compatible for use with a hearing aid as soon as possible. We are also encouraged by those sections of H.R. 7168 regarding rulemaking activity and consumer education. These provisions will further enhance access to telephone services for persons with impaired hearing.

We were pleased that H.R. 7168 received such strong and favorable support from the Committee on Energy and Commerce. We would urge the House to act in an expeditious and equally positive manner.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH D. ROMER,
Director of Governmental Affairs.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF RETIRED PERSONS,
Washington, D.C., September 23, 1982.

Hon. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Consumer Protection, and Finance, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIRTH: The American Association of Retired Persons is writing in support of H.R. 7168, the Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982, designed to promote access to the telephone network for persons with physical impairments.

We are pleased that this legislation recognizes and begins to address the problem of telephone receiver incompatibility with hearing aid telephone pickups. The Association is concerned that incompatible tele-

phone equipment is restricting certain individuals' access to the use of the telephone—an integral part of everyday life.

Hearing impairment among the elderly is a widespread disability which threatens the quality of life of our elderly by inhibiting their communication with others. The hearing aid, although not a panacea, is a rehabilitative device which provides assistance to many hearing impaired elderly. Hearing aids should serve the hearing impaired elderly in as many different situations as possible; using the telephone is one method of communication which should not be denied this population.

Nor should access to the telephone be denied to those individuals with other physical impairments who need different types of specialized telephone equipment. Therefore, as contained in section (g) of H.R. 7168, it is important that telephone companies be allowed and encouraged to provide that specialized telephone equipment in a manner which is affordable to those who need access to the telephone most.

The lack of access to telephones has far-reaching implications in such problem areas as freedom from isolation, emergency protection, equal employment opportunities, and freedom of mobility. For example, there are elderly individuals who suffer from chronic conditions which restrict their mobility and cause them to be confined to their homes. For them, the telephone is an essential tool for communication. It may be the only or major means for them to have contact with others and thereby provide protection from social isolation. In an emergency situation, the telephone may be their only resource for obtaining assistance.

Again, AARP supports H.R. 7168, the Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982, and urges that this legislation be acted upon favorably during this session of Congress.

Sincerely,

PETER W. HUGHES,
Legislative Counsel.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Lansing, Mich., September 24, 1982.

HON. TIMOTHY WIRTH,
Chairman, U.S. House of Representatives,
Subcommittee on Telecommunications,
Consumer Protection and Finance,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WIRTH: I am writing you today to express my support for H.R. 7168. This bill will provide access to telephone service for persons with impaired hearing and it will also enable telephone companies to provide other specialized terminal equipment needed by persons whose hearing, speech, vision or mobility is impaired. In the latter instance, the bill authorizes State commissions to allow carriers to recover in their regulated service tariffs reasonable costs of this equipment not charged directly to the users of this equipment. I commend you for introducing this legislation and support you in your efforts to enact this bill.

Sincerely,

ERIC J. SCHNEIDKIND,
Chairman.

CENTEL,
Washington, D.C., September 24, 1982.
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, House Energy and Commerce
Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: We understand that your committee has been very receptive to newly introduced H.R. 7168, the Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982.

H.R. 7168 is a bill designed to achieve a worthwhile objective. Moreover, it involves minimal regulatory involvement and limited cost to telephone manufacturers, telephone companies and ratepayers. A similar bill, S. 2355, was recently passed by the Senate, and we supported that bill.

Central Corporation supports your actions and the efforts of Mr. Wirth and the bill's other cosponsors to move this legislation to the full House. I shall be happy to encourage support for H.R. 7168 as incorporated into S. 2355 among our representatives in the full House.

Very truly yours,

MARTIN T. MCCUE.

AMERICAN SPEECH-
LANGUAGE-HEARING ASSOCIATION,
Rockville, Md., October 13, 1982.

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL,
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BROYHILL: The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) supports S. 2355 as amended to incorporate the changes provided by H.R. 7168, the Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982. We agree with the four points discussed under Section 2 of the bill and find that the new section, Telephone Service for the Disabled, appropriately resolves many of the difficulties the speech, language and hearing impaired have had with obtaining and funding the correct telephone.

The telephone is an important part of the lives of most Americans and, therefore, the telephone should be as accessible as possible for those Americans who have communicative disorders. As ASHA testified on May 6, 1982, before the Senate Subcommittee on Communications, there is a rise in incidence of hearing loss in our country. The National Center for Health Statistics reported that in 1971 there were 14.5 million individuals with hearing impairment and that by 1977 the figure rose to well over 16 million. We need to be certain that those who have a hearing loss serious enough to warrant the wearing of a hearing aid find that telephones are compatible with the induction coils of their hearing aids. ASHA would like to see the telephone companies required to insure availability of induction coil telephones in all settings. These induction coil units are readily available at present and all consumers and telephone personnel should be made aware that ordering a more useful telephone for their home or office is possible. The bill calls for the labeling of packaging material and this action should remedy the situation in the homes and workplaces of the hearing impaired. The necessity of compatible essential telephones mandated by the bill would improve ease of telephones by the hearing impaired when outside of their homes and work environments.

It is our hope that you will support the prompt passage of S. 2355 during the post-election session of the 97th Congress.

Sincerely,

STEVEN C. WHITE, Ph. D.,
Director, Reimbursement Policy Division.

AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR THE BLIND,
Washington, D.C., September 27, 1982.
Re Telecommunications for the Disabled
Act.

HON. TIMOTHY WIRTH,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.
Attention: Scott Rafferty.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WIRTH: On behalf of the thousands of members of the American Council of the Blind, please let me take this opportunity to express our support for the Telecommunications for the Disabled

Act. We believe that this legislation will be of benefit not only to hearing impaired people but also to other handicapped persons such as deaf-blind individuals who need costly, highly specialized telephone equipment.

We believe that the local telephone companies should be permitted to subsidize the cost of special equipment and installation from the general rate base.

We appreciate your efforts in connection with this legislation and hope that this bill will be passed by the House without delay.

Very truly yours,

J. SCOTT MARSHALL,
Director of Governmental Affairs.

Washington, D.C., September 27, 1982.

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH,
Chairman, Telecommunications and Finance
Subcommittee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIRTH: The undersigned organizations appreciate your efforts in developing and introducing the Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982. We support the bill in its extension of the compatibility requirements of S. 2355 to emergency phones, hospital phones and similar phones. We are also very supportive of the provisions which enable state utility commissions to allow telephone companies to recover costs of special terminal equipment for the disabled such as those who are deaf, vision-impaired or immobile. Technology has developed at a rapid rate in telecommunications for the disabled. These advances can permit severely disabled people to live independent lives; lives that might otherwise be relegated to institutions. This kind of technological development, together with architectural and design developments and developments in medical technology permit the disabled to lead much more productive lives.

The membership of our organizations provides health care and related services to disabled people. The goal of our services—the rehabilitation of the physically disabled—is dependent on the access of disabled people to communications systems. Your bill is important to us for it makes telecommunications advances financially feasible to the disabled.

Sincerely,

American Congress of Rehabilitation
Medicine; American Academy of Physical
Medicine & Rehabilitation; and
Association of Academic Psychiatrists.

By Their Counsel:

RICHARD E. VERVILLE, Esq.

NORTH AMERICAN TELEPHONE
ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D.C., November 30, 1982.

HON. TIM WIRTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIRTH: Your staff has asked for the views of the North American Telephone Association on H.R. 7168, The Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982. As you perhaps know, we were pleased to have been invited to participate in the development of this important legislation. Upon review of the final provisions of the Bill and its Report issued by Congressman Dingell for the House Committee on Energy and Commerce on September 23, 1982, we wish you to know that we strongly endorse enactment of the legislation in the form it is now submitted.

We have particularly appreciated the cooperation of your staff in working with us to accomplish this task!

Sincerely,

EDWIN B. SPIEVACK,
Executive Director.●

LAW OF THE SEA TREATY

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1982

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I commend this article from Reason magazine to the attention of my colleagues:

LIFE WITHOUT THE TREATY

What happens if the US government stands firm in its decision not to sign the United Nations law of the Sea treaty? Does it leave the United States in international isolation? Will it be impossible for US firms ever to mine the seabed?

It is true that on April 30 the United States was joined by only three other nations in voting against the Conference treaty. In the aftermath, the words "isolated" and "isolation" have shown up frequently in news reports and former diplomats' comments on the US vote and on President Reagan's July announcement that the United States would not be signing the agreement.

Yet 17 other nations—including the Soviet Union, Britain, and West Germany—failed, by abstaining, to vote for the treaty. Although greatly outnumbered by the 130 nations voting for the agreement, the abstaining and nay-voting countries are the source of 60 percent of world production and of contributions to the United Nations. In fact, the only major industrial nations voting for the treaty were France and Japan—and both pointed out that they were not saying whether they would ultimately ratify the treaty.

Sixty ratifications are needed for the treaty to go into effect, but analysts now speculate that they may be a long time in coming. Moreover, if 60 ratifications do come through, they may well be mainly from small nations. If so, the US government's desire for further negotiations on an alternative "minitreaty" could bear fruit. The now-defunct Reciprocating States Agreement (RSA)—negotiated by France, West Germany, Britain, and the United States within the context of UNCLOS—could be the starting point.

The aim of the RSA was to provide a framework for harmonizing national ocean-mining legislation among its signatories and for delineating mine sites. It was to be open to signing by any nation, signatory or non-signatory to the law of the Sea treaty, industrial or developing. It attempted, not to regulate seabed mining, but to provide an international legal environment in which development of oceanbed resources might proceed.

Critics of the US stance against the UN treaty worry that, without it, US firms will be unable to obtain financing for the huge capital investments needed to explore and mine the ocean floor. The mining industry itself, however, has enthusiastically supported the Reagan administration's refusal to sign the treaty. As pointed out in a Heritage Foundation report ("The Law of the Sea Treaty: Can the US Afford to Sign?"), it seems doubtful that financing would be forthcoming anyway under the restrictive conditions imposed by the treaty; and with or without the Law of the Sea treaty, credit

would be extended to ocean-mining firms on the basis of their existing assets and not their ability to produce seabed minerals.

The advantage of a treaty, then, would not be in the area of financing but in providing the climate in which potential seabed developers might risk their capital on such ventures. And the industry seems willing to bet on there being a viable alternative to the Law of the Sea regime.●

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1982

● Mr. La FALCE. Mr. Speaker, for the past 8 years, I have had the privilege of serving with a truly gifted man, an individual who will leave his mark on this body when he retires at the end of the 97th Congress. Today, Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a few moments to pay tribute to the work and the genius of my dear friend and colleague, HENRY REUSS.

During his 28 years as the U.S. Representative from Wisconsin's fifth Congressional District, HENRY REUSS has employed his intellectual gifts to improve our banking system, to enhance international relations, to speed pollution control efforts and, in his last term, to focus special attention on the chronic needs of our economy. It has been a career marked by brilliant ideas, and this chamber will be at a loss to replace the man and his genius.

Even a cursory review of those 28 years reveals the extent of this brilliance. As a young Congressman from Milwaukee, HENRY developed the idea of the Peace Corps and saw it bloom into one of America's best-known and admired tools of foreign aid. Several years later, as America's attention focused on the problems of pollution, he unearthed the unused Refuse Act of 1899, which prohibited the dumping of pollutants into navigable waters. He used the act to file hundreds of lawsuits and turned over the money won to Wisconsin's Department of Natural Resources to help its antipollution programs.

His leadership as chairman of the House Banking Committee built the groundwork for major changes in Federal regulation of the financial institutions industry. Having worked closely with Chairman REUSS on such matters as the Depository Institutions Deregulation and Monetary Control Act of 1980, I know that his vision for a modernized banking system has been instrumental in the changes now underway in this industry.

I also know that his leadership skills were instrumental in creating and passing the financial package necessary to save New York City from bankruptcy in the mid-1970's. As a young member of the Economic Stabilization Subcommittee, I took a special interest in this legislation because of its po-

tential effects on my home State of New York and other cities across America. Thinking back to those times, it is difficult to recall a more complex and emotional battle at the subcommittee and committee level. It was a privilege to serve on a committee led by an individual who allowed all parties to be heard and who forced the committee to produce a strong and reasoned bill.

On the Joint Economic Committee, both as chairman during this Congress and as a member during previous sessions, HENRY's strong and forceful voice has been heard often. Over a decade ago, HENRY authored a controversial JEC subcommittee report urging the Nixon administration to close the gold window and move to a system of floating exchange rates. During this Congress, with our economic future uncertain, Chairman REUSS has conducted one of the most aggressive and broadminded hearing schedules in this history of the committee. During the REUSS era, the JEC has held over 170 days of hearings and issued approximately 15 percent of the total number of publications—studies, reports, hearing records—in the 36-year history of the committee. Those hearings have touched virtually every facet of the national and international economic scene. Included among those hearing topics have been agricultural policy, the Nation's economic outlook, deregulation of natural gas, defense spending, the economic status of women, President Reagan's New Federalism proposals, urban policy, international trade, income distribution, and the Federal budget. The committee has published reports on Poland, studies of the economic situation in Cuba, and researched the status of the semiconductor industry in Eastern Europe and its effect on our trade with Soviet bloc nations.

Chairman REUSS's strong and consistent efforts to focus on issues affecting the stability and growth of America's economy are symbolic of his personal commitment to this Chamber. Even as he began the work of packing 28 years of work, he developed and proposed a program of infrastructure investment and job creation that the House will consider during this special session.

Mr. Speaker, in *The Other America*, author Michael Harrington wrote that—

The millions who are poor in the United States tend to become increasingly invisible. . . . It takes an effort of the intellect and will even to see them.

For over a quarter of a century, HENRY REUSS has commanded his intellect to see the pressing needs of this Nation. The legacy he leaves behind is one of vigor and brilliance in pursuit of improved economic conditions for all people.●

exploding a living body with compressed gas is not acceptable to those who oppose the use of cold harpoons on humane grounds.

There have been experiments with killing by electrocution, but this requires that the whale first be harpooned and dragged by a cable back to the catcher boat so that the electrodes can be implanted, during which time the animal is conscious.

It is clear that the cold harpoon is the most inhumane way of killing and that high technology "humane" killing weapons that have been developed are not reliable. These devices are usually tested under ideal conditions which fail to simulate the worst case conditions.

Cold harpoons should not be used on any species of whale. Given the level of technology possessed by many IWC members, it should not be difficult to develop a humane alternative. The complete ban on this archaic and inhumane hunting weapon should be enforced and nations that have objected to the ban should agree on a date to stop using the cold harpoon and withdraw their objections. ●

LEE NAMED INTERIM FAMILY COURT JUDGE

HON. JOHN L. NAPIER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1982

● Mr. NAPIER. Mr. Speaker, I come from the small town of Bennettsville, S.C., in the northeastern part of the State. Bennettsville is located in one of the smaller counties in the State in terms of population.

Until I was elected to Congress, Marlboro County had not been the home of a Congressman in this century. Congressman John L. McLaurin served in the Congress just prior to the turn of the century, and later served in the U.S. Senate.

Likewise, until recently, Marlboro County had not been the residence of a State judicial officer for over 100 years. Last week, however, Bennettsville attorney Jamie Lee was selected to fill the vacancy on the Fourth Circuit Family Court to succeed Judge LeRoy M. Want of Darlington who died in November.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Jamie Lee on his selection and wish him much success as he approaches his new assignment. His new position is an extremely important one in the South Carolina judicial structure. His court has jurisdiction over domestic matters and include divorces, adoptions, termination of parental rights, juveniles, and support and other such matters—matters which go to the heart of our family institution.

As one who has practiced law on the opposing side from Jamie Lee, I feel extremely comfortable as he assumes this important post. Jamie Lee has the temperament of a judge. He is knowledgeable. He is extremely fair. He is firm. He is compassionate.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Marlboro County are proud of Judge Lee for his accomplishment, and I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the

House a recent news account and an editorial in the Marlboro-Herald Advocate of December 2, 1982, which detail the announcement of his selection, his background, and his accomplishments.

LEE NAMED INTERIM FAMILY COURT JUDGE

Bennettsville attorney Jamie Lee has been selected to fill the vacancy in the 4th Circuit Family Court. That vacancy occurred when Judge LeRoy M. Want of Darlington died in November.

Lee, 52, learned of his interim appointment on Monday from S.C. Gov. Richard Riley. Lee will still have a couple of obstacles to hurdle as any opposition that would file against him has until Friday to do so. Lee's interim term lasts until the legislature acts in 1985 to fill the unexpired term, which ends March 1, 1984.

"It is a great honor for me. I am very grateful for the appointment and confidence that has been shown in me by the governor and the Chief Justice," Lee said.

"I realize that Judge Want's shoes will not be easy to fill, but I will do the best job that I can," Lee said. Want had served as Family Court Judge since 1977 and died on November 9 after a long illness.

FIRST IN 105 YEARS

Lee will be the first state judge to come from Marlboro County in over 100 years.

Judge Joshua H. Hudson was the last to be named in 1878. "I hope that I can be a credit to the county and to the community. This is my home and it is an honor to have the chance to serve," Lee said.

Coincidentally, Jamie Lee is a great-great nephew of Judge Hudson, as is Fourth Circuit Solicitor DuPre Miller, also of Bennettsville.

Lee has been a practicing attorney here since graduating from the University of South Carolina Law School in 1959. Lee and his wife, the former Mary Breeden, have three children.

Lee served in the S.C. House of Representatives 1962-1966 and is a veteran of the Korean War. He currently holds the rank of Lieutenant Colonel in the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

Lee has also been an active member of the Marlboro community as a Shriner, Mason, in Boy Scouts and the United Way.

Lee has also served as attorney for the City of Bennettsville and also for the Marlboro County School Board. He has also been chairman of the Marlboro County Board of Elections.

Lee has informed the Herald-Advocate that he will resign from these jobs and also will close his law practice. Work on that had already started on Wednesday morning.

"Whenever you receive a Judgeship you have to close down your practice and also remove yourself from all other duties," Lee said.

His new position would mean, Lee said, that as a Family Court Judge he would have jurisdiction over all domestic claims like divorce, adoption, support and juvenile cases.

"This means anyone under 17 years old and would include anything from not going to school to robbing a store," Lee said.

Lee said that he would be the resident judge in Marlboro County and his work would take him to the four counties in the district (Marlboro, Chesterfield, Darlington, and Dillon) and wherever else he might be assigned by the Chief Justice of the S.C. Supreme Court.

DIFFERENT FEELING

After so many years of being on the other side of the courtroom, how will it feel to be behind the bench?

"It will be a different feeling to be sure, but an awful lot of people have made the

adjustment and I am looking forward to it. I would like to say thanks to all the people that helped me and I will try to do my best," Lee said.

A CREDIT TO US ALL

The "Marlboro Herald-Advocate" hails the appointment of Bennettsville attorney Jamie F. Lee to an interim appointment as Family Court Judge for the Fourth Judicial Circuit.

Lee's appointment by Gov. Richard W. Riley this week is a historic one in that it has been more than 105 years since the last Marlboro County attorney was named to a state bench.

In 1878, Joshua Hillary Hudson of Bennettsville was named Fourth Judicial Circuit Judge on Feb. 14, 1878, succeeding another Bennettsville attorney Charles Pinckney Townsend, who sat as circuit judge since 1873.

This is not the first time that Lee's name has surfaced for consideration for such a judgeship. When the family court system was inaugurated in S.C., Lee was then considered a likely candidate for such a seat, but was not then named.

It seems very appropriate to us that he should be named to fill the interim for the late Judge Leroy Want of Darlington, who died in office last month.

Lee's credentials are many, illuminating his career: State Champion B.H.S. Basketball Team member, honor guard to Gen. Douglas McArthur, University of S.C. and USC Law School graduate, former member of the S.C. House of Representatives, attorney in private practice here as well as serving as attorney for the Marlboro County Board of Education and City of Bennettsville, and election commissioner for Marlboro County.

We congratulate Jamie Lee on this signal selection and express to him our appreciation for bringing this coveted position home to Marlboro County once again. ●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1982

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the House on official business on Monday, December 6, 1982. I am using this opportunity to indicate my positions on some of the votes conducted on that day in relation to H.R. 6211, the Surface Transportation Act.

Rollcall No. 416, "no"; rollcall No. 417, "no"; rollcall No. 418, "no"; rollcall No. 419, "no"; rollcall No. 420, "aye"; rollcall No. 421, "aye."

On rollcall No. 422, on Tuesday, December 7, I would have voted "aye." ●

TELECOMMUNICATIONS FOR THE DISABLED

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1982

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Energy and Commerce has unanimously reported S. 2355, the Telecommunications for the Disabled

Act of 1982. This bill accomplishes two vital purposes. It changes an intrusive and ill considered Federal regulation that would prevent telephone companies from supplying equipment to deaf and other handicapped individuals under the approval of State regulatory commissions. Second, the legislation resolves a longstanding dispute within the telephone industry by directing the Federal Communications Commission to establish a technical standard for the manufacture of telephones that are compatible with hearing aids.

The regulation that S. 2355 modifies is scheduled to become effective on January 1, 1983. Unless Congress acts this session, disabled Americans will be unable to obtain tariffed new terminal equipment after that date. Many disabled persons rely on this equipment to lead productive, self-sufficient, and independent lives. Therefore, I am pleased that the major telephone carriers—and unaffiliated manufacturers of telephone equipment—have joined with the handicapped community and State utility commissions to support this consensus legislation. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a selection of their letters, which explain the urgency of this legislation.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS;

Washington, D.C., September 23, 1982.

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH,

U.S. House of Representatives, Chairman, Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Consumer Protection and Finance, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WIRTH: I am writing to you in response to the legislation you are proposing that would amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide reasonable access to telephone service for persons with impaired hearing and enable telephone companies to accommodate persons with other physical disabilities.

Quite frankly, the Disabled American Veterans has supported efforts to improve the lives of all American citizens with physical and mental disabilities, particularly, those disabled while in the wartime service to the United States.

A review of the legislation which you are proposing reveals that essential and frequently used coin operated telephones will be made compatible for specially equipped hearing aids utilized by the hearing impaired.

As equally important, your bill will finally permit telephone companies to make special telephone communications equipment available to the seriously handicapped at affordable costs.

Chairman Wirth, the DAV believes that your proposal will, if enacted, go a long way towards improving the quality of life for millions of hearing impaired and physically handicapped Americans.

On behalf of the 687,000 members of the Disabled American Veterans, I am pleased to strongly endorse your proposal and thank you for your endeavors to enable handicapped citizens to gain greater free-

dom and access to the mainstream of American society.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD G. GALIAN,
National Commander.

PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA,

Bethesda, Md., September 22, 1982.

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH,

Chairman Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Consumer Protection, and Finance Committee on Energy and Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WIRTH: On behalf of the 11,000 members of Paralyzed Veterans of America, I want to express appreciation for your efforts to promote access to the telephone communications system for individuals with physical impairments. Your recognition of the importance of improved and available communications for disabled citizens and the essential role modern communications play in assisting disabled people to achieve maximum independence is gratifying.

Your legislative proposal clearly addresses many problems presently facing disabled citizens regarding the acquisition and payment for specialized communications equipment. The recent Federal Communications Commission decision, Computer II, would preclude many individuals from obtaining this necessary, and often only means of contact with other people including vital medical and emergency personnel. Additionally, this FCC decision serves to retard technological innovations which benefit disabled people by drastically restricting their use and potential market.

Under the Computer II decision telephone companies would be prevented from subsidizing special and unique equipment which meet the needs of handicapped individuals. This not only will sever their primary means of communications but will also, in certain cases, prevent their gainful employment. This decision is unduly harsh and restrictive as it applies to devices for disabled people and presents a great hardship and peril to many of the most catastrophically disabled citizens.

Again, thank you for your recognition of this issue. If I or any member of my staff can further assist you in securing passage of this legislation, please contact us.

Sincerely yours,

R. JACK POWELL,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL EASTER SEAL SOCIETY,

Washington, D.C., September 27, 1982.

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Consumer Protection and Finance, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WIRTH: I am writing of behalf of the National Easter Seal Society to express support for the "Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982". We believe that this bill, H.R. 7168, amends the Communications Act of 1934 so that the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) will address two issues of critical importance to persons with disabilities. With respect to individuals with hearing impairments, the bill provides for reasonable access to telephone services. Moreover, H.R. 7168 provides states with the flexibility needed to allow telephone companies to continue to meet the unique needs of individuals with disabilities.

The National Society has consistently promoted efforts to provide persons with disabilities every opportunity to achieve fully productive and independent lives. For this reason, efforts by the Bell System and other

telephone companies to render the telephone network accessible to persons with disabilities have been viewed very favorably. In the past, these companies have readily developed and distributed special telephone equipment for private and public use. By incorporating the costs associated with special terminal equipment into the regular rate structure, telephone companies have enabled thousands of individuals with hearing, speech, vision or mobility impairments to purchase telephone service at a reasonable cost.

The National Easter Seal Society is concerned, however, that recent action by the FCC to deregulate terminal equipment will jeopardize access to the telephone network for persons with disabilities. The FCC's Computer II decision prohibits state communications commissions from allowing telephone companies to subsidize terminal equipment. We believe that this ruling, although apparently not directed at the equipment used by persons with disabilities, could, nonetheless, have a devastating impact on their access to the telephone system. Unless states are once again allowed to permit telephone companies to recover a portion of the development and distribution costs of special terminal equipment, individuals with disabilities may soon be confronted with exorbitant telephone equipment costs. Disabled consumers will be forced to either forego the use of the telephone or pay charges considerably higher than those borne by the general public.

The National Society believes that H.R. 7168 provides the necessary statutory flexibility to permit telephone companies to continue to meet the unique needs of persons with disabilities at a reasonable charge to the disabled consumer. Access to the telephone system is crucial to the lives of persons with disabling conditions and should not be threatened.

Furthermore, the National Easter Seal Society is fully supportive of provisions within the "Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982" ensuring reasonable access to telephone services for person with hearing impairments. Telephones provided for emergency use or that are used frequently by persons with hearing impairments should be made compatible for use with a hearing aid as soon as possible. We are also encouraged by those sections of H.R. 7168 regarding rulemaking activity and consumer education. These provisions will further enhance access to telephone services for persons with impaired hearing.

We were pleased that H.R. 7168 received such strong and favorable support from the Committee on Energy and Commerce. We would urge the House to act in an expeditious and equally positive manner.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH D. ROMER,
Director of Governmental Affairs.

**AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF RETIRED PERSONS,**

Washington, D.C., September 23, 1982.

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Consumer Protection, and Finance, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIRTH: The American Association of Retired Persons is writing in support of H.R. 7168, the Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982, designed to promote access to the telephone network for persons with physical impairments.

We are pleased that this legislation recognizes and begins to address the problem of telephone receiver incompatibility with hearing aid telephone pickups. The Association is concerned that incompatible tele-

phone equipment is restricting certain individuals' access to the use of the telephone—an integral part of everyday life.

Hearing impairment among the elderly is a widespread disability which threatens the quality of life of our elderly by inhibiting their communication with others. The hearing aid, although not a panacea, is a rehabilitative device which provides assistance to many hearing impaired elderly. Hearing aids should serve the hearing impaired elderly in as many different situations as possible; using the telephone is one method of communication which should not be denied this population.

Nor should access to the telephone be denied to those individuals with other physical impairments who need different types of specialized telephone equipment. Therefore, as contained in section (g) of H.R. 7168, it is important that telephone companies be allowed and encouraged to provide that specialized telephone equipment in a manner which is affordable to those who need access to the telephone most.

The lack of access to telephones has far-reaching implications in such problem areas as freedom from isolation, emergency protection, equal employment opportunities, and freedom of mobility. For example, there are elderly individuals who suffer from severe chronic conditions which restrict their mobility and cause them to be confined to their homes. For them, the telephone is an essential tool for communication. It may be the only or major means for them to have contact with others and thereby provide protection from social isolation. In an emergency situation, the telephone may be their only resource for obtaining assistance.

Again, AARP supports H.R. 7168, the Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982, and urges that this legislation be acted upon favorably during this session of Congress.

Sincerely,

PETER W. HUGHES,
Legislative Counsel.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Lansing, Mich., September 24, 1982.
Hon. TIMOTHY WIRTH,
Chairman, U.S. House of Representatives,
Subcommittee on Telecommunications,
Consumer Protection and Finance,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WIRTH: I am writing to you today to express my support for H.R. 7168. This bill will provide access to telephone service for persons with impaired hearing and it will also enable telephone companies to provide other specialized terminal equipment needed by persons whose hearing, speech, vision or mobility is impaired. In the latter instance, the bill authorizes State commissions to allow carriers to recover in their regulated service tariffs reasonable costs of this equipment not charged directly to the users of this equipment. I commend you for introducing this legislation and support you in your efforts to enact this bill.

Sincerely,

ERIC J. SCHNEIDWIND,
Chairman.

CENTEL,
Washington, D.C., September 24, 1982.
Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, House Energy and Commerce
Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: We understand that your committee has been very receptive to newly introduced H.R. 7168, the Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982.

H.R. 7168 is a bill designed to achieve a worthwhile objective. Moreover, it involves minimal regulatory involvement and limited cost to telephone manufacturers, telephone companies and ratepayers. A similar bill, S. 2355, was recently passed by the Senate, and we supported that bill.

Central Corporation supports your actions and the efforts of Mr. Wirth and the bill's other cosponsors to move this legislation to the full House. I shall be happy to encourage support for H.R. 7168 as incorporated into S. 2355 among our representatives in the full House.

Very truly yours,

MARTIN T. MCCUE.

AMERICAN SPEECH-
LANGUAGE-HEARING ASSOCIATION,
Rockville, Md., October 13, 1982.

Hon. JAMES T. BROYHILL,
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BROYHILL: The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) supports S. 2355 as amended to incorporate the changes provided by H.R. 7168, the Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982. We agree with the four points discussed under Section 2 of the bill and find that the new section, Telephone Service for the Disabled, appropriately resolves many of the difficulties the speech, language and hearing impaired have had with obtaining and funding the correct telephone.

The telephone is an important part of the lives of most Americans and, therefore, the telephone should be as accessible as possible for those Americans who have communicative disorders. As ASHA testified on May 6, 1982, before the Senate Subcommittee on Communications, there is a rise in incidence of hearing loss in our country. The National Center for Health Statistics reported that in 1971 there were 14.5 million individuals with hearing impairment and that by 1977 the figure rose to well over 16 million. We need to be certain that those who have a hearing loss serious enough to warrant the wearing of a hearing aid find that telephones are compatible with the induction coils of their hearing aids. ASHA would like to see the telephone companies required to insure availability of induction coil telephones in all settings. These induction coil units are readily available at present and all consumers and telephone personnel should be made aware that ordering a more useful telephone for their home or office is possible. The bill calls for the labeling of packaging material and this action should remedy the situation in the homes and workplaces of the hearing impaired. The necessity of compatible essential telephones mandated by the bill would improve ease of telephones by the hearing impaired when outside of their homes and work environments.

It is our hope that you will support the prompt passage of S. 2355 during the post-election session of the 97th Congress.

Sincerely,

STEVEN C. WHITE, Ph. D.,
Director, Reimbursement Policy Division.

AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR THE BLIND,
Washington, D.C., September 27, 1982.
Re Telecommunications for the Disabled
Act.

Hon. TIMOTHY WIRTH,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.
Attention: Scott Rafferty.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WIRTH: On behalf of the thousands of members of the American Council of the Blind, please let me take this opportunity to express our support for the Telecommunications for the Disabled

Act. We believe that this legislation will be of benefit not only to hearing impaired people but also to other handicapped persons such as deaf-blind individuals who need costly, highly specialized telephone equipment.

We believe that the local telephone companies should be permitted to subsidize the cost of special equipment and installation from the general rate base.

We appreciate your efforts in connection with this legislation and hope that this bill will be passed by the House without delay.

Very truly yours,

J. SCOTT MARSHALL,
Director of Governmental Affairs.

Washington, D.C., September 27, 1982.
Hon. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH,
Chairman, Telecommunications and Finance
Subcommittee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIRTH: The undersigned organizations appreciate your efforts in developing and introducing the Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982. We support the bill in its extension of the compatibility requirements of S. 2355 to emergency phones, hospital phones and similar phones. We are also very supportive of the provisions which enable state utility commissions to allow telephone companies to recover costs of special terminal equipment for the disabled such as those who are deaf, vision-impaired or immobile. Technology has developed at a rapid rate in telecommunications for the disabled. These advances can permit severely disabled people to live independent lives; lives that might otherwise be relegated to institutions. This kind of technological development, together with architectural and design developments and developments in medical technology permit the disabled to lead much more productive lives.

The membership of our organizations provides health care and related services to disabled people. The goal of our services—the rehabilitation of the physically disabled—is dependent on the access of disabled people to communications systems. Your bill is important to us for it makes telecommunications advances financially feasible to the disabled.

Sincerely,

American Congress of Rehabilitation
Medicine; American Academy of Physical
Medicine & Rehabilitation; and
Association of Academic Psychiatrists.

By Their Counsel:

RICHARD E. VERVILLE, Esq.

NORTH AMERICAN TELEPHONE
ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D.C., November 30, 1982.
Hon. TIM WIRTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIRTH: Your staff has asked for the views of the North American Telephone Association on H.R. 7168, The Telecommunications for the Disabled Act of 1982. As you perhaps know, we were pleased to have been invited to participate in the development of this important legislation. Upon review of the final provisions of the Bill and its Report issued by Congressman Dingell for the House Committee on Energy and Commerce on September 28, 1982, we wish you to know that we strongly endorse enactment of the legislation in the form it is now submitted.

We have particularly appreciated the cooperation of your staff in working with us to accomplish this task!

Sincerely,

EDWIN B. SPIEVACK,
Executive Director.●

LAW OF THE SEA TREATY

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1982

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I commend this article from Reason magazine to the attention of my colleagues:

LIFE WITHOUT THE TREATY

What happens if the US government stands firm in its decision not to sign the United Nations law of the Sea treaty? Does it leave the United States in international isolation? Will it be impossible for US firms ever to mine the seabed?

It is true that on April 30 the United States was joined by only three other nations in voting against the Conference treaty. In the aftermath, the words "isolated" and "isolation" have shown up frequently in news reports and former diplomats' comments on the US vote and on President Reagan's July announcement that the United States would not be signing the agreement.

Yet 17 other nations—including the Soviet Union, Britain, and West Germany—failed, by abstaining, to vote for the treaty. Although greatly outnumbered by the 130 nations voting for the agreement, the abstaining and nay-voting countries are the source of 80 percent of world production and of contributions to the United Nations. In fact, the only major industrial nations voting for the treaty were France and Japan—and both pointed out that they were not saying whether they would ultimately ratify the treaty.

Sixty ratifications are needed for the treaty to go into effect, but analysts now speculate that they may be a long time in coming. Moreover, if 60 ratifications do come through, they may well be mainly from small nations. If so, the US government's desire for further negotiations on an alternative "minitreaty" could bear fruit. The now-defunct Reciprocating States Agreement (RSA)—negotiated by France, West Germany, Britain, and the United States within the context of UNCLOS—could be the starting point.

The aim of the RSA was to provide a framework for harmonizing national ocean-mining legislation among its signatories and for delineating mine sites. It was to be open to signing by any nation, signatory or non-signatory to the law of the Sea treaty, industrial or developing. It attempted, not to regulate seabed mining, but to provide an international legal environment in which development of oceanbed resources might proceed.

Critics of the US stance against the UN treaty worry that, without it, US firms will be unable to obtain financing for the huge capital investments needed to explore and mine the ocean floor. The mining industry itself, however, has enthusiastically supported the Reagan administration's refusal to sign the treaty. As pointed out in a Heritage Foundation report ("The Law of the Sea Treaty: Can the US Afford to Sign?"), it seems doubtful that financing would be forthcoming anyway under the restrictive conditions imposed by the treaty; and with or without the Law of the Sea treaty, credit

would be extended to ocean-mining firms on the basis of their existing assets and not their ability to produce seabed minerals.

The advantage of a treaty, then, would not be in the area of financing but in providing the climate in which potential seabed developers might risk their capital on such ventures. And the industry seems willing to bet on there being a viable alternative to the Law of the Sea regime.●

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 7, 1982

● Mr. LA FALCE. Mr. Speaker, for the past 8 years, I have had the privilege of serving with a truly gifted man, an individual who will leave his mark on this body when he retires at the end of the 97th Congress. Today, Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a few moments to pay tribute to the work and the genius of my dear friend and colleague, HENRY REUSS.

During his 28 years as the U.S. Representative from Wisconsin's fifth Congressional District, HENRY REUSS has employed his intellectual gifts to improve our banking system, to enhance international relations, to speed pollution control efforts and, in his last term, to focus special attention on the chronic needs of our economy. It has been a career marked by brilliant ideas, and this chamber will be at a loss to replace the man and his genius.

Even a cursory review of those 28 years reveals the extent of this brilliance. As a young Congressman from Milwaukee, HENRY developed the idea of the Peace Corps and saw it bloom into one of America's best-known and admired tools of foreign aid. Several years later, as America's attention focused on the problems of pollution, he unearthed the unused Refuse Act of 1899, which prohibited the dumping of pollutants into navigable waters. He used the act to file hundreds of lawsuits and turned over the money won to Wisconsin's Department of Natural Resources to help its antipollution programs.

His leadership as chairman of the House Banking Committee built the groundwork for major changes in Federal regulation of the financial institutions industry. Having worked closely with Chairman REUSS on such matters as the Depository Institutions Deregulation and Monetary Control Act of 1980, I know that his vision for a modernized banking system has been instrumental in the changes now underway in this industry.

I also know that his leadership skills were instrumental in creating and passing the financial package necessary to save New York City from bankruptcy in the mid-1970's. As a young member of the Economic Stabilization Subcommittee, I took a special interest in this legislation because of its po-

tential effects on my home State of New York and other cities across America. Thinking back to those times, it is difficult to recall a more complex and emotional battle at the subcommittee and committee level. It was a privilege to serve on a committee led by an individual who allowed all parties to be heard and who forced the committee to produce a strong and reasoned bill.

On the Joint Economic Committee, both as chairman during this Congress and as a member during previous sessions, HENRY's strong and forceful voice has been heard often. Over a decade ago, HENRY authored a controversial JEC subcommittee report urging the Nixon administration to close the gold window and move to a system of floating exchange rates. During this Congress, with our economic future uncertain, Chairman REUSS has conducted one of the most aggressive and broadminded hearing schedules in this history of the committee. During the Reuss era, the JEC has held over 170 days of hearings and issued approximately 15 percent of the total number of publications—studies, reports, hearing records—in the 36-year history of the committee. Those hearings have touched virtually every facet of the national and international economic scene. Included among those hearing topics have been agricultural policy, the Nation's economic outlook, deregulation of natural gas, defense spending, the economic status of women, President Reagan's New Federalism proposals, urban policy, international trade, income distribution, and the Federal budget. The committee has published reports on Poland, studies of the economic situation in Cuba, and researched the status of the semiconductor industry in Eastern Europe and its effect on our trade with Soviet bloc nations.

Chairman REUSS's strong and consistent efforts to focus on issues affecting the stability and growth of America's economy are symbolic of his personal commitment to this Chamber. Even as he began the work of packing 28 years of work, he developed and proposed a program of infrastructure investment and job creation that the House will consider during this special session.

Mr. Speaker, in *The Other America*, author Michael Harrington wrote that—

The millions who are poor in the United States tend to become increasingly invisible. . . . It takes an effort of the intellect and will even to see them.

For over a quarter of a century, HENRY REUSS has commanded his intellect to see the pressing needs of this Nation. The legacy he leaves behind is one of vigor and brilliance in pursuit of improved economic conditions for all people.●