

ding seized merchandise as Fort Lauderdale. They obviously need a push, however, by organizations like the GAO.●

NATIONAL ENTOMOLOGY WEEK

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution, together with 29 of my colleagues, to designate November 27 through December 3, 1983, as "National Entomology Week." On the 13th anniversary of the founding of the Entomological Society of America it is fitting that we recognize the contributions entomologists have made over the years. Entomologists have made sense and order out of the insect world, contributing to a better understanding of the natural systems which surround us. They have made advances possible in insect control, which have allowed us to produce such agricultural bounty. And as the biological sciences increase in importance, entomology will continue to add to our basic biological knowledge and provide many practical methods of biological pest control.

What has prompted me to take the unusual step of introducing this resolution is my respect for the entomological research taking place across the country. One of the finest centers of this research is the University of California at Riverside, recognized internationally for the work being done there. The agricultural experiment station at Riverside, which recently celebrated its 75th anniversary, was an early center of excellence in entomological research, a tradition which continues today. Entomology has become a major area of study, with research being conducted in every State at colleges, universities, and research centers across the country.

I think that it is important to recognize important scientific disciplines as we enter a time of renewed interest in science and the contribution which it can make to our economy and our society. Entomologists have certainly contributed their share and deserved to be singled out for special recognition.

A copy of the resolution follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas the study of entomology continually yields advances in our knowledge of the ecology, behavior, and dynamics of insects;

Whereas entomologists make significant contributions to the production and protection of food, clothing, and shelter and in the preservation of human health and the environment;

Whereas advancements in entomology contribute substantially to the national welfare and improvements in the daily lives of our Nation's citizens;

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Whereas entomological research is being undertaken in all 50 States—in the Federal, State, and private sectors; in colleges, universities, and museums; in government, commercial, and private laboratories; and in experiment stations;

Whereas 1983 marks the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the Entomological Society of America;

Whereas the Entomological Society of America will hold its annual meeting on November 28 through December 2, 1983, in Detroit, Michigan, and approximately 2,500 leading entomologists from around the world will gather at the meeting to share their research findings and discuss developments in entomology; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of November 27 through December 3, 1983, is designated as "National Entomology Week" and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate activities.●

A GOOD GRAIN DEAL—AND A GOOD DEAL MORE

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1983

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues this editorial from the August 1, 1983 edition of the Christian Science Monitor, which goes far beyond its title, "A Good Grain Deal," and discusses the several areas where the Soviets appear to be taking policy initiatives which the U.S. Government should welcome and to which reasonable and favorable responses should be given.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 1, 1983]

A GOOD GRAIN DEAL

It is heartening to see that the United States and the Soviet Union can do business. Poland, Afghanistan, Central America, and other hot spots notwithstanding, the superpowers are capable of getting together in areas where they have a mutual interest in cooperation. Trade is one of them. A new grain agreement commits the Russians to buying at least nine million metric tons of US grain in each of the next five years. The Russians are happy, American farmers are happy, and—while this does not eliminate all the knotty problems in US-Soviet relations—it is an important positive step.

Domestic considerations seem to have played the overriding role on both sides. President Reagan was faced with American farmers pleading to do something in the face of mounting grain surpluses. His PIK program to reduce production and alleviate government storage costs has had mixed results. Farmers have taken land out of production, to be sure, but it has largely been marginal land. Being the shrewd businessman they are, they kept the best land in use and actually worked it harder than normal. So, overall, grain output has not declined as much as expected. Selling to the Russians has looked better and better as a way out of the dilemma of American farm efficiency.

August 2, 1983

This of course required some fast footwork on the President's part. Mr. Reagan, as part of his policy of economic sanctions against Poland, had refused to negotiate a new grain agreement with Moscow. He simply renewed the old one—twice. But domestic pressures were building and he bent to a more practical, pragmatic course.

So much for economic sanctions. In the process of reversing course, however, his negotiators managed to strike a good deal—requiring the Russians to purchase 50 percent more each year than under the old accord. The required minimum purchases from the U.S. will now constitute about 30 percent of the USSR's total grain imports.

And what of Yuri Andropov? Let it be said first that Americans are not saving Soviet agriculture. The Russians in fact expect a good grain harvest this year—over 200 million metric tons as compared with 180 million tons in 1982. The imported grain, moreover, is for the purpose of building up their livestock herds, not feeding people. The fact is, the Russians like to cover all bases in such an unpredictable area as agriculture. While they can import plenty of grain from Canada, Australia, and other countries, it clearly is to their advantage to be able to count on a single supplier. Especially given their cumbersome long-term planning system.

Perhaps there is a political nuance in all this as well. There have been a number of signs of late that Mr. Andropov is prepared to improve U.S.-Soviet relations. These signs—release of the Pentacostals, a softer position in the Madrid security conference, and others—seem to be saying that Moscow is willing to deal with the Reagan administration if the latter responds accordingly. Such "reasonableness" has its reverberations on public opinion in Western Europe, where the Russians are trying to stave off the deployment of new NATO missiles. Does Mr. Andropov calculate that, if deployment does go ahead and he is forced to respond in some way, he can escape being blamed for a worsening of East-West relations inasmuch as he tried so visibly to come to terms?

No one can be sure. In general the Russians' basic approach is to keep economic policy separated from politics. The grain agreement is good economics. In any case, the world can always breathe a little more easily when the nuclear giants are trading with each other—not exchanging bullets.●

ANIMAL WELFARE GAINS ADVOCATES

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1983

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the past week has shown the remarkable power of public opinion, the press, and congressional persistence. We have commended the Secretary of Defense for responding promptly to a letter of protest signed and sent to him by more than 40 Members of the House. We now need to turn our attention to positive proaction rather than reaction. We need to thoughtfully design legislation which makes it unnecessary and unlawful to deliberately destroy animal life without clear and valid jus-

Augu

tificat
anim
shock
to th
woun
expre
we ar
cates
Anim
The
Instit
the F
mode
anim
scien
comp
but i
allow
weak
pose
I
lette
York
31.

It
tion:
refo:
[Fr
W

To tl
Se
com
dem
men
wou
men
bull
keys
Sc
tow
guid
of l
be
nec
use
to e
Ir
ing
ove
tern
the
par
the
ma
me
an
an
ger
tio
E
leg
th
ra
bil
nu
mi
of
th
ar
ea
re
ot
sp
cc
h
A
ci

tification. All Americans, not only animal welfare advocates, have been shocked and disgusted by the exposure to the procedures used in military wound laboratories. Public opinion, as expressed through the deluge of mail we are all receiving on this topic, indicates that it is time to strengthen the Animal Welfare Act.

The reauthorization of the National Institutes of Health will be voted in the House this week. Included are the modest but important provisions on animal research recommended by both animal welfare groups and research scientists. These provisions are not as comprehensive as the Dole legislation, but it is very important that we do not allow this modest reform to be further weakened by substitute provisions proposed on the floor.

I am including, for the record, a letter written to the editor of the New York Times, published Sunday, July 31.

It is a reasonable argument for a rational approach to this much needed reform.

[From the New York Times, July 31, 1983]

WHEN ANIMAL EXPERIMENTS CANNOT BE AVOIDED

To the Editor:

Secretary of Defense Weinberger is to be commended for his prompt compliance with demands to stop gunshot-wound experiments on dogs (news story July 27). But would those so indignant over these experiments have been equally outraged were the bullets aimed at pigs, goats, rabbits or monkeys rather than dogs?

Scientific advancement and humaneness toward animals are compatible, and ethical guidelines have been established for the use of laboratory animals. Live animals should be used only when the data are absolutely necessary, no adequate alternatives to the use of animals exist and every effort is made to eliminate suffering.

In the Defense Department's dog-wound experiment, serious questions existed over the need for the study and whether alternatives were available. But, ironically, the experimental model the Defense Department proposed was more humane than the designs that have been approved for many other Government-funded experiments. Animals are often not adequately anesthetized before painful experiments, and are allowed to recover from painful surgery so that they can be "recycled" for additional procedures.

Senator Robert Dole recently introduced legislation (S.657) that would strengthen the Animal Welfare Act by improving laboratory conditions for research animals. This bill would require the use of the lowest number of animals possible in any Government-funded experiment, encourage the use of alternatives, avoid repeated operations on the same animal, curb the use of paralytics and provide improved oversight by requiring each research institution to include on a review committee at least one member from outside the institution who would be responsible for community animal welfare concerns.

Were the bill to become law, some of the horrible practices that now take place in American laboratories would cease. The cancellation of gunshot wound experiments on

80 dogs was a minor victory. Much more significant for the welfare of millions of laboratory animals would be the passage of S.657.

JOHN F. KULLBERG,
Executive Director, A.S.P.C.A.●

**TRIBUTE TO CHARLOTTE
HAWKINS BROWN**

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1983

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, on August 5, 1983, the Palmer Memorial Institute Alumni Association will hold its fourth reunion at the Huntington Sheraton Hotel in Pasadena, Calif.

The Palmer Memorial Institute of Sedalla, N.C., was one of the first private schools to seriously address the educational needs of blacks. Its founder, the late Dr. Charlotte Hawkins Brown, opened the school in October 1902, and graduated its first class in 1905.

Named after Alice Freeman Palmer, a prominent educator who fostered Dr. Brown's own education, the school flourished and over the years grew into an important institution. Throughout this time the moving spirit behind the school was Dr. Brown whose pioneering efforts lead the way for other black institutions. Her untiring efforts on behalf of the school touched the lives of thousands of students.

Beyond sound academic training, Dr. Brown believed that good manners and social graces were indispensable elements of a full education. She vigorously impressed importance of this on all her students.

Dr. Brown received many honors recognizing her great contributions, and was always an outspoken advocate for improved educational and vocational opportunities for blacks. In October 1952 she concluded 50 years of service to the school she founded. Others carried on until 1971 when the Palmer Memorial Institute fell victim to financial troubles.

However human character and spirit transcend bricks and stone, for the graduates of the Palmer Institute have passed the traditions of its founder to their children. Alumni are found in such diverse fields as the arts, education, medicine, law, government, agriculture, and the military.

Throughout her life, Dr. Charlotte Hawkins Brown set an example we would all do well to emulate. I am proud to join the Palmer Memorial Institute Alumni Association in honoring her memory.●

**BURBANK-GLENDALE-PASADENA
AIRPORT**

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1983

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate Transportation Appropriations Committee Reports contain conflicting language relating to the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport. Recent action by the local jurisdiction has resolved the problems that originally led me to request the inclusion of this language in the House report.

The impact of an urban airport on surrounding homeowners is not a new issue in my district. I believe that all residents of surrounding communities who benefit from airport services should also share the noise burden associated with the facility. For years, several of the communities that I represent have borne a disproportionate amount of the noise level resulting from daily operations at the airport. Furthermore, these residents have been unrepresented on the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority which manages the airport.

During full committee consideration of the Transportation appropriations bill, Congressman DIXON introduced on my behalf report language that directed the Federal Aviation Administration to withhold airport improvement funds for the purposes of building a new terminal at the Burbank Airport until the airport developed a noise compatibility program and adopted a master plan.

At the time of the floor debate on the bill, Congressmen ROYBAL, MOORHEAD, and myself agreed in a colloquy that efforts at the local level should begin immediately to resolve these longstanding problems. Since that time, airport officials, representatives of the homeowners' groups, and the Congressmen involved have spent considerable time in drawing up a plan that would make significant progress toward equalizing runway use and therefore dispersing the noise more fairly.

Yesterday, the commission of the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority adopted a resolution regarding the development and implementation of such a runway utilization program. Based on numerous conversations, I am confident that the authority intends to do everything in its power to implement the policy set forth in this resolution.

Congressmen DIXON, ROYBAL, MOORHEAD, and I all agree that given the actions of the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority and their commitment to implementing this resolution, that the FAA should disregard