

Pat Choate, author of *The High-Flex Society* and an economist at TRW, Inc., argues that the jobs brought by direct foreign investment are not payment enough for the benefits of investment that non-Americans enjoy in this country. He points out that jobs created in Japanese-run manufacturing facilities are of a simple "screwdriver" variety that, on balance, short-changes America of new jobs that are higher paid, skilled or professional in nature. Choate expects that as the Japanese penetrate many industries in the U.S., "they will be in a position to dominate our economy in every area that matters by the mid-1990s. You ain't seen nothing yet."

Others think America should be pickier about the kind of foreign investment it welcomes. "If a foreign group comes here and puts in a new plant, that's fine," says Representative John Bryant. "But if they buy a bank farm or manufacturing facility, that's another thing." Bryant criticizes the government as being too nonchalant about tracking the ownership and extent of foreign holdings and is pushing for tighter reporting systems for foreign investors.

Ultimately, the commitment that foreigners make to the U.S. market will be measured in whether profits are plowed back into the U.S. or returned to the home office. But Americans who are sampling sushi in the lunchroom and savoring the economic shot in the arm that foreign investment brings rarely dwell on the long-term implications.

BIGGEST BUYS

(The 11 biggest foreign acquisitions of U.S. companies in 1986)

Acquirer	Acquired, merged firm	Value
Cameau Corp. (Canada)	Allied Stores Corp.	\$3.61
News Corp. (Australia)	Metromedia, Inc. (7 TV stations)	\$1.99
Electrolux Group (Sweden)	White Consolidated Industries	\$742.7
Prudential Corp. (Britain)	Jackson National Life Insurance	\$597
Imperial Chemical Industries (Britain)	SCM Corporation (Glidden Coatings & Resins division)	\$580
Boots Company (Britain)	Baxter Travenol Labs (Flint unit)	\$555
Dainippon Ink & Chemicals, Inc. (Japan)	Sun Chemical Corp. (graphic-arts-material group)	\$550
British Petroleum Company (Britain)	Purina Mills	\$545
Hanson Trust (Britain)	SCM Corp.	\$503.5
Sumitomo Bank (Japan)	Goldman, Sachs & Company (12.5%)	\$500
Sir James Goldsmith (Britain)	Goodyear Tire & Rubber (11.5%)	\$500

¹ Billion.
² Million.

Note.—USN & WR.—Basic data: Mergers & Acquisitions.

In fact, many states and cities can't get enough new foreign investment and will go to extremes to attract it. Take the city of Texarkana, population 55,000, which straddles the Texas-Arkansas border. It is so eager to woo Japanese manufacturers that a score of civic leaders are studying Japanese in night school. As feed-grain-and-cotton farmer Lynn Lowe, chairman of the Texarkana Chamber of Commerce, puts it: "There are golden plums out there, and we hope to get some of them."●

VIOLENCE AGAINST HOUSES OF RELIGION

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of S. 794. I commend my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. METZENBAUM, for introducing this legislation.

The gaps in current Federal law regarding the perpetration of religious violence need to be filled. In recent years, there have been increasing reports from many regions of the country of violence directed against houses of religion. These reports have included incidents of bombing, arson, vandalism, and defacement of religious buildings by the painting of swastikas and other hate symbols. Although most of such religiously motivated hate crimes have been anti-Semitic and directed against synagogues, the problem is by no means limited to those of the Jewish faith. Protestant and Catholic churches have also been the target of such attacks. Some of these incidents have been the work of organized hate groups whose perverse theories attempt to make scapegoats of certain religious groups. While the States have the primary responsibility for law enforcement with regard to such matters, the Federal Government also has a responsibility. But unfortunately, where organized hate groups have extended their operations across State lines, Federal authorities have been able to respond only in limited circumstances. This bill will expand those circumstances so there can be a more effective Federal response.

It is important to note that this legislation does not preempt the authority of State and local law enforcement in this area. It is intended merely to supplement that authority when specific jurisdictional requirements are met.

This year marks the 200th anniversary of the U.S. Constitution. There are few more cherished freedoms protected by our Constitution than the first amendment right to worship where one pleases. Unlike totalitarian Communist regimes, this right is not merely stated in theory in our fundamental law; it is honored in practice. Thus, I think it most appropriate that the Federal executive be given effective means to protect the right to religious freedom when groups or individuals attempt to interfere with that right through force or violence. This bill represents a strong statement that Americans are united in their commitment to religious tolerance and in opposition to those who threaten it.●

KEITH BRAUN, A DIVIDED SPOUSE

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the case of Keith Braun, a divided spouse. As I have stated before on the Senate floor, Keith Braun has been waiting for more than 2 years for his Soviet bride, Svetlana, to join him in Southfield, MI. Svetlana Braun, of Moscow, has been refused an exit visa five times.

On January 4, 1987, Keith met with the Deputy Director of the Consular Administration of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, who promised Keith that he would receive an answer about his wife's exit visa soon after January 10, 1987. The Deputy Director implied that the answer would be a positive one. It is now March 26, and Keith has heard nothing.

The building of trust between our two countries is essential. In good faith, Keith trusted what was told him by the Soviet official. On Sunday, March 29, Keith is meeting with this same official in Washington. It is my sincere hope that he will keep his word, and have an answer for Keith Braun.●

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 9 A.M.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER DESIGNATING A PERIOD FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the two leaders are recognized on tomorrow under the standing order, there be a period for the transaction of morning business, not to extend beyond the hour of 9:30 a.m., and that Senators be permitted to speak during that period for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 78—INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I believe this request has been cleared on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. DOLE. It has been cleared.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Republican leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Order No. 64, Senate Joint Resolution 78, be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 9 A.M.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, at 7:05 p.m., recessed until Friday, March 27, 1987, at 9 a.m.