

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GOVERNOR GRAHAM'S REMARKS AT COMMISSIONING CEREMONIES FOR THE U.S.S. "FLORIDA"

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to include in the RECORD the remarks of Florida's dynamic and popular Gov. Bob Graham, at the commissioning of the trident submarine U.S.S. *Florida* at Groton, Conn., June 18:

Today is a day of pride for all Floridians, as our State's namesake once again joins the fleet that forms the first line of defense for liberty.

Not since 1931, when the battleship U.S.S. *Florida* was decommissioned, has our State been recognized in this significant manner. We are proud of, and grateful for, this designation.

This ceremony today is an historic echo of the "brilliant and impressive" ceremonies in Pensacola, Fla., back on December 18 in the year 1911, when Gov. Albert Waller Gilchrist and his military staff reviewed a parade of more than 1,000 marines and sailors in San Carlos Square, as the battleship *Florida* was commissioned.

Governor Gilchrist expressed the sense of pride and excitement of all Floridians on that magnificent afternoon, as he said with only slight exaggeration:

"To us, the U.S.S. *Florida* is the greatest, largest most powerful ship in all the world. Through the power of her guns, her machinery, her incomparable workmanship and through the intelligence and courage of her officers and men," he said, "our namesake vessel would carry throughout the world not only the message of our military might, but also the reality of our peacetime technological achievements."

As Governor Gilchrist concluded on that day, "It is . . . highly appropriate for the State whose products contribute so much pleasure and so much joy, and so much comfort to all the people of the Nation, and whose population is more national than that of any other State, should have its name borne by one of our greatest ships . . ."

Our sense of self-confidence as a State has not diminished since the days of Governor Gilchrist's modest self-assessment. Nor has our sense of pride in being part of the Navy's vital role in the tumult of the modern world.

Like the five naval vessels that have gone before it, the new submarine bearing our State's name has a dual mission.

The U.S.S. *Florida* serves both as a tool for making war, and as a reason for keeping the peace.

Like the battleship U.S.S. *Florida* that helped to end the First World War, and like

the sidewheel steamer that bolstered the Federal blockade during the Civil War, this nuclear submarine will serve as an ultimate instrument of Foreign policy.

But, like the first U.S.S. *Florida*, a sailing vessel which helped to map the southern coast, this submarine also will serve a peacetime role.

This impressive submarine will travel the world, serving as an ambassador for America, as well as for Florida. In every port it visits, this submarine serves notice to the world: America wants peace, and America is strong. Strong in technology, strong in resolve, and strong in the security our military provides.

The commissioning of the U.S.S. *Florida* underlines our will to compete in the world, and our resolve to win. A strong America needs a strong military, and a strong military needs a strong navy.

Since the time of the Phoenicians, the presence of a strong naval fleet has made a statement of national resolve and power. Seapower is as important in a nuclear age as it was in the days of sail and oar, and our Navy today deserves our support as firmly as at any time in our history.

We, as Floridians, have a special understanding of the sea, and the requirements of seapower, by reason of sheer geography. We have 8,426 miles of coastline, on both the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico. German submarines prowled our coasts in the Second World War. Our maritime history dates almost to the time of Columbus.

So it is especially fitting for our State's name to join the roster of submarines of the line of the U.S. Navy.

Florida and Floridians are proud today, proud once again to be a part of our Nation's first line of defense. And proud that our State's name again is boldly emblazoned on a ship whose technology is state of the art, and whose mission is vital to the preservation and extension of the benefits of democracy and justice.

I'm aware that the submarine service demands many sacrifices from its sailors. Quarters are cramped, cruises can be long and arduous, and I understand the coffee will eat through stainless steel.

But there's another special burden that all of us in the Sunshine State can empathize with particularly, and that's sunshine deprivation. When you're out trying to break a record for the longest submerged run under the polar icepack, remember us on the sunny beaches of Florida.

As Governor, I want to extend a special warm, and personal, invitation to every member of the crew of our namesake vessel to visit us when you return.

And to the Navy, I officially offer the hospitality of all of our ports, from Pensacola to Key West to Mayport. Our citizens welcome you, We're proud to be a part of this historic day, and proud to be back in the Navy. ●

TAX CUT

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, because the liberals have been unable to take away the third year of the tax cut, we should pause to reflect to see what it really means.

An editorial in the *Atlanta Journal* shows that this tax cut became a real tax cut with the third year on July 1. The tax cut encourages savings and investment which creates more jobs than any Government program could.

As this editorial points out, people now have more of their own money to spend, which means higher savings. Consumer spending will also increase, and economic growth is certain to continue at even higher rates. As long as taxes stay low and inflation is under control, the recovery will continue.

The editorial follows:

[From the *Atlanta Journal*, June 29, 1983]

TAX CUT SHOULD BE A TOOL FOR RECOVERY AND SAVINGS

Advocates of supply-side economic theory have maintained that cuts in marginal income tax rates encourage savings and help spur spending and the economy.

Critics of the 25 percent tax cut now being completed have argued that the cuts did neither in the first two rounds and that savings is unlikely to increase as a result of the 10 percent phase going into effect Friday.

The truth is this case lies squarely in the middle, but the best evidence rests on the supply side.

After last year's tax cut, the nation's savings rate increased—albeit slightly—perhaps because of fear of the recession, but surely in part because of more disposable income.

The experts say the increased cash going home in paychecks in the coming weeks is more likely to be spent than saved. In the current economy that is not a negative.

Interest rates the previous two years were too high for prudent purchasing or business expansion. They are still high, but in the zone of reason. There is also that old standby at work—pent-up consumer demand.

To those who decry the tax cuts as harmful to the savings rate and the budget deficits we think it's worth pointing out that the cuts will help spur the recovery. Automobile and home sales are spurting. Consumer products are following. Savings can and will come later.

It is also worth pointing out that the coming 10 percent tax cut is the first net cut that affects most Americans. The first two stages of the tax cut were cancelled out by increased Social Security taxes and bracket creep.

The psychology of savings and investment requires that wage-earners believe saving

means a gain for them. Through years of double-digit inflation, higher taxes and bracket creep, there were few incentives. With inflation under control and a steady recovery in sight, the nation's savings rate should increase steadily.

As Rep. Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) pointed out recently, the last period of sustained economic growth for the United States was in the 1960s when taxes amounted to 18 percent of the gross national product. Before President Reagan took office, the tax burden amounted to 20 percent of GNP.

If Congress sticks to the tax cut and the indexing of tax brackets, the tax burden will drop to 19 percent. The drop in taxes and the recovery of the economy seem related.

If the nation's savings rate is to increase, wage-earners must feel certain that inflation is under control and that higher taxes are not likely to nick away at their take-home pay.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF H.R. 1904, THE CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT AND ADOPTION OPPORTUNITIES ACT

HON. AUSTIN J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, several of my colleagues have requested that their names be placed as cosponsors of this year's reauthorization legislation for the child abuse prevention program, H.R. 1904. Unfortunately, H.R. 1904 was reported out of the full committee on Education and Labor in early May, thus prohibiting additional cosponsors according to House rules. Therefore, I would like to announce that the following Members of Congress have requested that their names be placed as cosponsors of H.R. 1904, and would have been added to the list of cosponsors if the bill had not already been reported out of committee: Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. WORTLEY.●

CREDIT CARD FRAUD LEGISLATION

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide criminal penalties for counterfeiting of access devices and other computer assisted crimes. In this unsettled era where everything appears to be changing far more rapidly than our institutions can cope with them, there is presently a strong trend for our personal and commercial transactions to be cashless.

I am sure that it is not surprising to most of us that currency and even checks are becoming a diminishing part of our everyday life. Instead we now are increasingly becoming dependent on numerous credit cards and other plastic devices, all of which eventually involve use of computers and other electronic devices which also are subject to criminal attack. For example, a preliminary perusal of new data indicates that there are some 73 million legitimate credit cards lost or stolen each year and that some 10 percent of these (or 20,000 a day) are fraudulently used. There are also indications of a growing problem in counterfeit credit cards and unauthorized use of account numbers or access codes to banking system accounts called debit instruments. Financial institutions claim that they lost \$128 million from bank card fraud in 1982 which was an increase of 35 percent over 1981 losses. They further estimate that \$40 million of this figure was just from counterfeit credit cards which was a 500-percent increase since 1980. There are also indications that thieves are becoming increasingly sophisticated and in fact are stealing account numbers and using them without even getting physical control of the cards themselves. There are two major pieces of Federal legislation in this area, both in title 15 of the United States Code; 15 U.S.C. 1644, part of the Truth in Lending Act, generally deals with fraudulent use of credit cards affecting interstate or foreign commerce and prohibits use, transporting, selling, receipt of goods from such transactions, receipt of tickets, and fraudulent furnishing of money to people with counterfeit, stolen or lost credit cards. This legislation does not cover the actual counterfeiting of the cards and there is some question whether it covers the stealing and use of the account numbers.

Part of the Electronic Funds Transfer Act, 15 U.S.C. 1693, covers transactions involving debit instruments which affect interstate or foreign commerce in a similar fashion as section 1644. Debit instruments include a card, code or other device other than a check, draft or other proper instrument which may initiate an electronic fund transfer. It also does not cover counterfeiting.

Both of these statutes use a jurisdictional amount of \$1,000 for activity in each instrument but there are indications that organized groups generally stay just under this amount but use many different counterfeit or stolen cards or debit instruments to avoid Federal jurisdiction.

The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Mr. ANNUNZIO, has introduced H.R. 2885 to close some of these gaps and I

commend him for it. Mr. ANNUNZIO's bill would restrict disclosure of access device numbers and would amend section 1644 to substitute "access device" for "credit cards" and in this fashion include "debit instruments," codes, etc. His bill also adds a possession clause ("ten or more counterfeit, fictitious, altered, forged, lost, stolen or fraudulently obtained access devices.")

Mr. FISH, the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, has introduced H.R. 3181 (of which I am a cosponsor), to complement this bill by adding, in essence, counterfeiting of these instruments (called payment devices in his bill) as a new violation of title 18.

The bill I am introducing today will also cover counterfeiting in a somewhat different fashion and expands the scope of this complementary legislation to other computer assisted crimes. Anyone with views on this legislation should communicate directly with the Subcommittee on Crime, Committee on the Judiciary, 207 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515 or telephone (202) 225-1695.●

THE PEACE ACADEMY PROPOSAL

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the proposal for the establishment of a taxpayer-funded U.S. Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolution is based on unfounded hopes that a so-called science of conflict resolution exists which makes the use of force obsolete.

I certainly desire peace, and I am sure that all of my colleagues do, too. Yet, I perceive that much of the support for the Academy is generated by feelings of guilt over the level of defense spending. The cost of the Peace Academy is constantly being compared to defense expenditures. This comparison, however, fails to consider that there is a constitutional justification in providing for the national defense, while none exists for the creation of a peace academy. In the face of staggering budget deficits, we cannot continue to fund every seemingly nice program.

I am not opposed to the study of conflict resolution. But, in the name of fiscal responsibility and academic freedom, the peace academy should be privately funded, if it is funded at all.

I am not convinced that the study of conflict resolution has advanced far enough to be considered a separate academic discipline. Yet, even if there is a bona fide academic discipline of conflict resolution, it should compete freely in the marketplace of ideas with

the traditional studies of diplomacy, history, politics, et cetera. For the Federal Government to evaluate one specific approach to the study of conflict to official status would be to trample academic freedom underfoot.

A vote against H.R. 1249 is a vote in favor of academic freedom. The study of peace and conflict resolution should be left in private hands where it will prosper if fruitful or succumb to other studies if it yields no definitive results.

The late John Ashbrook was a paragon of sound judgment and good sense. He served on the commission which studied the peace academy proposal extensively. His "Dissenting Views," from the commission report are absolutely essential reading. I highly commend his cogent analysis, which is printed below.

[From: To Establish the U.S. Academy of Peace: Report of the Commission, 1981]

DISSENTING VIEWS OF COMMISSIONER JOHN ASHBROOK

Peace is like health in the limited sense that everyone is for it. If "peace learning" (to use the Commission majority's phrase) were like health learning, the case for a new Federal agency analogous to the National Institutes of Health would be persuasive. But it is not.

There is no consensus among scholars, even among those who support the concept of a Federal Peace Academy, on whether peace research is now or even will be a coherent and rigorous academic discipline. Professor Kenneth Boulding wrote in 1978 that the field is still in the first phase of a new discipline: it has a bibliography, and you can give an examination in it. In the second phase, according to Professor Boulding, "the intellectual ferment has produced a moderately homogenous brew which can be summarized in a textbook. The conflict and peace studies discipline . . . has not yet reached this stage, but I would expect it to do so in the next ten years."

The Commission majority makes no such prediction, but it argues:

" . . . that peace studies is a distinct and definable field of learning for three reasons: it has a literature, courses of study, and professional organizations; it has well-defined assumptions and definitions, and a variety of research methodologies; and it has a strong applied component in the practice of conflict intervention."

By those standards, "health" has been a distinct field of learning for most of the last millennium, including the centuries when the average encounter between the average doctor and the average patient was as likely to shorten the later's life as to lengthen it. So are astrology, Lysenkoism, and Keynesian economics.

But an academic field which wants to have an official government agency of its very own should be held to higher standards. It should demonstrate the kind of conceptual solidity and compelling explanatory power which irresistibly command the attention and transform the thinking habits of scholars in related or competing fields. It should prove beyond reasonable doubt that it is more than a passing fad.

Peace learning has not yet done this. It may never do so. But some 80 colleges and universities currently have departments of peace studies or conflict resolution; we do

not need a new Federal agency to give peace studies a chance.

The Commission's staff has mentioned its concern that an official Peace Academy might be "too close to the government to ask the hard questions such an institution should ask." The Commission majority apparently believes that it is possible to solve this problem, but I do not. By its very nature it is impossible to solve.

Peace is inseparable from justice, and justice is inseparable from morality. Sometimes it is impossible to secure justice without conflict, and that means that some conflicts are desirable. The best outcome for some conflicts is not compromise or arbitration, but a clearcut victory for the side that deserves to win.

Unless a Peace Academy confines itself to trivia, it will have to make judgments about which conflicts are desirable, which not. Such judgments are inescapably value-laden; as the Commission majority observes, "questions of ethics and values are central, not peripheral, to peace inquiries." But the formulation of values is not a proper activity for a government agency. Government-formulated values are almost always warped values: bent by the pressures of special interests and ideologues.

What would those pressures be? As a practical matter, the danger of an official Peace Academy's being unduly influenced by the selfish interests of, say, the Joint Chiefs of Staff is rather small. Given the ideological predilections of most "peace studies" professionals, it is more likely that the Academy would become a sounding board for the antinationalist, accommodationist views which are increasingly unpopular among American taxpayers. (The Commission proposal increases this danger by allowing the Academy to receive and spend funds from private organizations.) But the dilemma is unavoidable: if a government Peace Academy exists, it will either force citizens to subsidize the promotion of beliefs they disagree with, or allow research decisions to be swayed by popular pressures. The only way out of this dilemma is to leave the frontiers of controversial research in the private sector, which is where they belong in a free society.

Judging by the Commission's hearing record, most proponents of an official Peace Academy seem to believe that the United States should have a government agency which views the world, not from the perspective of American values and interests, but with the sort of pseudo-cosmopolitan outlook that prevails at places like the United Nations. Embedded in this outlook are a number of tacit premises:

"Ideologies, except for so-called 'colonialism,' are mostly benign or unimportant. In any case, ideology can be defused by neutral expertise.

"The chief barrier to worldwide progress is Western arrogance and selfishness.

"Nationalism" is a bad thing, except in the Third World.

"Power politics is inherently immoral, at least when used by the West.

"It is more important to 'resolve' conflicts than to win them, except for selected conflicts in places like southern Africa.

"There is no irreconcilable conflict of values between the United States and the Soviet Union."

So much for some of their major premises.

The type of thinking which is based on these premises has been with us for a long time. It was stated as ably as it can be by Zbigniew Brzezinski, who wrote in 1970 that "Today the old framework of international

politics . . . with their spheres of influences, military alliances between nation-states, the fiction of sovereignty, doctrinal conflicts arising from 19th-century crisis is clearly no longer compatible with reality." For the last four years, this view was the dominant one in our foreign policy. The results are plain for all to see.

In March 1980, the staff of this Commission produced a "Design Paper" which allows further insight into the pro-Peace Academy philosophy. On page 6 of this document, the writers state that "when conflict resolution or conflict management is taken to mean pacification, delay, placation . . . of the status quo, justice is not served and often more violence is apt to occur." With all due respect to my fellow Commissioners and to our staff, I must say that this statement is pure malarkey. It reflects a naive view of historical change, which is all too common among modern liberals confronted by revolutionaries who believe in dialectical materialism.

In the real world, the status quo is often the least violent, least unjust choice available—as it was in Indochina, Ethiopia, and Iran. There is often a lot to be said for "delay," especially when the changes being delayed are nasty, and difficult to reverse.

On page 7 of this document there appears another passage worth pausing to consider. The writers opine that:

"Inflation, unemployment, and the limits of resources, combined with poverty, racial discrimination, the problems of social services delivery, equal educational opportunity, consumer and environmental protection, and prison conditions are among the conditions which have resulted in an increase in the number of conflicts to almost unmanageable proportions. The degree to which society deals with such disputes in creative, just, and direct ways may affect future levels of social violence."

The fascinating thing about this passage is the way it manages to be both selective and expansive at the same time. Why do the writers not include on their list of "conditions" such items as high taxes, zero-growth economics, regulatory strangulation, street crime, pornography, race/sex quotas, and forced busing? Why do they include only those problems which are thought by some (usually the liberals) to require more Federal activism rather than less? The list's selectivity pinpoints one of the fundamental problems with any government research academy: it will not bite the hand that feeds it.

On the other hand, why do the writers lump together so many different kinds of disagreements which one human being might have with another? There is no particularly good reason to do so unless one believes that conflict is unnatural to the human condition and can be banished through some exotic new blend of therapeutic and managerial techniques. Since this belief is totally founded on hope rather than experience, each of us is free to accept or reject it. I reject it.

The most frequent argument I have heard in favor of an official Peace Academy is also the most exasperating. It goes like this: the government spends a lot of money on the military, but relatively little on peace. If we really care about peace, we should give it a bigger share of the Federal budget.

Aside from the fact that this argument implicitly denies that our military spending is at least intended to help keep the peace, it reflects a fundamental misunderstanding as to who "we" are. "We," the American

people, are not identical to the national government. We pursue many important and diverse goals through means other than Federal programs; in some areas, like education, we have learned the hard way that Federal programs do more to strangle than to promote creativity and progress.

If dollars are the measure, consider that in 1978 Americans spent more than \$377 billion in international trade and tourism: three times the size of that year's defense budget. Most of that sum represented "spending for peace," and it was spent a lot more efficiently than it would have been under any conceivable government program.

If Peace Academy proponents really believe that the Federal government should have a monopoly on peace—or should stop having a monopoly on war—they should say so. If not, they should drop this whole line of argument. I am glad to see that the majority report does not use this argument; I wish it had explicitly repudiated it.

While I would be known as a hawk, not a dove in the modern concept of those terms, peace and pursuit of peaceful goals would be uppermost in my conscience. We all want peace. Americans have no apologies to make for our 200 year history when compared to any other nation in history. Most of us follow the thesis set out by John Adams who said something to the effect that he studied war so his sons could study politics and so his grandsons could study poetry and the classics.

The Commission majority has tried to anchor its proposal in the American heritage by citing numerous proposals, from the 1790's to the present, for an official "peace office" or "department of peace" in the Federal bureaucracy. (The 1783 quotation from George Washington is grotesquely distorted: Washington was actually recommending a peacetime militia, not a peace agency in the sense conveyed by the majority report.) All these proposals have had one striking element in common: they have always been rejected, no matter what faction or party was in power. Benjamin Banneker's 1792 essay actually lamented that neither the victorious Federalist nor the anti-Federalist opposition seemed interested in the idea. Despite frequent repetition, the proposal has never been accepted by the mainstream of American political thinking.

A common thread seemed to go through the thinking of most of the individuals and groups who favor this Peace Academy. Indeed, one of the phenomena of this post-war era has been the fear that liberals seem to have about American power. I have no fear of American power because it is my sincere belief that it will continue to be exercised for good. History shows that power has always existed and someone has always had it—like it or not. There are no vacuums and with modern technology we will no longer have the safety margin of time and distance.

The only question we really have to ask ourselves is whether it is better for us to continue to possess the power to be the leader in the world to use it for principles which we clearly espouse or to relinquish that power to other forces who surely would not use it for the lofty goals and ideals which have been the American dream and the American reality. There is a guilt feeling among many Americans of the liberal persuasion who think we are too strong, too rich, too powerful. Some even argue, therefore, too dangerous to world peace. I cannot agree with them. The real dangers to world peace come from other quarters.

I cannot agree that Congress should embark on the Peace Academy route envisioned by my fellow commissioners. Years ago it became apparent to me that we should have some Freedom Academy, a place where Americanism can be taught and courses on communism made available to teachers, scholars, and other interested citizens. I would favor that before we embark on the course cited in this report. Even in a Freedom Academy, I would have difficulty in advocating the model set out by my fellow commissioners. I just can't trust Federal prime responsibility for such a venture, whether it be in the climate of a Carter or a Reagan administration.

If Congress should be so foolish as to create a Federal Peace Academy and even if it became a forum wherein its one foreign policy philosophy were identical to my own, I still would not welcome any such official favoritism. But more likely, the Peace Academy would soon become a haven for our Andrew Youngs, Ramsey Clarks, and others who believe that the way to make peace with the assorted ayatollahs and other titled bandits of today's world is to grovel.

The irony is that this "new" idea has already had its chance, has already been thoroughly tested and explored. For the last four years, an official Federal agency was dedicated to this very philosophy and embarked on this very experiment: the White House.●

BARTER FOR STRATEGIC MATERIALS

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, since the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act was enacted in 1979 a whole series of administrative decisions, rules, and regulations have gradually developed which has precluded effective management of the stockpile.

With unanimous consent and co-sponsorship by the Subcommittee on Seapower and Strategic and Critical Materials of the House Armed Services Committee, I am today introducing a bill that incorporates a series of amendments to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, Public Law 96-41, dated July 30, 1979. These amendments have been designed to give the stockpile manager more flexibility in increasing the quantities of materials in the stockpile and to upgrade the quality of materials in the stockpile. This has become particularly necessary during this time of severe budgetary constraint which precludes the appropriation of necessary funds to meet goals for the National Defense Stockpile. At the current rate of appropriations it would take decades to meet these goals. It is, therefore, the opinion of the Seapower and Strategic and Critical Materials Subcommittee that these amendments are necessary to meet the urgent needs of the stockpile.

The amendments would authorize the stockpile manager to barter excess Government material and excess defense industrial property for materials needed for the stockpile when in the national interest. It would authorize the use of barter in the acquisition of materials for the stockpile as well as barter for disposal of material from the stockpile. It would authorize such barter transactions to be carried out through bilateral, multilateral, or open-end contracts, and whenever practicable, through the services of traders, brokers, and dealers in the private sector in order to secure the most favorable terms for the United States to meet the goals of the stockpile. It would authorize the exchange of raw ores and inferior grade materials now in the stockpile at fair market value for specification grade material needed for the stockpile by allowing the stockpile manager to either pay for the upgrading services or by contracting for upgrading services and allowing the provider of such services to retain a portion—or toll—of such material as payment for the services provided.

Large quantities of surplus strategic materials are being sold as scrap by the Department of Defense and other Government agencies at a fraction of the cost to purchase these same materials for the stockpile. It makes good business sense for the United States to upgrade and transfer these materials directly to the stockpile.

The bill would establish an inter-agency Barter Coordination Council in the Executive Office of the President to promote and expedite the barter of surplus materials and property of the United States for strategic and critical materials needed for the stockpile, and to establish procedures to systematically identify opportunities for barter, including a process to regularly solicit, evaluate, and respond to barter proposals from private industry and foreign suppliers for acquisition or disposal of stockpile materials.

I hope my colleagues who are interested in a strong national defense will support this legislation.●

A TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH HYDRUSKO, A NATIONAL HERO

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the Members of this House of the passing of one of our national heroes, a constituent of my Fourth Congressional District, Mr. Joseph S. Hydrusko, of Massapequa, N.Y.

Mr. Hydrusko, 63, died yesterday, July 13, 1983, of burns suffered when his plane caught fire and exploded.

Throughout his 63 years of life, Joseph Hydrusko exemplified the dedication and devotion to country of patriotic citizenship. His activities in civic, government and community affairs were always directed toward one supreme goal—the best interests of our country. Joseph Hydrusko was deeply patriotic, and his interests always were to encourage patriotism and support of America among all with whom he came in contact.

Joseph Hydrusko displayed his loyalty to America early in life, enlisting in the U.S. Naval Reserve in September, 1939. In April of 1941, his unit was ordered to active duty, and in December 1941, Joseph Hydrusko, seaman first class, was stationed at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, aboard a hospital ship, the U.S.S. *Solace*. Little did he, or anyone else aboard the ship know how soon they would be at war.

At 7:30 a.m. on the morning of December 7, 1941, Seaman First Class Hydrusko had assembled a crew to do some service work aboard the ship, at anchor in the harbor. A half-hour later, Hydrusko and his crew were startled by the sight of planes diving down and dropping bombs on the anchored fleet and on shore installations. As the first explosions filled the sky with fire and heavy black smoke, Seaman First Class Hydrusko personally requested and received permission from the ship's captain to take command of a motor launch for rescue missions.

Mr. Speaker, only those who were at Pearl Harbor and experienced the terrible shock of the attack, and the horrifying scenes of death and destruction that followed can appreciate fully the tremendous courage and coolness under fire displayed by S1c. Hydrusko in the ensuing hours.

As the bombs continued to fall, turning battleships into fountains of flame and smoke, Hydrusko directed his motor launch to move alongside the stricken battleship *Oklahoma*, which had capsized, trapping about 500 men below deck. Picking up three sailors from the water, Hydrusko's launch then moved alongside the battleship *Nevada* and rescued several score of the survivors, many suffering from severe wounds or burns.

After taking the first load of survivors to his hospital ship, S1c. Hydrusko continued to direct his motor launch on rescue missions to other parts of "battleship row" where the Pacific Fleet was anchored. In less than 2 hours after the first bombs fell, Hydrusko and his crew made five trips between the ruined battleships and his hospital ship, bringing back more than 250 sailors. In his sixth mission, Hydrusko came alongside the capsized

Oklahoma again, and boarded the aft section of the big ship. He heard sailors trapped inside the capsized hull tapping out the SOS signal in code. With the help of a navy yard repair crewman, Julio de Castro, Hydrusko managed to cut a hole in the exposed side of the *Oklahoma*. The two crawled inside the hull and for the next 40 hours helped sailors trapped in compartments and bulkheads to safety, until all who could be reached were brought out.

There was constant danger of explosion or fire in that ruined battleship. But S1c. Hydrusko ignored that danger and made repeated trips into the interior of the battleship until certain that all who could be removed were led to freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the heroic actions of S1c. Joseph Hydrusko merit the Congressional Medal of Honor, and have petitioned the U.S. Navy to make that award. At this time, the Navy has my request under consideration. I hope the decision will be favorable. But, whatever the outcome, nothing can diminish the heroism Joseph Hydrusko displayed in those terrible hours of death and destruction.

Mr. Speaker, it is more than 40 years since those events occurred at Pearl Harbor. During the ensuing decades, Joseph Hydrusko continued to demonstrate at every possibility his devotion to our country. Always active in the veterans organizations to which he belonged, he also took a keen interest in government matters, especially those dealing with defense of our country. After learning to fly late in life, Hydrusko established a tradition which captured the imagination and stirred the patriotism of New Yorkers. For the past 13 years on December 7, the anniversary of the Pearl Harbor attack, Joseph Hydrusko has piloted his plane over the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor, and dropped roses in memory of those who died at Pearl Harbor.

A most successful businessman, Hydrusko and his wife Helen operated a very popular restaurant in Massapequa for 22 years.

Mr. Speaker, Joseph Hydrusko has left his mark in the history of our country. As a war hero, his name always will be honored. But those of us who were privileged to enjoy Joe's friendship will always remember him best for his warm, outgoing personality, and his friendly pat on the back.

He will be sorely missed by all who knew him. I know that my colleagues here will join me in offering our condolences to his lovely wife Helen and to his brothers and sister. ●

SPEAKER TIP O'NEILL SPINNING TAX WHEELS

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, because the liberals were unable to sabotage President Reagan's tax cut, it is important to note who really benefits from the tax cut.

An article by Nick Poulos in the June 26 Atlanta Constitution drives home the point that the tax cut was one for the middle class. Fighting against the tax cut, TIP O'NEILL wanted to appear as a champion of the poor. He wanted us to think that Reagan's tax policy only helps the rich. But indeed, the rich pay more than their share of taxes, and the tax cut helps all Americans.

TIP O'NEILL escapes the issue of tax reform through empty rhetoric about helping the poor. Neither he nor any other liberal Democrat addresses the real issue of tax reform, that is, creating a system which is fair to all. Behind TIP's empty rhetoric, we find the same old liberal tonic of tax and spend, tax and spend.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, June 26, 1983]

SPEAKER TIP O'NEILL SPINNING TAX WHEELS (By Nick Poulos)

House Speaker Tip O'Neill reminds one of the little boy who keeps spitting into the wind, hoping he'll prevail against the odds.

O'Neill has been spending an inordinate amount of his time trying to get a dollar limit imposed on the 10 percent cut in income taxes scheduled to go into effect Friday.

The House last Thursday approved O'Neill's measure which would alter tax brackets in the middle- and upper-income ranges so that the tax cut won't amount to more than about \$700 for any taxpayer.

The Senate isn't likely to embrace O'Neill's measure; but even if it did, President Reagan has vowed to veto the legislation.

The savings that would be effected by such a tax cut limitation would amount to only several billion dollars, hardly making a dent in the budget deficit.

So it can be assumed that O'Neill's motivation in this regard is political, that he feels he can capitalize on his effort to demonstrate to the poor that he is still their champion as he excoriates the more affluent members of society for benefitting from tax cuts.

O'Neill keeps insisting that the "burden of Reaganomics should be shared by those in the upper-income groups as well." In point of fact, the upper-income taxpayers do carry their share of the load—and more.

TREASURY REPORT CITED

Citing a Treasury Department report, Charles J. Nicolosi, first vice president of Dean Witter Reynolds Inc., notes that the top 50 percent of taxpayers account for about 90 percent of total personal taxes paid to the government.

In contrast, the working poor and lower middle-income taxpayers account for only 7 percent of total tax revenues.

"For as long as I can remember, I've never seen or heard of a poor person creating a single job," Nicolosi observes.

"On the other hand, I can recall hundreds upon hundreds of people who begged, borrowed or earned money with which to start up a business, that to grow and be successful compelled the founder to hire people to help him.

"We should be thankful we're a nation of many rich people, else we'd be unable to feed the poor, harbor the homeless, school our kids, defend our land, build our roads, move our sewage, transport our water, and provide the money to pay Tip's and his staff's salaries, fringes and perks.

"Without those horrible affluent folks, he'd never have been able to take a 'fact-finding' trip halfway around the world with his wife and 12 of his staff about a year ago. Doesn't it follow that those who pay the lion's share of Uncle Sam's tax collections should be no less benefitted by tax cuts?"

Some of O'Neill's fellow Democrats feel that the speaker's tax-cut limitation campaign may boomerang, that Reagan may be the one who capitalizes instead as he draws support from the more affluent voters.

COMPLICATES THE EFFORT

All the flak surrounding O'Neill's tax-cut limitation measure simply complicates the effort to effect a meaningful reduction in the budget deficits to aid the economy, which is still plagued by high interest rates.

Economists Allen Sinai and Peter Rathjens of Data Resources Inc., a consulting firm based in Lexington, Mass., assert in a report that a sustained \$100 billion reduction in the deficit would result in an immediate 2 percentage-point drop in long-term interest rates and a 4 to 5 point decline in short-term rates.

The deficit reductions, the economists note, could be produced by a \$50 billion cut in government spending and a \$50 billion tax increase.

A tighter fiscal policy, coupled with an easier monetary policy, would result in permanently lower interest rates, permanently higher housing starts and auto sales, a permanently higher rate of capital spending, higher real gross national product, little change in the rate of inflation, and a substantially reduced federal budget deficit.●

H.R. 1510

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, immigration reform is a constant concern of my constituents. As southern Californians, we have a huge stake in the immigration reform debate. I am reminded of this fact with every trip I make home to my district, and by the hundreds of letters that arrive in my office each week.

My constituents are deeply concerned about H.R. 1510. They worry about what a lenient immigration policy—or no new policy at all—will do to the quality of life in southern California. Most of all, they are concerned

that their voices will not be heard in the national debate over the bill.

For this reason, I asked all those in the 33d District who have written on immigration reform to react to H.R. 1510, as it was drafted by the House Judiciary Committee.

This survey will be an important personal guide when the debate on H.R. 1510 finally takes place. I think my colleagues will find it of interest as well and submit the following information for the RECORD:

(1) On the January 1982 amnesty date set by the House Judiciary Committee: 79 percent were opposed to this or any form of amnesty; 21 percent support the 1982 date or a later date.

(2) Regarding employer sanctions: 78 percent felt that sanctions against employers who hire aliens should be increased; 22 percent felt that they should be decreased or eliminated.

(3) On limits to legal immigration: 75 percent thought that legal immigration should be sharply curtailed until our immigration policy is put in order; 25 percent felt that current limits were adequate.

(4) On final passage: 90 percent were opposed to the bill in its present form; 10 percent supported it.●

CUBA AND THE TRUTH

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues two articles of great interest on the United States and Cuba. I believe that these articles are particularly important in light of the Radio Marti bill that the House soon will consider.

Dr. Norman Luxenburg, professor at the University of Iowa, points out that the lack of information about Cuba is not limited to the people of Cuba. A serious effort by scholars and journalists is needed to bring the Cuban reality to the attention of the American people also. In his second article, Dr. Luxenburg makes the point that we have to be aware of the historical record. He says, "The United States should not seek hostilities with any nation. However, there should be no rewards for those nations that avail themselves of every opportunity to attack U.S. policies and undermine American diplomatic efforts. Castro Cuba is no friend of the United States * * *

For the benefit of my colleagues, these two articles follow.

[From Iowa City (Iowa) Press Citizen, Sept. 29, 1982]

U.S. ALSO NEEDS FACTS ON CUBA: AMERICANS, AS WELL AS CUBANS, NEED TO BE SET STRAIGHT

(By Dr. Norman Luxenburg)

Proponents of the creation of Radio Marti, which would be a semi-independent

radio station broadcasting news about Cuba to the inhabitants of that island, argue that Castro presents distorted information to his people.

And they are right. The Cuban people receive from their government little accurate news about their country.

If we are concerned about disseminating the truth about Cuba, though, we should not neglect the home front. Scholars specializing in Cuba have a duty to challenge information circulating in the West. For the Western media frequently puts forward inaccuracies concerning the past and present state of affairs of Cuba.

For example, there is a tendency, assiduously furthered by Castro and his supporters, to assume that prior to Castro's accession to power in 1959 Cuba was a static, third-world nation, coming more and more under the control of large U.S. monopolies which were draining the wealth of the nation.

Again and again reports on Cuba imply that pre-Castro Cuba was a typical, underdeveloped Caribbean nation.

Thus, a columnist writing on the front page of the Wall Street Journal of last Nov. 16 stated "The average Cuban lives very well these days by Third World standards." the writer went on to say that this fact has made Castro popular with the Cuban people, who are quite ready to forego political liberties because of the material benefits that have accrued to them.

However, pre-Castro Cuba was most definitely not a typical Third World nation in the commonly accepted sense. Neither was it a typical Caribbean nation. By whatever measure used, whether it is the per capita gross national product, the number of students per capita, the number of physicians per capita, the infant mortality rate, the number of television sets, phones, cars, etc., Cuba in the late 1950s was far ahead of any other nation in the Caribbean and any nation in the Third World.

Factual errors in reports about Cuba abound, apparently because many persons accept without checking further the statistics given them by questionable sources. Thus, the article already mentioned states "The average life expectancy (under Castro) has risen from 58 . . ." In actuality, life expectancy in pre-Castro Cuba was 62, not 58. Cuba's 62 compares with 55 in Latin America as a whole and with an expectancy of about 45 in a number of the Caribbean states. (Source: "U.N. World Population Trends and Policies," 1977 Vol. 1, Table 75.)

It is not merely the popular journals that makes such errors. In 1977 a U.S. House committee, headed by Rep. Jonathan Bingham of New York, visited Cuba. Apparently impressed by talks with Cuban officials, this committee published an official report on May 23, 1977, stating that before Castro there were "187,000 students" in Cuba and that the literacy rate under Castro had risen from 25 percent to 99 percent.

If one accepts without questions such outlandish figures as the committee apparently did, it becomes very easy to excuse almost all excesses and inadequacies of the Castro regime and to credit it with many undeserved virtues.

In pre-Castro Cuba, however there were not 187,000 students but about 1 million. The literacy rate was not 25 percent but 78 percent. (Source: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1959, article on Cuba. Also, U.N. Statistical Yearbooks, 1960, 1962, etc.)

In the pre-Castro period, Cuba had a favorable balance of trade. In addition, and extremely important as a portent for the future, the island was developing a source of "hidden income" from tourism.

Today the nation is operating at a deficit. The Soviets sell Cuba petroleum at below-market prices and buy sugar at inflated prices. In return Cuban surrogates perform some of the Soviets' difficult and dirty work in Africa and elsewhere.

Instead of foreign and United States capital gaining an ever-greater hold on the Cuban economy in the pre-Castro years, Cuban capital was increasing very rapidly and acquiring control of many enterprises once dominated by North Americans and other outsiders. This is true, for example, for both the banking and sugar industry, which between the late 1930s and the early 1950s had passed overwhelmingly into Cuban hands.

No doubt its supporters envision Radio Marti broadcasting such facts.

These facts should also be disseminated in the West, however, by scholars and journalists knowledgeable about Cuba.

[From Iowa City (Iowa) Press-Citizen, Mar. 10, 1982]

A REALISTIC LOOK AT PRE-CASTRO CUBA

(By Dr. Norman Luxenburg)

A widespread misconception, and one assiduously furthered by Fidel Castro and his supporters, is that before Castro's seizure of power 23 years ago, Cuba was a backward, Third-World nation.

The fact that Cuba today has a higher standard of living and a higher standard of health than do other nations of the Caribbean and the Third World is often attributed even in the press to Castroism.

It is also implied that the Castro revolt was a struggle by large sections of the Cuban population to achieve social change.

In actuality, the Cuban revolt was in no way a mass movement for social change but a political movement of the middle classes who gave Castro their support because they believed his promises to reestablish democracy and have free elections in Cuba.

By no criteria, whether it is per capita income, life expectancy, infant mortality, number of persons per physician, number of telephones per capita, or number of televisions, cars or refrigerators per capita, could pre-Castro Cuba be considered a Third World nation. In fact, it stood far ahead of any nation of the Caribbean and of the Third World.

For example, life expectancy in Cuba when Castro took over was 64, and it was 62 for the years 1955-59. This 64 compared with an average of 41 in Honduras and 45 in Guatemala. (Source: *UN World Population Trends and Problems*, 1977.)

Cuba had more than one physician per 1,000 population, a proportion slightly better than it has today. This rate compared with one per 7,000 in the neighboring Dominican Republic and one per 33,000 in Haiti, a true Third-World nation.

When Castro took over, Cuba with 191,000 telephones had more than twice as many phones as did the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Guatemala and El Salvador combined. Cuba with 500,000 television sets in 1959 and its 6 million people had eight times the number of TV sets as did those other Caribbean nations combined.

Cuba had an infant mortality rate in 1955-59 of 32 per 1,000. This 32 in Cuba compared with about 100 in Guatemala and

Honduras, more than 50 in Spain and Puerto Rico, and about 38 in Germany.

Before Castro, Cuba continually ran a favorable balance in its foreign trade; the Cuban peso was valued at one dollar, and Cuba capital was increasing greatly. It had increased to such an extent that it had taken over overwhelming control of both the sugar and banking industries, industries that had come under foreign and North American domination during the great depression of the early 1930's.

The numbers of students in higher education which had increased from fewer than 1,000 in the early 1900's to 5,000 by 1930 had reached 35,000 by the mid-1950's.

In some circles it seems to be a mark of distinction and an indication of being a free thinker to emphasize the positive achievements of those opposed to the United States and to emphasize anything negative about those who wish to have good relations with us.

There are those anxious to renew trade with Cuba.

The United States should not seek hostilities with any nation.

However, there should be no rewards for those nations that avail themselves of every opportunity to attack U.S. policies and undermine American diplomatic efforts.

Castro Cuba is no friend of the United States. And there is no need for this country to purchase sugar from that hostile nation when there are friendly nations eager for a share of the American sugar market. ●

SOVIET SCIENTIST SAKHAROV WARNS WEST NOT TO UNDERESTIMATE SOVIET MILITARY THREAT

HON. STEPHEN L. NEAL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the latest edition of *Foreign Affairs* magazine contains a reprint of an open letter from physicist and Nobel Peace Prize winner, Andrei Sakharov, concerning the nuclear arms race. As my colleagues know, Dr. Sakharov was a pre-eminent nuclear physicist in the Soviet Union until his criticism of the Soviet system led to his fall into disfavor with Soviet authorities and eventual internal exile to the city of Gorki.

Considering his status among peace loving people of the world and his intellectual credentials, Dr. Sakharov's insights should broaden our understanding of the Soviet Union and, therefore, help us avoid nuclear war. That is his purpose, Mr. Speaker and I submit the full text of the letter as printed in *Foreign Affairs* magazine, by permission, for the consideration of my colleagues.

[From *Foreign Affairs*, February 2, 1983]

THE DANGER OF THERMONUCLEAR WAR

AN OPEN LETTER TO DR. SIDNEY DRELL

DEAR FRIEND: I have read your two splendid lectures—the speech on nuclear weapons at Grace Cathedral, October 23, 1982, and the opening statement to Hearings on the

Consequences of Nuclear War before the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight. What you say and write about the appalling dangers of nuclear war is very close to my heart and has disturbed me profoundly for many years now. I decided to address an open letter to you, feeling it necessary to take part in the discussion of this problem, one of the most important facing mankind.

In full agreement with your general theses, I will express certain considerations of a more specific nature which, I think, need to be taken into account when making decisions. These considerations in part contradict some of your statements and in part supplement and, possibly, amplify them. It seems to me that my opinion communicated here in open discussion can prove of interest in view of my scientific, technological, and psychological experience, acquired in the period when I took part in work on thermonuclear weapons, and also because I am one of the few independent participants in this discussion in the U.S.S.R.

II

I fully agree with your assessment of the danger of nuclear war. In view of the critical importance of this thesis, I will dwell on it in some detail, perhaps repeating what is already well known.

Here, and later on, I use the terms "nuclear war" and "thermonuclear war" nearly interchangeably. Nuclear weapons mean atomic and thermonuclear weapons; conventional weapons mean any weapons with the exception of three types with the capability of mass destruction—nuclear, chemical, and bacteriological weapons.

A large nuclear war would be a calamity of indescribable proportions and absolutely unpredictable consequences, with the uncertainties tending toward the worse.

According to data from United Nations experts, by the end of 1980 the world's overall supply of nuclear weapons consisted of 50,000 nuclear charges. The total power of these charges (most of which are in the 0.04- to 20-megaton range) amounts to 13,000 megatons according to the experts' estimates. The figures you have presented are not in conflict with those estimates. In this regard you mention that the total power of all the explosives used in the Second World War did not exceed six megatons (three megatons, according to the estimates with which I am familiar). However, when making this comparison one must take into account the greater relative efficacy of smaller charges with the same total power, but that does not alter the qualitative conclusions about the colossal destructive power of the nuclear weapons that have been amassed.

You also cite data according to which the U.S.S.R. at the present time (1982) has 8,000 thermonuclear charges deployed and the United States 9,000. Many of these charges are warheads on ballistic missiles, and many of these are multiple independently-targetable reentry vehicles (MIRVs). It should be noted that the basis of the U.S.S.R.'s arsenal (70 percent, according to statements by Tass) consists of gigantic land-based missiles (in silos) and somewhat smaller intermediate-range missiles, on mobile launchers. Eighty percent of the U.S. arsenal consists of submarine-based nuclear missiles, much smaller but less vulnerable than silo-based missiles, and also of strategic bombers carrying nuclear bombs, some of which are apparently very powerful. It is doubtful whether masses of aircraft could penetrate Soviet territory deeply—but a more precise

assessment of their capabilities must take the possibilities of cruise missiles into account; these would probably be able to penetrate the enemy's air defense systems.

Currently, the most powerful American ICBMs (I am not speaking of the planned MX) possess several times less throw-weight than the principal land-based Soviet Missiles. The American ones carry fewer MIRVs, and the yield of their warheads is less. (It is assumed that when dividing the throw-weight of a missile among several warheads—let's say ten—the aggregate yield of the multiple warheads is less than the yield of a large single warhead on the same missile. But MIRVs greatly increase the ability of one side to attack compact targets on the other. MIRVs are also highly destructive against targets spread out over a wide area such as large cities. The aggregate yield may be less than that of a large single warhead, but the destructiveness will remain high because of the multiple blasts spread out over the area. I have dwelt on these details since they may prove of substance in further discussion.)

You cite the estimates of the international journal of the Royal Swedish Academy, according to which an attack on the principal cities of the Northern Hemisphere by 5,000 warheads with a total power of 2,000 megatons will kill 750 million people as a result of the shock wave alone.

I would like to add the following to that estimate:

1. The overall number of long-range nuclear weapons possessed by the five nuclear powers is three or four times greater than the figure used in the Swedish estimate and their overall power is six to seven times greater. The accepted average number of casualties per missile—250,000 people—cannot be considered an overestimate if one compares the accepted average power of a thermonuclear charge of 400 kilotons with the power of the 17-kiloton explosion at Hiroshima and the number of victims from its shock waves, no fewer than 40,000.

2. An extremely important factor in the destructive capability of nuclear weapons is thermal radiation. The fires at Hiroshima were the cause of a significant portion (up to 50 percent) of the fatalities. With the increase of the charges' power, the relative role of thermal radiation increases. Therefore, this factor significantly increases the number of direct casualties.

3. During an attack on especially dense, compact enemy targets (like silo-based missile launchers, command points, communication centers, government institutions, shelters, and other of the more important targets) it must be assumed that a significant portion of the explosions will be ground-level or low. In such cases there inevitably will be "traces," bands of dust fallout raised by the explosion from the surface and "impregnated" by the products of uranium fission. Therefore, although the direct radioactive effect of a nuclear charge takes place in a zone where everything alive is, in any case, annihilated by the shock wave and by fire, its indirect effect—through fallout—proves very substantial. The area contaminated by fallout so that the total dose of radiation exceeds the safety limit of 300 roentgens is, for a typical one-megaton nuclear charge, thousands of square kilometers!

During the ground-level test of the Soviet thermonuclear charge in August 1953, tens of thousands of people were evacuated beforehand from the zone where fallout was possible. People were only able to return to the settlement of Kara-aul in the spring of 1954! In war conditions an orderly evacu-

ation is impossible. Hundreds of millions will flee in panic, often from one contaminated zone into another. Hundreds of millions of people will inevitably become the victims of radioactive irradiation, the mass migrations of people will make the chaos, the deterioration of sanitary conditions and the hunger all the greater. The genetic consequences of irradiation will threaten man as a biological species and all animal and plant life on the Earth.

I entirely agree with your basic idea that mankind has never encountered anything even remotely resembling a large nuclear war in scale and horror.

No matter how appalling the direct consequences of nuclear explosions, we cannot exclude that the indirect effects will be even more substantial. The indirect effects could be fatal for modern society, which is extraordinarily complex and thus highly vulnerable.

The general ecological consequences are just as dangerous, although by virtue of the complex nature of ecological interdependencies, forecasts and estimates are extremely difficult here. I will mention some of the problems discussed in the literature (in your talks, in particular) without assessing their seriousness, although I am certain that many of the dangers indicated are entirely real:

1. Continuous forest fires could destroy the greater part of the planet's forests. The smoke involved would destroy the transparency of the atmosphere. A night lasting many weeks would ensue on Earth followed by a lack of oxygen in the atmosphere. As a result, this factor alone, if real, could destroy life on the planet. In less pronounced form, this factor could have important ecological, economic, and psychological consequences.

2. High-altitude wartime nuclear explosions in space (particularly the thermonuclear explosion of ABM missiles and the explosion of attacking missiles whose purpose is to disrupt enemy radar) could possibly destroy or seriously damage the ozone layer protecting Earth from the sun's ultraviolet radiation. Estimates of this danger are very imprecise—if the maximal estimates are true then this factor is sufficient to destroy life.

3. Disruption of transportation and communication could prove critical in the complex modern world.

4. No doubt there will be a (complete or partial) disruption in the production and distribution of food, in water supply and sewage, in fuel and electric service, and in medicine and clothing—all on a continent-wide scale. The public health-care system will be disrupted, sanitary conditions will revert to a medieval level and may become even worse than that. It will be impossible in practice to provide medical assistance to the hundreds of millions who have been wounded, burned, or exposed to radiation.

5. Hunger and epidemics in a context of chaos and devastation could take more lives than the nuclear explosions would take directly. It is also not out of the question that, along with the "ordinary" diseases which will inevitably spread far and wide—influenza, cholera, dysentery, typhus, anthrax, plague, and others—entirely new diseases could arise as the result of the radiation-caused mutation of viruses as well as especially dangerous forms of the old diseases against which people and animals would have no immunity.

6. It is especially difficult to foresee mankind's maintaining any social stability in

conditions of universal chaos. Great gangs will kill and terrorize people and struggle among themselves in keeping with the laws of the criminal world: "You die today, I'll die tomorrow."

Of course, our experience of social upheaval and war demonstrates that mankind possesses unexpected reserves; people's vitality in extreme situations surpasses what could have been imagined a priori. But even if mankind were able to preserve itself as a social body, which seems highly unlikely, the most important social institutions—the foundation of civilization—would be destroyed.

In sum, it should be said that all-out nuclear war would mean the destruction of contemporary civilization, hurl man back centuries, cause the deaths of hundreds of millions or billions of people, and, with a certain degree of probability, would cause man to be destroyed as a biological species and could even cause the annihilation of life on earth.

Clearly it is meaningless to speak of victory in a large nuclear war which is collective suicide.

I think that basically my point of view coincides with yours as well as with the opinion of a great many people on earth.

III

I am also in complete agreement with your other conclusions. I agree that if the "nuclear threshold" is crossed, i.e., if any country uses a nuclear weapon even on a limited scale, the further course of events would be difficult to control and the most probable result would be swift escalation leading from a nuclear war initially limited in scale or by region to an all-out nuclear war, i.e., to general suicide.

It is relatively unimportant how the "nuclear threshold" is crossed—as a result of a preventive nuclear strike or in the course of a war fought with conventional weapons, when a country is threatened with defeat, or simply as a result of an accident (technical or organizational).

In view of the above, I am convinced that the following basic tenet of yours is true: *Nuclear weapons only make sense as a means of deterring nuclear aggression by a potential enemy*, i.e., a nuclear war cannot be planned with the aim of winning it. Nuclear weapons cannot be viewed as a means of restraining aggression carried out by means of conventional weapons.

Of course you realize that this last statement is in contradiction to the West's actual strategy in the last few decades. For a long time, beginning as far back as the end of the 1940s, the West has not been relying on its "conventional" armed forces as a means sufficient for repelling a potential aggressor and for restraining expansion. There are many reasons for this—the West's lack of political, military, and economic unity; the striving to avoid a peacetime militarization of the economy, society, technology, and science; the low numerical levels of the Western nations' armies. All that at a time when the U.S.S.R. and the other countries of the socialist camp have armies with great numerical strength and are rearming them intensively, sparing no resources. It is possible that for a limited period of time the mutual nuclear terror had a certain restraining effect on the course of world events. But, at the present time, the balance of nuclear terror is a dangerous remnant of the past! In order to avoid aggression with conventional weapons one cannot threaten to use nuclear weapons if their use is inadmissible.

One of the conclusions that follows here—and a conclusion you draw—is that it is necessary to restore strategic parity in the field of conventional weapons. This you expressed somewhat differently, and without stressing the point.

Meanwhile this is a very important and non-trivial statement which must be dwelt on in some detail.

The restoration of strategic parity is only possible by investing large resources and by an essential change in the psychological atmosphere in the West. There must be a readiness to make certain limited economic sacrifices and, most important, an understanding of the seriousness of the situation and of the necessity for some restructuring. In the final analysis, this is necessary to prevent nuclear war, and war in general. Will the West's politicians be able to carry out such a restructuring? Will the press, the public, and our fellow scientists help them (and not hinder them as is frequently now the case)? Can they succeed in convincing those who doubt the necessity of such restructuring? A great deal depends on it—the opportunity for the West to conduct a nuclear arms policy that will be conducive to the lessening of the danger of nuclear disaster.

In any case, I am very glad that you (and earlier, in another context, Professor Panofsky) have spoken out in favor of strategic parity in the area of conventional weapons.

In conclusion, I should stress especially that a restructuring of strategy could of course only be carried out gradually and very carefully in order to prevent a loss of parity in some of the intermediate phases.

IV

As I have understood them, your further thoughts on nuclear weapons per se amount to the following:

It is necessary to conduct a balanced reduction of the nuclear arsenal, and a first stage in this process of nuclear disarmament might be a mutual freeze on the currently existing nuclear arsenals. I will quote you: "Decisions in the area of nuclear weapons should be based simply on the criterion of achieving a reliable deterrent and not on other additional demands relating to nuclear war since, generally speaking, such demands are not limited by anything and are not realistic." This is one of your central theses.

For talks on nuclear disarmament you propose that one quite simple—and, within the limits of the possible, fair—criterion for assessing nuclear strength be worked out. As that criterion you propose taking the sum total of the number of delivery vehicles and the total number of nuclear charges which can be delivered (probably one should assume the maximal number of certain standard or conventional charges which can be delivered by a given type of missile with a corresponding division of the usable weight).

I will begin by discussing that latter proposal of yours (made jointly with your student, Kent Wisner). This proposal seems practical to me. Your criterion takes into account delivery vehicles of various throw-weights by assigning them various weight factors. This is very important—the assigning of an equal weight factor to both the small American missiles and the large Soviet missiles was one of the points for which I, at one time, criticized the SALT I Treaty (while in general viewing the very fact of the talks and the concluding of the Treaty in a positive light). Here, in distinction to criteria using the power of the

charge as a rule not published officially, the number of deliverable charges is easy to determine. Your criterion also takes into account the fact that, for example, five missiles each carrying one warhead have a significant tactical advantage over one large missile carrying five warheads. Of course, the criterion you propose does not encompass all the parameters like distance, accuracy, or degree of vulnerability—they will have to be allowed for supplementarily or, in some cases, not taken into account so as to facilitate agreements.

I hope that your (or some analogous) criterion will be accepted as the basis for negotiations both on intercontinental missiles and (independently) on medium-range missiles. In both cases it will be much more difficult than it now is to insist on unfair conditions in the agreements and possible to move from word to deed more swiftly. Most likely, the very acceptance of your (or an analogous) criterion will require a diplomatic and propaganda struggle—but it's worth it.

V

From this relatively specific question I will move to one more general, more complex and controversial. It is actually possible when making decisions in the area of nuclear weapons to ignore all the considerations and requirements relevant to the possible scenarios for a nuclear war and simply limit oneself to the criterion of achieving a reliable deterrent—when that criterion is understood to mean an arsenal sufficient to deal a devastating blow in response? Your answer to this question—while perhaps formulating it somewhat differently—is positive and you draw far-reaching conclusions.

There is no doubt that at present the United States already possesses a large number of submarine-based missiles and charges carried by strategic bombers which are not vulnerable to the U.S.S.R. and, in addition, has silo-based missiles though they are smaller than the U.S.S.R.'s—all these in such amounts that, were those charges used against the U.S.S.R., nothing, roughly speaking, would be left of it. You maintain that this has already created a reliable deterrent—independently of what the U.S.S.R. and the United States have and what they lack. Therefore, you specifically consider the building of the MX missile unnecessary and similarly consider irrelevant the arguments which are advanced in support of developing it—U.S.S.R.'s substantial arsenal of intercontinental missiles with large throw-weight which the United States does not have; and the fact that Soviet missiles and MX missiles have multiple warheads so that one missile can destroy several enemy silos during a missile duel. Therefore you consider it acceptable (with certain reservations) for the United States to freeze the nuclear arsenals of the United States and the U.S.S.R. at their current numerical levels.

Your line of reasoning seems to me very strong and convincing. But I think that the concept presented fails to take into account all the complex realities of the opposition that involves two world systems and that there is the necessity (despite your stance) for a more specific and comprehensive unbiased consideration than a simple orientation toward a "reliable deterrent" (in the meaning of the word as formulated above, i.e., the possibility of dealing a devastating retaliatory strike.) I will endeavor to explain this statement.

Precisely because an all-out nuclear war means collective suicide, we can imagine

that a potential aggressor might count on a lack of resolve on the part of the country under attack to take the step leading to that suicide, i.e., it could count on its victim capitulating for the sake of saving what could be saved. Given that, if the aggressor has a military advantage in some of the variants of conventional warfare or—which is also possible in principle—in some of the variants of partial (limited) nuclear war, he would attempt to use the fear of further escalation to force the enemy to fight the war on his (aggressor's) own terms. There would be little cause for joy if, ultimately, the aggressor's hopes proved false and the aggressor country perished along with the rest of mankind.

You consider it necessary to achieve a restoration of strategic parity in the field of conventional arms. Now take the next logical step—while nuclear weapons exist it is also necessary to have strategic parity in relation to those variants of limited or regional nuclear warfare which a potential enemy could impose, i.e., it is really necessary to examine in detail the various scenarios for both conventional and nuclear war and to analyze the various contingencies. It is of course not possible to analyze fully all these possibilities or to ensure security entirely. But I am attempting to warn of the opposite extreme—"closing one's eyes" and relying on one's potential enemy to be perfectly sensible. As always in life's complex problems, some sort of compromise is needed.

Of course I realize that in attempting not to lag behind a potential enemy in any way, we condemn ourselves to an arms race that is tragic in a world with so many critical problems admitting of no delay. But the main danger is slipping into an all-out nuclear war. If the probability of such an outcome could be reduced at the cost of another ten or fifteen years of the arms race, then perhaps that price must be paid while, at the same time, diplomatic, economic, ideological, political, cultural, and social efforts are made to prevent a war.

Of course it would be wiser to agree now to reduce nuclear and conventional weapons and to eliminate nuclear weapons entirely. But is that now possible in a world poisoned with fear and mistrust, a world where the West fears aggression from the U.S.S.R., the U.S.S.R. fears aggression from the West and from China, and where China fears it from the U.S.S.R., and no verbal assurances and treaties can eliminate those dangers entirely?

I know that pacifist sentiments are very strong in the West. I deeply sympathize with people's yearning for peace, for a solution to world problems by peaceful means; I share those aspirations fully. But, at the same time, I am certain that it is absolutely necessary to be mindful of the specific political, military, and strategic realities of the present day and to do so objectively without making any sort of allowances for either side; this also means that one should not proceed from an a priori assumption of any special peace-loving nature in the socialist countries due to their supposed progressiveness or the horrors and losses they have experienced in war. Objective reality is much more complicated and far from anything so simple. People both in the socialist and the Western countries have a passionate inward aspiration for peace. This is an extremely important factor, but, I repeat, itself alone does not exclude the possibility of a tragic outcome.

VI

What is necessary now, I believe, is the enormous practical task of education so that specific, exact, and historically and politically meaningful objective information can be made available to all people, information that will enjoy their trust and not be veiled with dogma and propaganda. Here one must take into account that, in the countries of the West, pro-Soviet propaganda has been conducted for quite a long time and is very goal-oriented and clever, and that pro-Soviet elements has penetrated many key positions, particularly in the mass media.

The history of the pacifist campaigns against the deployment of missiles in Europe is telling in many respects. After all, many of those participating in those campaigns entirely ignore the initial cause of NATO's "dual decision"—the change in strategic parity in the 1970s in favor of the U.S.S.R.—and, when protesting NATO's plans, they have not advanced any demands on the U.S.S.R. Another example: President Carter's attempt to take a minimal step toward achieving balance in the area of conventional arms, i.e., to introduce draft registration, met with stiff resistance. Meanwhile, balance in the area of conventional arms is a necessary prerequisite for reducing nuclear arsenals. For public opinion in the West to assess global problems correctly, in particular the problems of strategic parity both in conventional and in nuclear weapons, a more objective approach, one which takes the real world strategic situation into account, is vitally needed.

VII

A second group of problems in the field of nuclear weapons about which I should make a few supplementary remarks here concerns the talks on nuclear disarmament. For these talks to be successful the West should have something that it can give up! The case of the "Euromissiles" once again demonstrates how difficult it is to negotiate from a position of weakness. Only very recently has the U.S.S.R. apparently ceased to insist on its unsubstantiated thesis that a rough nuclear parity now exists and therefore everything should be left as it is.

Now, the next welcome step would be the reduction of the number of missiles—which must include a fair assessment of the *quality* of missiles and other means of delivery (i.e., the number of charges deliverable by each carrier, its range and accuracy, and its degree of vulnerability—the last being greater for aircraft and less for missiles; most likely, it would be expedient to use your criterion, or analogous ones). And what is absolutely at issue here is not moving the missiles beyond the Urals but *destroying* them. After all, rebasing it too "reversible." Of course, one also must not consider powerful Soviet missiles, with mobile launchers and several warheads, as being equal to the now-existing Pershing I, the British and French missiles, or the bombs on short-range bombers—as the Soviet side sometimes attempts to do for purposes of propaganda.

No less important a problem is that of the powerful silo-based missiles. At present the U.S.S.R. has a great advantage in this area. Perhaps talks about the limitation and reduction of these most destructive missiles could become easier if the United States were to have MX missiles, albeit only potentially (indeed, that would be best of all).

A few words about the military capabilities of powerful missiles: they can be used to deliver the largest thermonuclear charges for destroying cities and other major enemy

targets—while for exhausting the enemy's ABM systems there will most likely be a simultaneous use of a "rain" of smaller missiles, false targets and so on. (Much is written about the possibility of developing ABM systems using super-powerful lasers, accelerated particle beams, and so forth. But the creation of an effective defense against missiles along these lines seems highly doubtful to me.) We present the following estimates to give an idea of what a powerful missile attack on a city would be like. Assuming that the maximal power of an individual charge carried by a large rocket would be of a magnitude of 15-25 megatons, we find that the area of complete destruction of dwellings would be 250-400 square kilometers, the area affected by thermal radiation would be 300-500 square kilometers, the zone of radioactive traces (in case of a ground-level explosion) would be 500-1000 kilometers long and 50-100 kilometers wide!

Of equal importance is the fact that powerful MIRVed missiles could be used to destroy compact enemy targets, in particular, similar silo-based enemy missiles. Here is a rough estimate of an attack of that type on launch sites. One hundred MX missiles (the number proposed by the Reagan Administration for the first round of deployment) could carry one thousand 600-kiloton warheads.

Considering the ellipse of concentration and the hardness assumed for the Soviet launch sites, each of the warheads had, according to the data published in the American press, a 60-percent probability of destroying one launch site. During an attack on 500 Soviet launch sites, with two warheads targeted for each site, 16 percent will remain undamaged, i.e., "only" 80 missiles.

A specific danger associated with silo-based missiles is that they can be destroyed relatively easily as a result of enemy attack, as I have just demonstrated. At the same time, they can be used to destroy enemy launch sites in an amount four to five times larger than the number of missiles used for the attack. A country with large numbers of silo-based missiles (at the present time this is primarily the U.S.S.R., but if the United States carries out a major MX program, then it too) could be "tempted" to use such missiles first before the enemy destroys them. In such circumstances the presence of silo-based missiles constitutes a destabilizing factor.

In view of the above, it seems very important to me to strive for the abolition of powerful silo-based missiles at the talks on nuclear disarmament. While the U.S.S.R. is the leader in this field there is very little chance of its easily relinquishing that lead. If it is necessary to spend a few billion dollars on MX missiles to alter this situation, then perhaps this is what the West must do. But, at the same time, if the Soviets, in deed and not just in word, take significant verifiable measures for reducing the number of land-based missiles (more precisely, for destroying them), then the West should not only abolish MX missiles (or not build them!) but carry out other significant disarmament programs as well.

On the whole I am convinced that nuclear disarmament talks are of enormous importance and of the highest priority. They must be conducted continuously—in the brighter periods of international relations but also in the periods when relations are strained—and conducted with persistence, foresight, firmness and, at the same time, with flexibility and initiative. In so doing, political figures should not think of exploit-

ing those talks, and the nuclear problem in general, for their own immediate political gains but only for the long-term interests of their country and the world. And the planning of the talks should be included in one's general nuclear strategy as its most important part—on this point as well I am in agreement with you!

VIII

The third group of problems which should be discussed here is political and social in nature. A nuclear war could result from a conventional war, while a conventional war is, as is well known, a result of politics. We all know that the world is not at peace. There are a variety of reasons for this—national, economic, and social reasons, as well as the tyranny of dictators.

Many of the tragic events now occurring have their roots in the distant past. It would absolutely be wrong to see only Moscow's hand everywhere. Still, when examining the general trend of events since 1945 there has been a relentless expansion of the Soviet sphere of influence—objectively, this is nothing but Soviet expansion on a world scale. This process has spread as the U.S.S.R. has grown stronger economically (though that strength is one-sided), and in scientific, technological and military terms, and has today assumed proportions dangerously harmful to international equilibrium. The West has grounds to worry that the world's sea routes, Arab oil, and the uranium, diamonds, and other resources of South Africa are now threatened.

One of the basic problems of this age is the fate of the developing countries, the greater part of mankind. But, in fact, for the U.S.S.R., and to some degree for the West as well, this problem has become exploitable and expendable in the struggle for dominance and strategic interests. Millions of people are dying of hunger every year, hundreds of millions suffer from malnutrition and hopeless poverty. The West provides the developing countries with economic and technological aid, but this remains entirely insufficient due largely to the rising price of crude oil. Aid from the U.S.S.R. and the socialist countries is smaller in scale and, to a greater degree than the West's aid, military in nature and bloc-oriented. And, very importantly, that aid is in no way coordinated with world efforts.

The hot spots of local conflicts are not dying but are rather threatening to grow into global wars. All this is greatly alarming.

The most acutely negative manifestation of Soviet policies was the invasion of Afghanistan which began in December 1979 with the murder of the head of state. Three years of appallingly cruel anti-guerrilla war have brought incalculable suffering to the Afghan people, as attested by the more than four million refugees in Pakistan and Iran.

It was precisely the general upsetting of world equilibrium caused by the invasion of Afghanistan and by other concurrent events which was the fundamental reason that the SALT II agreement was not ratified. I am with you in regretting this but I cannot disregard the reasons I have just described.

Yet another subject closely connected to the problem of peace is the openness of society and human rights. I use the term the "openness of society" to mean precisely what the great Niels Bohr meant by it when introducing it more than 30 years ago.

In 1948, the U.N.'s member states adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and stressed its significance for maintaining

peace. In 1975, the relationship of human rights and international security was proclaimed by the Helsinki Final Act, which was signed by 35 countries including the U.S.S.R. and the United States. Among those rights are: the right to freedom of conscience; the right to receive and impart information within a country and across frontiers; the right to a free choice of one's country of residence and domicile within a country; freedom of religion; and freedom from psychiatric persecution.

Finally, citizens have the right to control their national leaders' decision-making in matters on which the fate of the world depends. But we don't even know how, or by whom, the decision to invade Afghanistan was made! People in our country do not have even a fraction of the information about events in the world and in their own country which the citizens of the West have at their disposal. The opportunity to criticize the policy of one's national leaders in matters of war and peace as you do freely is, in our country, entirely absent. Not only critical statements but those merely factual in nature, made on even much less important questions, often entail arrest and a long sentence of confinement of psychiatric prison.

In keeping with the general nature of this letter, I refrain here from citing many specific examples, but must mention the fate of Anatoly Shcharansky, who is wasting away in Chistopol Prison for the right to be visited by his mother and to write to her, and Yuri Orlov who, now for a third time, has been put for six months in the punishment block of a Perm labor camp, after having been beaten unmercifully in the presence of a warden.

In December 1982 there was an amnesty to honor the U.S.S.R.'s sixtieth anniversary but, just as in 1977 and in the preceding amnesties, there was a point made of excluding prisoners of conscience. So distant is the U.S.S.R. from the principles it proclaims, a country which bears such great responsibility for the fate of the world!

IX

In conclusion I again stress how important it is that the world realize the absolute inadmissibility of nuclear war, the collective suicide of mankind. It is impossible to win a nuclear war. What is necessary is to strive, systematically though carefully, for complete nuclear disarmament based on strategic parity in conventional weapons. As long as there are nuclear weapons in the world, there must be a strategic parity of nuclear forces so that neither side will venture to embark on a limited or regional nuclear war. Genuine security is possible only when based on a stabilization of international relations, a repudiation of expansionist policies, the strengthening of international trust, openness and pluralization in the socialist societies, the observance of human rights throughout the world, the rapprochement—convergence—of the socialist and capitalist systems, and worldwide coordinated efforts to solve global problems.

ANDREI SAKHAROV. ●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

1983 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the results of the questionnaire which was conducted by me. The results have just now been tabulated, as follows:

Question: "Should it be illegal for employers to hire illegal aliens?"

Responses: Yes, 91%; No, 9%.

Question: "Should nuclear weapons and nuclear war be outlawed for all nations?"

Responses: Yes, 73%; No, 27%.

Question: "In view of multi-billion dollar Federal budget deficits, should revenue sharing with local governments be discontinued?"

Responses: Yes, 53%; No, 47%.

Question: "Should food stamps and welfare be merged into one program for the needy?"

Responses: Yes, 86%; No, 14%.

Question: "Should the U.S. aid rebels fighting the leftist Nicaraguan government?"

Responses: Yes, 63%; No, 37%. ●

MEDICARE PACEMAKER PAYMENT REFORM AND PATIENT PROTECTION ACT

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation that will help provide quality health care at a price Americans can afford. It achieves this goal by eliminating excessive costs, fraud, and abuse in the pacemaker industry. And it does so to the tune of \$200 million in savings per year to the Federal Government and taxpayers.

The need for this legislation, entitled the Medicare Pacemaker Payment Reform and Patient Protection Act of 1983, is obvious. Approximately 150,000 Americans, most of them elderly, will receive pacemakers this year. Some 80 percent of those pacemakers, which cost some \$10,000 to \$18,000 per patient to purchase and implant, will be paid for by Medicare, and thus by the taxpayer. The total Federal tab for implanting and performance tracking and monitoring will approach \$2 billion if last year's experience is any indication.

Why is the Federal Government paying so much? One answer is profit. From the point of manufacture to the purchase of the pacemaker device by the hospital, the pacemaker traditionally has been marked up three times: First, from manufacturer to salesman, then from the salesman to the hospital, and finally from the hospital to Medicare.

This means that Medicare is paying an average of \$4,000 for a device which only costs between \$600 and \$900 to manufacture. And worst of all, these increases simply are not justified. For example, hospitals normally mark up pacemakers from 50 to 100 percent, despite the fact that there is no correlating hospital cost associated with the unit.

Likewise, surgical fees charged for implantation of the devices are completely out of proportion with the difficulty of the technique. These fees, which range from \$750 to \$2,500, are based on data accumulated at a time when the pacemaker implantation could drag on for several hours and required sophisticated surgical procedures. Today, the state of the art in pacemaker implantation is such that it is considered by physicians to be a relatively nontraumatic operation that can be completed within half an hour. The prevailing attitude among physicians is that pacemakers are low-risk procedures with very high rates of return.

Senior citizens, many of whom are walking an economic tightrope balancing health care against fuel, and fuel against housing costs, cannot afford these costs. Neither can the bloated Medicare system, which experts have predicted will come up against the wall as early as 1986 if we do not act soon.

Our bill addresses this cost-inflation problem by establishing a uniform payment structure for the price of the pacemaker paid by Medicare to the hospital. This structure will reduce the price that Medicare pays for the implantation of new pacemakers by 15 percent and for pacemaker replacements by 30 percent.

In all, these reductions should mean a savings of \$200 million per year for the Medicare system.

Our bill also takes one final step to improve the quality of care. This third step will guarantee protection for the patient by insuring that pacemaker warranties are respected should the device malfunction. It also insures that the Food and Drug Administration is able to test the defective device and insure that future implant patients are protected.

Today, to the extent that warranty replacements or credits are offered by the manufacturer, they are rarely invoked and thus credits are not returned to Medicare. Without this tracking mechanism, manufacturers are free to subordinate their liability and shift costs to the Medicare system.

This bill clearly is not the complete answer to rising health care costs. But it is an important step in the right direction—and one which will move us closer to a more cost effective and better quality health care system.

I hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring this important cost-

saving bill—a bill that will help to insure better quality health care at a price Americans can afford.

The full text of the bill follows:

H.R. 3590

A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for procedures and payment limitations with respect to the furnishing of cardiac pacemakers in order to achieve cost savings for the medicare program, improve the quality of patient care, and insure against fraud and abuse, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Medicare Pacemaker Payment Reform and Patient Protection Act".

PAYMENTS TO HOSPITALS FOR CARDIAC PACEMAKERS

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1866 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h)(1) The amount of the payment to be made under part A to any hospital for any cost reporting period, after the application of the provisions of this section other than this subsection, shall be reduced by an amount equal to the sum of—

"(A) the number of cardiac pacemaker device implantations (other than replacements) performed in such cost reporting period by such hospital for which payment is being made under part A, multiplied by an amount equal to 15 percent of the average cost of a cardiac pacemaker device (as determined under paragraph (2)); and

"(B) the number of cardiac pacemaker device implantations involving replacement of such a device performed in such cost reporting period by such hospital for which payment is being made under part A, multiplied by an amount equal to 25 percent of the average cost of a cardiac pacemaker device (as determined under paragraph (2)).

"(2) For purposes of this subsection, the average cost of a cardiac pacemaker device shall be the national average cost to hospitals under this title of such a device, as estimated by the Secretary for the cost reporting period on the basis of the most recent data available. The Secretary shall update such amount not less often than annually."

(b) Section 1866(a)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (G), by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (H) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(I) to require that all physicians performing cardiac pacemaker or pacemaker lead implantations in such provider's facilities agree to (i) accept assignment under section 1842(b)(3)(B)(ii) with respect to physicians' services furnished in connection with all such implantations performed in such facilities (including preoperative and postoperative services, other than routine monitoring), and (ii) report to the provider the reason for any such implantation or replacement of such a device or lead, including a description of any failure of such a device or lead to perform correctly, and

"(J) to submit such information to the cardiac pacemaker and lead registry established by the Secretary under subsection (g) as the Secretary may require, to keep any explanted cardiac pacemaker device or lead for which payment was made or requested

under this title for such time as the Secretary may require, and to submit any such device or lead for testing if requested by the Secretary under subsection (g)(2)."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to implantations of cardiac pacemaker devices or leads occurring on or after October 1, 1983.

PAYMENTS TO PHYSICIANS FOR CARDIAC PACEMAKER IMPLANTATIONS AND MONITORING

SEC. 3. (a) Section 1842(b)(3) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The amount of any charges relating to the implantation of a cardiac pacemaker device or pacemaker lead which shall be considered reasonable shall be subject to limitations established by the Secretary, under which a single charge shall include all physicians' services furnished in connection with such implantation (including preoperative and postoperative services, other than routine monitoring), and under which such single charge, and the reasonable charge for any subsequent routine transtelephonic monitoring, shall reflect the relative ease of the implantation or monitoring, based on current technology and procedures, and shall, in the case of such routine transtelephonic monitoring, be at least 25 percent lower than the reasonable charge level for such monitoring in effect for the 12-month period ending June 30, 1983."

(b) Section 1833(a)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "and" at the end of clause (F), and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(H) with respect to physicians' services for the implantation of a cardiac pacemaker device or pacemaker lead (other than routine monitoring), furnished by a physician who has an agreement in effect with the Secretary by which the physician agrees to accept an assignment described in section 1842(b)(3)(B)(ii) with respect to payment for all physicians' services furnished in connection with the implantation of such devices or leads (including preoperative and postoperative services, other than routine monitoring), the amounts paid shall be the reasonable charge for such services, and"

(c) Section 1833(b)(3) of such Act is amended by inserting "or (H)," after "subsection (a)(1)(G)".

(d) Section 1862(a) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (13);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (14) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(15) where such expenses are for routine monitoring of a cardiac pacemaker device or pacemaker lead, in excess of six such monitorings in the case of transtelephonic monitoring, or in excess of four such monitorings in the case of monitorings made at a physician's office or other clinical setting, in any 12-month period (except where an unusual medical condition requires additional monitoring, as determined by the Secretary)."

(e) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to implantations of cardiac pacemaker devices or leads occurring on or after October 1, 1983, and to monitoring occurring in any 12-month period beginning on or after such date.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PACEMAKER REGISTRY

SEC. 4. Section 1866 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g)(1) The Secretary shall, through the Administrator of the Food and Drug Administration, provide for a registry of all cardiac pacemaker devices and pacemaker leads for which payment was made under this title. Such registry shall include the manufacturer, model, serial number, and manufacturer's price of each such device or lead, the name of the recipient of such device or lead, the date and location of the implantation or removal of the device or lead, the name of the physician involved in implanting or removing such device or lead, the name of the hospital or other provider billing for such procedure, any express or implied warranties associated with such device or lead under contract or State law, and such other information as the Secretary deems to be appropriate. Such registry shall be for the purposes of assisting the Secretary in determining when payments may properly be made under this title, determining when inspection by the Food and Drug Administration may be necessary under paragraph (2), and carrying out studies with respect to the use of such devices and leads. In carrying out any such study, the Secretary may not reveal any specific information which identifies any pacemaker device or lead recipient by name (or which would otherwise identify a specific recipient). Any person or organization may provide information to the registry with respect to cardiac pacemaker devices and leads other than those for which payment is made under this title.

"(2) In any case where the Secretary has reason to believe, based upon information in the pacemaker registry or otherwise available to him, that replacement of a cardiac pacemaker device or lead for which payment is or may be requested under this title is related to the malfunction of a device or lead, the Secretary may require that personnel of the Food and Drug Administration test such device, or be present at the testing of such device by the manufacturer, to determine whether such device was functioning properly."

REPORT ON DRG TYPE REIMBURSEMENT FOR PHYSICIANS' SERVICES RELATED TO CARDIAC PACEMAKER DEVICE IMPLANTATION

SEC. 5. Section 603(a)(2)(B) of the Social Security Amendments of 1983 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", including specifically any such recommendations with respect to services furnished in connection with the implantation of cardiac pacemaker devices or leads."

MX—AN AMERICAN WEAPON WITHOUT AN AMERICAN MISSION

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is now considering the most important issue of the 98th Congress: whether or not to go ahead with the production and deployment of the MX missile in existing Minuteman silos. For over 30 years I have been actively involved in national security decisions as a member of the House Armed Services Committee. My examination of the President's

proposal to deploy 100 MX missiles in existing Minuteman silos forces me to conclude that the MX makes no substantial contribution to our ability to deter attack on the United States, and may well serve to make such an attack more likely. The MX would also divert scarce defense dollars away from far more necessary projects. For these reasons I must oppose the production of the MX missile.

This decision has not been a difficult one, despite the fact that the President has so strongly requested the MX. The MX in Minuteman silos will not serve a cost-effective military mission, and will in all probability make the conclusion of effective and stabilizing arms control agreements more difficult, not easier.

For years the Air Force and accepted wisdom have told the Congress that our Minuteman missile silos are vulnerable to Soviet ICBM attack. And in recent years this fact served as a primary justification for the MX missile program, as we intended to deploy MX in some way which would render it invulnerable to such an attack. Unfortunately, this proved to be impossible. Now we are being asked to approve production of the MX for deployment in those same vulnerable silos. I reject this idea because if MX is just as vulnerable as our Minuteman it will add little to our ability to deter a Soviet attack through the threat of retaliation. Deterrence through the maintenance of a credible second strike capability has been the centerpiece of our national security policy for years. The MX deployed in Minuteman silos, vulnerable silos, can play no useful military role in such a policy.

The technical characteristics of the MX increase the likelihood of nuclear war. This is the result of both the vulnerability of the MX in existing silos and the capability of the missile itself to destroy hardened targets. The vulnerability of the MX will mean that it could only contribute to our retaliatory capability if it were launched before Soviet warheads actually reached the United States. There has been talk of the United States actually adopting such a launch-under-attack or launch-on-warning doctrine. I vehemently oppose such a move, as it would drastically increase the chances that nuclear disaster could begin by accident through faulty warning systems. The hard target kill capability of MX makes it a very tempting target for Soviet preemptive attack in a crisis. Why invite attack on the United States by deploying a weapon system which has no acceptable capability for retaliation?

Many who support the current MX plan argue that the United States must build and deploy these missiles in order to insure that our forces are sufficiently modern to maintain deterrence and demonstrate our national

will to defend our security interests. I fully support their objectives, and if the MX missile was a means to that end I would support it too. However, we are currently engaged in an extensive strategic force modernization program which includes procurement of the B-1B strategic bomber, the Trident ballistic missile submarine, thousands of air, ground, and sea-launched cruise missiles, the planned Trident II submarine-launched missile, to say nothing of the Midgetman single warhead land-based missile which I also support. In addition, in 1979 we began modernizing 300 of our 550 Minuteman III missiles by replacing their guidance systems and 900 warheads in order to increase their explosive yield and accuracy. These weapons programs will undoubtedly insure the credibility of our deterrent and demonstrate the broad scope of our will to do whatever is necessary for our continued security. We do not maintain our deterrent capability by deploying even the most powerful of missiles in a vulnerable basing mode, and we do not demonstrate national will by making militarily ill-advised weapons decisions on purely political grounds.

A decision to go ahead with the MX missile will do nothing to help prevent war, and will cost us a bundle in the process. The funds necessary to sustain the conventional forces we truly need are scarce. The MX program proposed by the President would cost an estimated \$20.2 billion in real dollars according to a Senate Appropriations Committee report. And this cost does not include an additional \$3 to \$4 billion for MX warheads which are budgeted in a separate Department of Energy account. These funds could be used to make nuclear war less likely by improving the capabilities of our conventional forces, a far more worthy undertaking. President Eisenhower said, "If we put one more dollar in a weapons system than we should, we are weakening the defense of the United States." I agree.

Today we read that the MX should be built as the Scowcroft Commission proposes because it is politically possible, or because a bipartisan consensus exists. We also have seen that some will vote for it in return for extraneous Presidential commitments, such as flexibility in arms reduction negotiations. It is said by others that the MX system is a useful bargaining chip for such negotiations with the Soviets. How so? Given its acknowledged vulnerability and its high cost in a time of tight defense budgeting, why should the Soviets consider MX an attractive chip?

None of these arguments are valid excuses for supporting an expensive weapon system which will drain away defense dollars we urgently need for improving our conventional military capabilities. I will be introducing an

amendment to the Department of Defense authorization bill to delete all procurement funding for the MX. I urge the Congress to support my amendment to prevent production of this missile. It is dangerous to our Nation's defense.●

IT IS UP TO THE ETHICS COMMITTEE NOW

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the investigation of the altered hearing transcripts is now in the hands of the House Ethics Committee. I hope the Ethics Committee will make a full-faith effort to get to the bottom of this case so the guilty will get the justice they deserve. Members of both sides of the aisle should want justice done in this case because, properly viewed, this is a bipartisan concern. If it happened to Republican Members, it could happen to Democrats.

James J. Kilpatrick recently wrote a column about the case of the altered transcripts that I would like to share with my colleagues. Kilpatrick's column, which appeared in the Washington Post on July 13, 1983, follows:

SKULDUGGERY

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

A story is developing on Capitol Hill that might be amusing if it didn't contain so many disturbing elements. It involves skulduggery within the staff of one or more subcommittees of the House.

On July 21 and 22, 1982, five subcommittees from three different House committees got together for hearings on the Environmental Protection Agency. The hearings were known as "EPA Oversight: A One-Year Review." They were not friendly hearings.

In years past, at least a nominal spirit of bipartisanship had been in evidence at EPA hearings. This time, as Joseph A. Davis reported in Congressional Quarterly, Democrats came to the hearings smelling blood: they saw the EPA's record "as a choice target for campaign trail attacks."

The Democrats chose their witnesses accordingly. The minority Republicans complained bitterly that the majority had scheduled the hearings as a "witch hunt." They said they were not given adequate notice, but such Democratic leaders as Toby Moffett of Connecticut and James H. Scheuer of New York brushed the objection aside.

In accordance with congressional practice, the testimony was taken down by shorthand reporters, who then typed up a transcript. After editing, the transcript went to the printers, and in April 1983 the official hearing record was published.

Last month Republican Judd Gregg of New Hampshire happened to thumb through the printed document. He was thunderstruck.

At the hearing on July 21, his colleague Robert S. Walker of Pennsylvania had said, as the official reporter had transcribed it: "Many members of the other party know

that I am willing to take part in reasonable hearings." The printed version read: "Many members of the other party know that I am not willing to take part in reasonable hearings."

John Hiler of Indiana had said: "... a great disservice to the witnesses ... to have very, very few people on the majority who called this particular hearing." The printed, official record read: "... very, very few people on the minority side in attendance, even though they ..."

At some point between the typewritten transcript and the printers, a long and defensive paragraph by Moffett had been inserted—words that he had never spoken at all.

Time after time, the printed record had been altered. Some of the changes might be explained in terms of mere editing, but when "majority" is changed to "minority," skulduggery is afoot.

The matter is important. Historians, teachers, judges and editors rely absolutely upon the printed records of congressional hearings. The EPA record was doctored. What else has been doctored?

Next question: who cares about this criminal act? The House voted unanimously on June 30 to authorize closed hearings on the matter in what is laughingly known as the Ethics Committee. Republicans had no choice; their plea for a select committee was rejected by the Democratic leadership. If the Ethics Committee identifies the dirty hands behind this business, and makes a definitive report by the end of the year, it will amaze everyone—and it particularly will amaze the Ethics Committee.●

MORE MISSILES

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, although the House passed the nuclear freeze resolution earlier this year, it now seems we do not know how to say no to more missiles. What are we waiting for? As Mr. Jerome Wiesner points out in the following article,

... there is no possibility of a winnable nuclear war. The only role for nuclear weapons is deterrence. This is a lesson that won't stay learned. Each new administration has to discover it all over again at the taxpayers' expense.

I thought the House showed it had learned that lesson when we voted for the nuclear freeze. The subsequent votes in favor of the MX missile in return for the administration's empty promise of efforts toward arms control made me reconsider. I call my colleagues' attention to Mr. Wiesner's reasoned arguments for the nuclear freeze:

STOCKPILE TO JUNKPILE

(By Jerome B. Wiesner)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—Last fall, approximately 25 percent of the American voters were given an opportunity to consider a proposal for a balanced and verifiable freeze on the development, testing and deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. A majority of those who voted were for it. In

the spring, members of the House of Representatives endorsed a similar proposition nearly two to one. On Wednesday, a freeze resolution is scheduled to come to a vote in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Yet it is still not being considered seriously by the Administration or Congress.

Meanwhile, they have been concentrating on the MX missile as a bargaining chip. But it takes more than bargaining chips and new missiles to stop the arms race. It requires, most of all, a sincere commitment and proposals that are balanced and fair to both sides. It requires also a proposal substantial enough to make it worthy of a major effort. None of the proposals put forward recently by either superpower meets these criteria. The freeze does.

"Fatally flawed" was the President's reaction to the freeze proposal. What are these flaws? He doesn't specify them. In my view, the only flaws are ones easily fixed. The current freeze proposals are too vague, deliberately so, because their sponsors drafted them to draw maximum support, not to create a negotiating document. They insist that a freeze be balanced and verifiable, but they don't explain what this would mean.

What is to be balanced: Bombs? Missiles? Security? Fear? How can a freeze be verified? How thorough must verification be? How would peaceful space activities be accommodated? The answers to these and other important questions need to be spelled out. The President could start to keep his promise to Congress by serious consideration of a freeze.

A freeze now makes very good sense for several reasons. First, it is generally agreed that an acceptable balance of nuclear forces already exists. The United States has more nuclear warheads than the Soviet Union; theirs are larger. The Soviet Union has more and larger ballistic missiles than we do, but a much bigger fraction of the Soviet missiles are land-based and thus more vulnerable.

Most important, both sides have forces so much greater than needed to provide a secure deterrent that maintaining an exact balance is not essential. Actually, a change by a factor of two, up or down on either side, would not begin to undermine the existing stalemate. This means that there is no possibility of a winnable nuclear war. The only role for nuclear weapons is deterrence. This is a lesson that won't stay learned. Each new administration has to discover it all over again at the taxpayers' expense.

Second, existing national surveillance systems provide each side with more than enough information about the other's testing and deployment of weapons to protect themselves against any buildup of missiles, present or new ones, or against a surprise technological breakthrough. Existing forces are so large that not even the unlikely invention of an effective antisubmarine system or a "Star Wars" missile defense system would undermine the other side's deterrent.

Some people object to the freeze because it does not immediately reduce or eliminate nuclear weapons. They should realize that a freeze would create the conditions favorable to reduction.

If testing of existing and new rockets and nuclear weapons were precluded, there would be a growing loss of confidence in their reliability and in the assumption that a given missile or bomb would function when its button was pressed. This is what first-strike proponents don't like about a

freeze. No military commander or political leader would have much confidence in the success of a preemptive strike by weapons that had not been recently tested or demonstrated.

On the other hand, no one could be certain that a substantial number of them would not work. So, as time passed, there would be less and less fear of a first strike, but there would always remain a belief that some of the old weapons would work. This is double uncertainty could obviously be a very effective deterrent. Moreover, it could well lead to reduction of stockpiles on both sides. (Even with flagging confidence in the reliability of the strategic weapons, the stockpiles of both countries would still be much larger than needed for an adequate deterrent.)

The risks in a freeze are incalculably smaller than the risks inherent in the continued escalation of weapons and polemics into the next century. If a freeze were achieved, nuclear weapons would slowly but surely become irrelevant to the security of both nations, and most of them would find their way from the stockpile to the junkpiles.●

COVERT ACTION IN NICARAGUA

HON. WYCHE FOWLER, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday the House is scheduled to begin consideration of H.R. 2760, a bill which would end funding for the paramilitary covert action in Nicaragua.

The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, which was established by the House as an oversight body in 1977 partly as a result of public and congressional reaction to past covert actions, has recommended that covert funding for administration policies in Nicaragua be discontinued.

This is the first time since its inception in 1977 that the committee has made such a recommendation.

It is not a step taken lightly. It was taken only after a majority of the committee had concluded that this covert action was probably illegal, was certainly unwise, could lead to a Cuban-American military confrontation in Central America and, like other paramilitary adventures in the past, simply would not work.

A covert paramilitary action within Nicaragua will not end a civil war in El Salvador.

This conclusion of the Intelligence Committee is echoed in the following Miami Herald article by a recently retired CIA official.

I commend the article to you.

The article follows:

[From the Miami Herald, June 5, 1983]

COVERT ACTION IN NICARAGUA

(By Tom Polgar)

In 1964 I had the privilege of talking about Vietnam with the late Sen. Richard Russell of Georgia, then chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Russell

said the situation of the United States in Vietnam reminded him of a scene he once witnessed back in Georgia, that of a cow hung up on a picket fence. The cow could not go forward, she could not go backward, and all the time the picket was hurting her belly.

Some 10 years later, as I was climbing to the roof of the American Embassy in Saigon for the helicopter ride that would terminate my service in Vietnam and end two decades of intensive U.S. engagement in that distant part of the world, I recalled the words of the late senator from Georgia.

Now in 1983 the United States again seems to be hung up on a picket fence, this time closer to home, in Central America. We cannot go forward and seek to clear up the situation through a massive military intervention, because Congress and public opinion would not accept such a solution. We cannot go backward and disengage from El Salvador, because we have elevated that small country into a test case of U.S. prestige and resolve and into a symbol of U.S. determination to resist the spread of Marxist-Communist regimes in Latin America, in the meanwhile, while we are seeking a politically acceptable settlement of the civil war, the pickets are hurting our belly and the pain may be a continuing one.

The recently announced transfers of Thomas Enders, assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs, and Deane Hinton, U.S. ambassador in San Salvador, and their replacements by people without experience in their respective new areas indicate the administration's dissatisfaction with the progress in reaching a solution to the problems of El Salvador through diplomacy. Unfortunately, it suggests also that the professional objectivity and caution of the career Foreign Service officers will not be allowed to stand in the way of attempts to resolve the situation through more direct and less conventional means, including use of what the press likes to call covert action.

What is covert action? A pragmatic definition of covert action is this: A government effort to fulfill national policy objectives abroad through intelligence channels.

While the term "covert action" may be new to much of the American public, the concept is as old as written history. It is one of the several means available to a government for the implementation of its objectives. No major power would ever preclude the use of covert action as a matter of principle.

The "Trojan horse"—the introduction of Greek soldiers into the fortress town of Troy by hiding them in a large wooden horse, ostensibly a gift to the town—was an early example of effective covert action.

More recent examples on which there is considerable literature, as well as controversy, include the British-American operation to oust Prime Minister Mohammed Mossadegh of Iran in 1953; the 1954 CIA project to remove from power the elected president of Guatemala, Jacobo Arbenz; the Israeli rescue of hostages in Etzebe; the Soviet manipulation, through numerous front organizations, of the anti-war sentiment, particularly in Western Europe, and the CIA's "secret war" in Laos.

The Bay of Pigs project remains as a reminder of all the things that can go wrong when an operation is based on false assumptions.

Perhaps because many people confuse covert action with "dirty tricks"—which can but need not be part of a specific, covert action project—or perhaps because they are

opposed to the objectives that the government seeks to attain through covert action, there appears to be a certain amount of opposition attached to the concept. Many, whose patriotic and anti-Communist motivation cannot be questioned, feel uncomfortable about covert action and are concerned that its use invokes difficult questions of morality, integrity and perhaps also of law.

Perhaps so, but in these respects covert action is no different from other means of policy implementation. The Biblical commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," is reflected in all of our religions and is firmly anchored in the criminal laws of all countries. Yet there are many circumstances in which killing is excused, tolerated, allowed, encouraged, ordered and praised. It depends on who does the killing, on the circumstances, on motivation and a whole series of other factors. On the other end of the scale, sexual activity, the source of life, is clearly encouraged and tolerated in certain circumstances while deemed indecent, illegal or prohibited under others. Covert action is not immoral or illegal. It is neutral. It is an age-old technique by which governments seek to influence events and alter conditions in their favor. The policies being implemented by covert action—and the specific covert action or actions being utilized—may well be immoral or illegal or both.

The 17th-Century British poet, John Dryden, wrote:

"Treason never prospers.

"What is the reason?

"Why, if it prospers

"None dare call it treason."

It goes something like that with covert action, too. If it is successful, there are few complaints—except from the defeated side. If the covert action fails, or goes on too long, or reaches dimensions that preclude secrecy, then it will attract controversy and condemnation, with opponents caring little whether they are beating the donkey or the saddle—that is, the policymaker, the operational concept or the executing agency.

Which brings us to Central America. In contrast to the U.S. involvement in Vietnam, which developed gradually and for over a decade with solid acceptance of the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations' policies by Congress and public opinion, the current U.S. policy in Central America has been controversial from the outset. Compared to the options available to the U.S. government in foreign affairs in earlier years, the freedom of initiative of the Reagan Administration is severely limited. Most specifically, the current political and psychological climate would make it difficult to employ even a token of U.S. military power in combat in Central America.

Against that background—and given the deterioration of the military and socio-economic situation in El Salvador—the administration opted to utilize, in addition to conventional military and civilian assistance, covert action mechanisms to create paramilitary forces capable of bringing pressure on the government of Nicaragua. I take it, from what I read in the papers, that it was the intention to create sufficient disturbance on the borders of Nicaragua to divert the Sandinistas from continuing their interference in El Salvador. Also, it might have been hoped that the paramilitary force would become such a nuisance to Nicaragua that it could be used as something of a quid pro quo in negotiations to bring about a regional settlement.

Can this scheme work? Can the Honduras-based paramilitary group contribute to the

ending of the civil war in El Salvador? Several reasons speak against it:

Nicaragua has long been a hotbed of nationalistic, anti-U.S. agitation in Central America. This led to U.S. military interventions before Fidel Castro was born. The incumbent Nicaraguan government considers itself the ideological heir to the late Gen. Augusto Sandino, a folk hero of Nicaraguan history, kept from power by the intervention of U.S. Marines and assassinated allegedly on orders of Anastasio Somoza, who was a protégé of the United States.

It is likely that Nicaragua would have had a leftist, anti-American, socialist-type regime long ago had it not been for the several North American military interventions.

While Cuban and Nicaraguan government objectives currently coincide, Nicaraguan history suggests that Sandinista sentiments were strong in that country, and opposed by the United States, long before the emergence of a Castroist Cuba.

Contrary to the claims of the Reagan Administration, the insurgency in El Salvador is not primarily the product of Nicaraguan or Cuban agitation. El Salvador has had an exceptionally troubled past. The smallness of the country and its great population density have led to frequent attempts to depart from the socioeconomic heritage of Spanish colonialism.

A series of military governments controlled the nation through the '50s and '60s without any reference to the will of the people. Civilian efforts to take office culminated in the apparent electoral victory in 1972 of a coalition headed by Christian Democrat Napoleon Duarte (now the great hope of the U.S. government) and Socialist Guillermo Ungo (now a leader of the leftist coalition opposing the government of El Salvador). On this occasion, too, the civilians were prevented from taking office. There has been guerrilla activity in El Salvador since the early '70s—before the Sandinistas came into power in Nicaragua. Since 1979, however, the insurgency in El Salvador has been strengthened materially and psychologically by the Sandinistas.

In recognizing the historic roots of insurgency in Central America, I certainly do not mean to deny or minimize the current Communist involvement in the struggle. There has been a clear pattern of Communist subversion and of the establishment of secret structures, particularly among the educated classes, for many years. Central America and the Caribbean have had their share of what the Soviets call "active measures"—that particularly Communist concept that peace is war by other means.

Soviet assistance to Cuba or to Nicaragua, or Communist assistance to the guerrillas in El Salvador, is no accident or an ad hoc decision, but a systematic implementation of longstanding Soviet policy. The question is not whether there is Communist support to the insurgency in El Salvador—we can take that as a given—but what can the United States do about restoring the situation to manageable dimensions?

I am afraid the answer to that question is "not enough." The current circumstances in El Salvador (and in Nicaragua) reflect a chain of events to which the United States has contributed by omission and by commission. While our intelligence services have been well aware that the Soviets and the Cubans were applying secret, underground, creeping techniques as well as propaganda and overt political means to expand their influence in Latin America, the logic of the situation was not translated into a policy of

appropriate defense posture; into a political commitment to protect friendly countries by force if need be, or into a continuing program to assist the security forces of friendly countries so they could cope with the problems on their own.

We are seeing in El Salvador an application of the teachings of Brazilian guerrilla leader Carlos Marighella, who wrote that "The guerrilla must use revolutionary violence to identify with popular causes and thus win a popular base." Further, "the government has no choice except to intensify repression. . . . [T]he general sentiment will emerge that the government is unjust, incapable of solutions and resorts purely and simply to physical liquidation of opponents. The political situation is translated into a military one, in which the military appear more and more responsible for error and violence." This would seem to sum up the recent developments in El Salvador and the reaction of much of the American and international media.

Having made El Salvador a symbol of its resistance to communism in 1981, the Reagan Administration is now confronted with difficult choices. The economic situation in El Salvador is worse now than it was two years ago. The guerrilla capability has improved, according to U.S. Army Gen. Wallace H. Nutting, who has recently relinquished command of SOUTHCOM, the U.S. Southern Command, in Panama. According to Gen. Nutting, we are also losing the psychological battle. While Congress has not imposed the kind of restrictions on military and economic aid to El Salvador that appeared possible earlier this spring, it is clear that Congress is not about to make any open-ended commitments. Thus, the administration will remain under constraints in its attempts toward stabilizing the situation.

Military intervention—the commitment of U.S. troops into combat—has been ruled out by the President, whose authority is, in any case, restricted by the War Powers Act. Barring some unexpected and unusually foolish provocation by Cuba or Nicaragua, or some such fortuitous event as the blowing up of the U.S. battleship *Maine* in Havana harbor on the eve of the Spanish-American war, it is inconceivable that Congress would authorize U.S. military action to restore order in El Salvador.

Diplomacy offers little promise. Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela and Panama are united in the Contadora group that looks skeptically, to put it mildly, at U.S. activities in Central America. Costa Rica and Guatemala are fearful that it may be their turn next. France has been openly critical of our policies, and we should not expect much from the socialist government of Spain. England and West Germany are supportive of U.S. policies, but after the Falkland affair, England is not looking for any additional troubles with Latin America, and West Germany has neither the tradition nor the willingness for any leading role in Central America. All countries recognize diplomatically the government of Nicaragua, which is more than can be said about our friends in El Salvador.

Elections, which are favored by the United States as a way out of the current conflict, are not in consonance with the realities of the situation. If the premise is accepted that the insurgency in El Salvador is Communist-dominated, then it follows that the insurgents would not participate in any elections. No significant Communist-led insurgency has ever agreed to stack arms and to return to the political mainstream as a result of free elections.

This brings us to covert action. To the Reagan Administration, coming into office in 1981 with a leadership relatively inexperienced in foreign affairs but with a firm conviction in its own ideology, the prospects of covert action must have looked attractive. Programs could be mounted without specific legislative approval, financial requirements would be relatively low (as things go in the federal government) and the Central Intelligence Agency has traditionally been an exceptionally dutiful and responsive servant of the incumbent president. No reason to think that this would be otherwise under William Casey, a man of immense energy and enthusiasm, the manager of Reagan's successful campaign, and by all accounts a trusted friend and ideological soulmate of the President. Covert action was demanded and the CIA hastened to comply.

The Honduras-based covert action program against Nicaragua, by now unfortunately widely publicized, has been one of the more ambitious of the new programs. In some respects it reminds one of a similarly ambitious undertaking, the training of Cuban exiles in Guatemala for the Bay of Pigs adventure. Well, that was 20 years ago and it would be reasonable to assume that some lessons have been learned since. Our ambassador in Honduras, John Negroponte, is a fine professional with experience in Vietnam and in Latin America. It seems that he has been given some authority for the coordination of Honduras-based activities, in contrast to the extreme and damaging compartmentation of the 1961 project. I would assume, also, that the CIA today would pay more careful attention to intelligence, to logistics and to planning than it did during the earlier Cuban expedition. The several defeats of the last two decades should have impressed all concerned with the need to keep to a minimum the wishful thinking, the conceit, the arrogance and the disdain for the opponent that have been ingredients of the failures in the past.

Nevertheless—and even allowing that the Honduras-based paramilitary force would do the best job possible under the circumstance—reliance on this already very public group as a major vehicle of U.S. policy implementation seems a very risky proposition. The record of U.S.-supported paramilitary actions is not a winning one. In Sumatra, in Cuba, in Laos, in Vietnam, in Angola . . . the challenges, commitments and operational missions were different but the outcome was the same. Our friends have lost. It would seem that the hopes of several administrations to achieve major foreign-policy objectives cheaply, "on the sly," and without a national commitment simply run contrary to the realities of life.

There is also another danger. When the intelligence service itself becomes the executor of policy in place of its more normal role of a contributor to policy formulation, it becomes easy to forget about the need for checks and balances. There is a great temptation to shape reporting to fit policy, to confuse desire with reality, to pretend that that which we can do equates to that which needs to be done. To admit failure does not help one's career—it is better to emphasize the progress of our side and to minimize the achievements of the enemy. All of this comes very naturally under the pressure of events and circumstances, particularly against a background of personnel shortages, insufficient knowledge of local terrain, language, culture and history. The combination can then lead to a collective mind-set that accepts very debatable and even false

assumptions as the truth. Objectivity and skepticism—essential ingredients of sound intelligence reporting—come under very heavy strain or may be lost altogether.

What, then, are my conclusions? The prospects are that a bloody and economically devastating statement will continue in El Salvador with neither the government nor the insurgents capable of a decisive and definitive victory over the other. The insurgents can live more easily with this situation than the government because of the government's responsibility for the country's economy and for social welfare and its increasing dependence on U.S. support. Since the level and duration of such support are subject to change and uncertain at best, the insurgents have little incentive to negotiate a peaceful solution.

U.S. military intervention could alter the situation radically, but the prospects and risks of such go beyond the scope of this article. Covert action, including the use of armed groups based in Honduras, is not likely to have decisive impact on the politics of Nicaragua or Cuba. Should the anti-Sandinista groups be able to obtain high-performance military aircraft, the level of the confrontation could escalate with unpredictable results. This could give some advantage to the anti-Sandinista forces but it may well open another can of worms.

The events in Central America prove once again that history moves in continuity while U.S. attempts to influence developments are sporadic, with widely diverging aims every couple of years, depending on our domestic politics. U.S. foreign policy and even U.S. intelligence coverage lack consistency and continuity and tend to be highly diffused in their aims. Continuity is lacking also in the deployment of personnel resources. Our new ambassador in San Salvador will be the fifth U.S. chief of mission there in less than five years, and there are similar patterns at the working levels. Such rapid rotation virtually guarantees that there will be insufficient awareness within the embassies of local political trends, insufficient appreciation of key personalities and insufficient area knowledge. Our problems in these respects are not new, but their consequences are more frightening as the Soviets and their associates continue to expand their "active measures" in the Western Hemisphere.

Those pickets will continue to hurt our belly. ●

BEYOND THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1982

HON. JOHN R. KASICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, much has been made in recent months about the deterioration of our Nation's infrastructure. Our highways in particular, the bulk of which were constructed over the past 25 years, are decaying and crumbling at an alarming rate.

Through passage of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982, Congress has provided an additional \$5.4 billion annually for highway programs. However, simply raising taxes to provide additional funds would not

solve the problem. We must insure that the money spent on road and bridge repair and related programs is money spent wisely, money that will provide lasting improvements.

As the times have changed so have the conditions on our highways and so have the needs of highway users. Road repair technologies have been developed to meet these conditions and needs. But the following report, done by Burson-Marsteller, questions whether enough has been done to encourage the use of these technologies, thus insuring that the taxpayers' money is used to make lasting repairs. I commend this report to my colleagues for their study.

**BEYOND THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION
ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1982
THE HIGHWAY SYSTEM**

Our nation's highway system, made up of some 3.9 million miles of federally aided and non-federally aided roads and highways, is a valuable national resource, often reflecting some of the most advanced engineering skills money can buy. Odd, therefore, that little consideration is given to new technologies in road surface repair which can save the Federal government, states and localities millions of dollars while at the same time saving motorists and commercial haulers added millions of dollars in reduced repairs resulting from potholes and cracked pavement.

When Congress recently passed the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 (STAA), most of the media and political attention focused on the five-cent per gallon fuel tax increase and the potential jobs which might be created by the resulting highway program. Almost lost was consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of the Act as a program to rectify the problem of our deteriorating highway system. Indeed, the Act takes only a small first step towards providing significant long run solutions to our highway problems. But its provisions and omissions certainly are worthy of greater national attention.

The highway problem

Our nation's highway system serves approximately 160 million vehicles traveling more than 1.5 trillion vehicle miles annually. It is no wonder the system often is called the "backbone of our nation's transportation system."

Over the years, however, this "backbone" has been crumbling at an alarming rate. A traditional orientation in heavy capital investments for new road work combined with construction costs that exceeded the rate of inflation by one and half times have resulted in serious neglect of both roads and bridges. In the next ten years alone, according to the U.S. Dept. of Transportation, over 200,000 miles of highways will need some level of capital investment to offset obsolescence.

The Surface Transportation Assistance Act

Congress reflected its concern about highway deterioration by passage of the STAA on December 23, 1982. When signed into law by President Reagan some 14 days later, the STAA—with its five-cent fuel tax hike and other transportation user fees—increased the revenue of the Highway Trust Fund by an estimated \$6.5 billion per year. The bulk of that—about \$5.4 billion—is set aside for highway and highway safety programs.

The STAA also authorizes Congress to appropriate funds for transportation development through 1986. The majority of those funds—over \$56 billion—is earmarked for highway and highway safety programs. \$17 million is slated for public transit.

Of all the highway development programs in the STAA, the most substantial funding increase is for Interstate highway resurfacing, restoration rehabilitation and reconstruction. Known as the Interstate 4R Program, it is designed to address the needs of some 2,000 miles of interstate highways which annually are meeting the end of their design life. The 1983 authorization level of the 4R program was increased by \$1.5 billion, over 100 percent increased from the 1982 authorization level.

Yet another indication of Congress' efforts to address deterioration problems is the STAA requirement that for projects on roads within the primary, secondary and urban systems, 40 percent of the federal aid dollars must be spent on 4R type activities. Previously, only 20 percent of federal aid dollars were earmarked for 4R type activities on these systems.

While \$1.5 billion is certainly a sizeable boost for the Interstate 4R program, the four year authorization level of \$10.3 billion is still below the minimum levels proposed by the Highway Users Federation.¹ Moreover, the highway appropriation continues to be diminished by inflation while confronting constantly growing and somewhat unpredictable capital improvement needs.

In essence, the financial enhancement of the highway program, combined with the trend toward preservation of existing roads and bridges through the expanded 4R Program, provides only the most basic tools for dealing with deterioration and obsolescence. Most important, it fails to provide incentives to utilize new technologies which can result in better highways and long-term savings. It should be remembered that it is just as easy to experience waste in repairs of highways as in any other government program.

The challenge for successful highway programs falls in part to state and local highway officials who must initiate programs which reflect imaginative and innovative management to maintain highway serviceability. Critical to such programs should be the application of new technologies providing cost effective improvement with longer serviceability.

Historically, solutions to problems of road repair have been shortsighted. It is evident from the number of increasing miles of deteriorating roads that traditional repair materials have been both costly and ineffective. Because traditional road repair employs relatively primitive technologies that also are inherently materials intensive, greater incentive and focus must be provided for new technological solutions that will address road repair problems in the long-term.

The congressional response

Congress made a stab at recognizing the general need for use of new technologies in one part of the new Act. It stated under the heading "Innovative Technologies":

"The Congress hereby finds and declares that it is in the national interest to encourage and promote utilization by the States of highway and bridge surfacing, resurfacing, or restoration materials which are produced

from recycled materials or which contain asphalt additives to strengthen the materials. Such materials conserve energy and reduce the cost of resurfacing or restoring our highways."

Section 142(a), Public Law 97-424-Jan. 6, 1983.

The STAA thus addresses the need to replace traditional materials by offering a special but very limited incentive for use of new technologies. The "Innovative Technology" provision does not, however, increase the total allocation of funds to a state; it provides a five percent increase in the federal share of projects to states which utilize recycled materials or strengthening materials containing asphalt. The Federal/State share ratio becomes 95/5 as opposed to 90/10 for repair projects on interstate, primary, secondary or urban systems.

The limitations of congressional action

Unfortunately, a five percent increase in Federal share does not provide states with much incentive. Moreover, as enacted, this provision alone will not result in widespread use of innovative materials. Consequently it will not significantly encourage state departments of transportation to examine and implement cost-effective solutions for highway deterioration. So while the provision is good in theory, it is far too limiting.

Because state subsidies are apportioned according to a predetermined population-based formula, the provision merely provides for a shifting of federal funds from one project employing traditional methods to another utilizing technology defined by the STAA as "innovative." Also, there is a question as to the real value of the five percent share increase, as opposed to an actual funding increase or other substantial incentive. Whether states will find the administrative costs of implementing the incentive provisions as enacted worthwhile or not is a further question.

The use of recycled materials or those containing asphalt additives represents only two of many available "innovative" technologies worthy of special support for the long-term savings they provide, particularly since road conditions and needs vary from state to state, as well as within states. One "innovative" application may work well in one segment of an interstate highway, while the same material may be unsatisfactory in another segment of the same system.

Technologies ignored in the act

Typical of the kind of new technologies overlooked in the Act are geotextiles. Since the early 70's, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Transportation Research Board and various state departments of transportation have been focusing on the innovative application of geotextiles. Such materials have the proven potential to provide comprehensive, cost-effective solutions to problems of extending life of the pavement by preventing or delaying reflection cracking. This is cracking in pavement overlays coinciding with cracks in the underlying pavement. These materials are also useful as a barrier to the ingress of water after cracks form in the overlay.

Reflection cracking is most common in freeze-thaw states—i.e., those in which severe climatic extremes subject pavements and subgrades to chronic expansion and contraction. In such states, predominantly those in the Northeast, North Central and Midwest regions, reflection cracking is rec-

¹ John C. Landen, Chairman, Highway Users Federation (testifying before House Subcommittee on Surface Transportation), July 16, 1981.

ognized as a prime cause of pavement deterioration. According to one report:²

"The occurrence of reflection cracking in asphalt concrete overlays is a major factor contributing to the loss of serviceability of a pavement system . . . The review of field data indicates that reflection cracking is a serious maintenance problem . . . reflective cracks require continued future maintenance for cracking sealing and patching, thus becoming a significant maintenance expense item."

The technology traditionally used as a remedy for cracked pavement has been the overlay of new asphalt, which may or may not involve excavation of the pavement prior to overlay. This method typically provides only short term improvement for cracked areas or spalled patches. A more expeditious method—filling in cracks with hot mix, cold patch or liquid asphalt—also provides only a temporary solution. Coupled with labor and material costs, such short term solutions are no longer the answer, especially in light of the emergence of more successful, cost-effective technologies.

For many engineers, the answer appears to lie with woven and non-woven geotextiles. Applied to the pavement prior to resurfacing, these fabrics may "hold the key toward an economical method to eliminate or reduce reflective cracking from occurring."³ such geotextiles may be classified into two basic types: polyester and polypropylene fabrics intended for waterproofing, and glass fiber reinforcements designed to reduce the pattern of crack reflection.

In Pennsylvania, for example, when reflective cracking in bituminous concrete overlays was a major factor contributing to the premature failure of the pavement systems, significant work was done with several woven and non-woven fabrics. Monitoring continued through three freeze-thaw cycles to test the systems' effectiveness. The Pennsylvania Department of Transportation in a September, 1981 report concluded that these fabrics "may be useful in retarding its reflective crack formation."

Although most states have placed test sections utilizing one or more of the 19 fabric products, they are not being used to their fullest potential. The result is highway repair projects that are more costly, and more frequently in need of repair than would be necessary if the new systems were used.

Various trial study reports point out the money-saving potential of many of these geotextiles, with physical characteristics necessary for long term effectiveness. In general, the major fabric properties relied upon are a combination of "strength, temperature resistance, asphalt retention, and conformability."⁴

One fabric repair system has combined glass fiber—which has a per-pound tensile strength greater than steel—and an asphalt polymer binder—which provides strong bonding and high elasticity, for an overall trial effective rate of 80 percent. This particular system, because it is applied on a "spot" rather than on a "curb-to-curb"

basis, is also less labor and materials intensive. In fact, a report on the system, prepared in 1979 by the Ohio Division of the FHWA, found that by substituting it for conventional methods "a great cost savings can be realized."⁵

The report also went on to say:

"If we are to continue to maintain our highways with ever dwindling revenues, we must look for more cost effective solutions to old problems. One way to lengthen the life of an overlay is to inhibit reflective cracking and to find a more cost effective manner of joint repair. The [aforementioned] system is one solution to these problems. Ohio's experience to date has been good with the [aforementioned] system."

In an installation of this glass fiber technology on Ohio State Route 15, more than \$20,000 in savings were realized for a single mile-long, one-lane section of road.

Demonstration projects

Many other State departments of transportation have explored the effectiveness of new technologies at one time or another through the FHWA's National Experimental and Demonstration Projects Program. Although financially limited, such programs provide seed money for experimental design and material projects to promote the use of new technologies. States, in turn, simply are asked to report the results of such projects to the FHWA and share the trial data with other States needing materials or design specifications to solve similar problems.

Unfortunately, such demonstration programs are limited. To date they appear not to have substantially increased the use of innovative technologies by state departments of transportation.

The need for real incentives

Beyond the limited STAA "Incentive Technology" provision and the FHWA Experimental and Demonstration programs, the state departments of transportation have no real financial incentives to thoroughly explore and use innovative technologies on a regular basis. Either the data about new technologies is not available or sufficient, or states simply have not been inspired to seek innovative technology data for use in 4R program activities.

Since trial data does exist on the application of innovative materials and designs, states desiring truly cost-effective programs could expand their traditional technologies to include those used by other states in FHWA Experimental or Demonstration projects.

The Federal Government's role and responsibility

Over the long run, however, solution may come only with a greater commitment on the federal level to generating real financial incentives for the application of new technologies for highway repair and restoration.

The time for this commitment may be when authorization for the federal aid highway programs expires in 1986. Then legislation to extend the program will be considered. If the problem of highway deterioration is to be solved the legislation must broaden the focus of the existing highway program to include all effective, innovative technologies. Only then will the highway program reflect a truly long-term, cost-effective policy.●

² A proposal to the Ohio Dept. of Transportation, "A Field Evaluation of Engineering Fabrics for Maintenance of PCC Pavement in Ohio," submitted by Dr. Kamran Majidzadeh, chairman of the board, Resource International, Inc., Worthington, Ohio, June 1982.

³ Construction and Geotechnical Engineering Using Synthetic Fabrics, R.M. Koerner, Ph.D., P.E., J.P. Welsh, P.E. Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1980, (p.110).

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ "Joint Reinforcement Membrane: Owens-Corning Roadglas Spot Repair System," Donald R. Tuggle, Assistant Area Engineer, Ohio Division, Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 1979, (p. 6).

CASTRO'S CONVICTS

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the July 11th Washington Post carried an excellent editorial about the dangerous convicted felons that Fidel Castro sent to this country in the 1980 Mariel boatlift.

The editorial noted that these individuals "belong in Cuban jails, not in American jails. Certainly they do not belong on American streets." I concur completely in this assessment.

Indeed, I would go one step farther. The States should not have to bear the cost of incarcerating those Cubans who after entry violated our laws and who now are being held in American jails. Immigration and refugees are Federal matters. Their financial impact on American society should be borne by the entire country and not by the few States. For this reason, I am cosponsoring H.R. 3350, a bill to compensate the States for cost incurred to confine Cuban nationals who entered the United States in the Mariel boatlift and who are being imprisoned for violation of State laws.

For the benefit of my colleagues, the editorial follows:

THEY'RE CASTRO'S CONVICTS

For three years the United States government has been trying to sort out the difficult problem of the dangerous convicted felons Fidel Castro unloaded on the United States in the Mariel boatlift. That task has now been made substantially more difficult by an Atlanta federal judge who has demanded all manner of rights for these illegal immigrants and threatened to release them into the community if his demands are not met.

Back in 1980, it seemed to be a humanitarian and patriotic gesture to accept provisionally, without papers or visas, all those fleeing from the port of Mariel. More than 125,000 came. Most were true refugees, many had families here, and the great majority has settled into American communities without mishap. But the Cuban dictator played a cruel joke. He opened his jails and mental hospitals and put their inmates on the boats too.

This country has since provided care for the mentally ill among them. The 22,000 arrivals who freely admitted that they were convicts were kept apart and have been treated separately. Each case has been reviewed individually by Justice Department lawyers, and hearings were afforded at which the Cubans could be represented by lawyers and present witnesses. Gradually, those thought to be less dangerous, including not only political prisoners but also some persons who had committed serious felonies, were released.

Of the original group, however, 1,050 remain at the federal penitentiary in Atlanta. Some 144 of these have been approved for release and are awaiting sponsors. Those still in custody are, according to corrections officials, a difficult and violent population.

Some have murdered other prisoners, and guards have been assaulted frequently. Each case continues to be reviewed on a regular basis. It would be simple enough to release them, but the Justice Department believes that this hard core—less than 1 percent of the Mariel boat people—is too dangerous to be allowed to roam the streets.

Now comes Judge Marvin H. Schoob. He concedes that deportation proceedings are civil, not criminal, and that the government has every right to hold illegal aliens pending deportation. But he has ordered the government to provide the Cuban inmates with free attorneys—though Americans involved in civil proceedings and other immigrants fighting deportation have no similar right. He has decreed that the Cubans should have subpoena power to summon witnesses—though no statute provides for granting such power. He threatens to release them unless these advantages are provided.

The matter could be settled quickly if these men could be deported, but Cuba refuses to take them back; the United States has tried to initiate negotiations on this subject, in vain, four times. As difficult as that may be, the pressure must be kept on the Castro regime to take them back. They belong in Cuban jails, not in American jails. Certainly they do not belong on American streets. Meanwhile, the government is under no obligation to accord these particular illegal aliens rights and privileges not available to other aliens or even to American citizens. ●

THE WEST LEARNS THE ART OF GUERRILLA WARFARE

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in the debate of U.S. aid to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua, we are confronted with a double standard by opponents of U.S. policy: They readily accept the violent activities of Communist guerrillas in the world aided and abetted by the Soviet Union and its allies; but they refuse to accept any support from the United States for those fighting the guerrilla campaigns or seeking freedom against Communist oppression. They cite international law as if it were a one-way street permitting only violent overthrow by—and never of—Communists.

The following article from the Wall Street Journal several months ago has an incisive discussion of the issue, and I urge my colleagues to read it.

THE WEST LEARNS THE ART OF GUERRILLA WARFARE

(By Jean-Francois Revel and Branko Lazitch)

PARIS.—East-West confrontation is usually measured by the military buildup of the superpowers and their allies. But history and current events show that guerrilla movements have always been a more efficient military avenue for communist expansionism. Today, however, a new phenomenon is taking place: For the first time, in various

places, genuinely popular anti-communist movements are resorting to communist guerrilla tactics.

After World War II, guerrilla movements became a communist monopoly. Sometimes the communists lost, as in Greece or Thailand; sometimes they won, as in Vietnam. But they were never seriously challenged by anti-communist guerrillas. In Poland and Yugoslavia the nationalist forces that attempted to resist a communist takeover were savagely crushed without difficulty and without a hint of Western help.

On the other hand, whenever there was a split within the communist world—for example, between the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia, China or Albania—the communist countries refrained from using guerrilla tactics against each other, using them only when they fought the West. The Bay of Pigs fiasco proved how little expertise the West had in the guerrilla game.

There is no doubt that the noble art of using guerrilla movements for imperialistic purposes is a communist specialty. That art must be correctly understood: It differs from mere destabilization, staged coups d'etat and other political or terrorist actions directed from the outside. It consists of hijacking a perfectly genuine local rebellion and turning it into a totem for Moscow's imperialism. That's why arguing whether the roots of trouble—as in El Salvador—lie in local injustice or Soviet interference is largely meaningless. Social injustice is a reality that must be cured. But Moscow will never allow it to be cured by reform, elections, compromise or aid because these solutions would stop its progression by violence toward its real goal: one-party communist rule.

The communists have several methods to reach that goal. They can train guerrilla leaders behind the Iron Curtain or in Cuba. They have the support of the local and international communist network. Most of the time, there is a "sanctuary" country in the vicinity. They have no parliamentary opposition or public criticism to contend with. Finally, in the West, parliamentary opposition and the media emphasize the idealistic and genuine side of the pro-communist guerrillas and pass over foreign and imperialistic Soviet interferences. Politicians in democratic countries are also less sensitive to long-range political implications than they are to legitimate fears about their governments' potential involvement in a quagmire.

But today guerrilla movements have become a boomerang. In Afghanistan, Cambodia, Angola and Nicaragua they are hitting back and challenging the communist power. In all four countries, pro-Soviet communist took power through military action. Today they face anti-communist rebellions they seem unable to subdue. These anti-communist guerrilla movements are well-organized, have grass-roots support, arms, ammunition and, above all, sanctuaries: Pakistan for the Afghan resistance, Honduras for the anti-Sandinistas, Thailand for the Cambodian Liberation Front and South Africa or Namibia for Jonas Savimbi's UNITA.

The anti-communist counter-guerrillas have learned to use communist guerrilla techniques effectively. They set up political alliances between very different forces. As the communists have assembled different political movements into "national fronts," anti-communist guerrillas have united heterogeneous elements with only one thing in common: anti-communist and anti-Soviet

feelings. In Nicaragua we see former Somocistas fighting along with democrats who at first had helped the Sandinistas and now resent their rule, or even with prominent Sandinista heroes like Eden Pastora, who are allergic to totalitarianism. In Cambodia former Khmer Rouge and pro-Sihanouk nationalists side-by-side resist Vietnamese occupation. In Afghanistan, religious, nationalist, tribal, and pro-Western motivations work together against the invader.

But the anti-communist guerrillas have weaknesses the communists don't. They aren't centralized by an autocratic political party or supervised by a powerful international organization. Also, the governments from which the anti-communist guerrillas are getting help—or could get help—are being stopped or crippled by critics who oppose any direct involvement in the conflict by their governments. That is happening in the U.S. over Nicaragua. As a result, the new guerrillas, although fighting for democracy and national independence, don't get much help from their natural allies, the democratic countries.

Finally: the double standard is the rule. We read, for instance, that, even when a foreign power is supporting a pro-communist insurrection—as in El Salvador—the underlying problems remain domestic. That may be true. But it is equally true—though less said—that Angola's and Nicaragua's underlying problems are domestic problems too—starvation and oppression. Why should resistance to communist tyranny, exploitation and occupation be less respectable than the struggle against archaic social structures? ●

HOW MANY IMPORTED CARS?

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, even though we are now experiencing an increasingly robust economic recovery—a recovery characterized by particularly dramatic turn arounds in the auto and housing industries—protectionist sentiment remains widespread. It is not surprisingly most prominent in those industries which, at once, have suffered most severely as a result of the recession and the structural changes now taking place in the economy, and which have the most political clout.

Perhaps the most dangerous example of protectionism is the domestic content legislation currently making its way through the House. No matter that American consumers, in many instances, prefer imported cars for reasons of price and quality; no matter that U.S. automakers have been largely responsible for their own problems; no matter that domestic content would significantly reduce the very competitive pressures responsible for the recent improvements in the U.S. auto industry. If this legislation were enacted, car prices would go up, as would autoworker wages. The result? The American consumer would suffer, and the U.S. auto industry would

become less competitive in an international sense.

International economic relationships are often difficult, particularly when one industry or sector seems to bear a disproportionate share of competitive pressures. Nevertheless, it is competition which assures that the economy operates efficiently; to the degree that competition is artificially reduced, the aggregate economic well-being of the American people is reduced as well.

I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a most perceptive editorial which recently appeared in the Washington Post.

HOW MANY IMPORTED CARS?

Japan's government has now served notice that it wants to end the quota that limits its exports of automobiles to the United States. The reaction from Congress is likely to be a roar of indignation. But the question for congressmen to ask is why the American automobile manufacturers, after a third year of these quotas, would still need protection from Japanese competition.

The present quota will expire next spring—not only in an election year, but in a year when the United Auto Workers will renegotiate their wage contracts. The Japanese are now the only effective competitors of the American producers, and a tight lid on Japanese imports is an invitation to a substantial wage boost to be passed through to the consumer in higher prices. Labor compensation in the auto factories, counting the fringe benefits, is already close to twice the average for all American manufacturing.

The recent troubles of the auto makers have been profound and by no means all of their own making. The tens of thousands of unemployed auto workers deserve special sympathy. But it's not easy to show that the past two-plus years of quotas have actually helped them much. By holding down the numbers of cars that the Japanese could ship, the quotas have probably speeded up the Japanese companies' shift from the lower end of the market into the much more profitable middle. The quotas have held down the Japanese manufacturers' volume, but not their revenues.

With the economic recovery that is now gathering force, automobile sales are rising rapidly. The time to peel off the quotas is when the market is expanding and employment is stable. Perhaps there is a case for doing it in stages, over a couple of years, to avoid a sudden great surge of imports. In principle that's a slightly dubious expedient, but in practice it offers the industry a measure of reassurance and would perhaps keep the issue of automobile protectionism out of the presidential campaign.

The one thing that you can say for these year-to-year quotas is that they are certainly preferable to permanent protectionist legislation like the domestic content bill, which would require nearly every car sold in this country to be, in some proportion, manufactured here. Although that bill is not very likely to be passed by Congress, and even less likely to be signed by President Reagan, it is a genuine menace. Temporary quotas, expanding over time, would not be an intolerable price to pay for diminished pressure to enact a far more damaging alternative. But the goal that best serves the American economy and American consumers is a return to an unrestricted market.●

YEAR OF THE BIBLE PROCLAIMED IN GEORGIA

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the State of Georgia has proclaimed the "Year of the Bible" in accordance with Senate Joint Resolution 165 as signed into law by the President as Public Law 97-280. The proclamation was made on May 9, 1983, and, in my view, is one to be emulated. Therefore, I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point.

YEAR OF THE BIBLE

Whereas, the Bible is one of the most fundamental and enduring influences that has shaped the history and character of our state and nation; and

Whereas, deep religious beliefs stemming from the Old and New Testaments of the Bible inspired many of the early settlers of our country, providing them with the strength, character, convictions and faith necessary to withstand great hardship; and

Whereas, the Bible and its teachings helped form the basis for the Founding Fathers' abiding belief in the inalienable rights of the individual, as well as the ideals set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution; and

Whereas, the history of our nation clearly illustrates the value of voluntarily applying the teachings of the Scriptures in the lives of individuals and families; and

Whereas, in times of trouble, our state and nation have found strength to sustain the purpose and promise of America through a reaffirmation of our spiritual heritage; and

Whereas, one of the greatest challenges in America today is to renew our commitment to the spiritual values which have made our nation great; now

Therefore, I, Joe Frank Harris, Governor of the State of Georgia, do hereby proclaim 1983 as the "YEAR OF THE BIBLE" in Georgia, and urge all our citizens to rediscover the priceless and timeless message of the Bible.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the Executive Department to be affixed. This 9th day of May, 1983.●

NUCLEAR FACTS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I submit for my colleagues edification the following article by David Carsen, an engineer who worked on the Manhattan Project from 1943-45 and now lives in my district in New York. By his own admission, he now devotes his time to writing in the hope that "we don't blow ourselves up".

FACTS BEHIND NUKE MYTHS

(By David Carsen)

It all began with a big bang, about 15 billion years ago.

This is how astrophysicists theorize that the universe, with its billions of galaxies, came into being. Today's nuclear physicists—of Nobel laureate stature—are warning us that if the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union continue their military policies, our tiny part of this universe could be destroyed soon. It will end as it all began: With a big bang.

The mushroom cloud bids well to replace the Stars and Stripes, the Hammer and Sickle, the Sign of the Cross and all other signs of man's attempts, however flawed, to build a rational society.

Unlike the Catholic bishops of the U.S., who have said "No" to the immorality and depravity of nuclear weapons and nuclear war, Ronald Reagan and Yuri Andropov continue to play the game of crisis diplomacy.

To convince their respective peoples that their goal is peace while preparing for nuclear war, they have resorted to a new form of specious language that is frighteningly like the "Newspeak" in George Orwell's prophetic novel "1984." (Newspeak is the language that uses psychologically motivating words to distort or eliminate meaning as we would understand it; e.g., naming the MX missile "Peacekeeper".)

In addition to deceptive rhetoric, a nuclear mythology has been created. One is tempted to label these imaginative efforts "Nukespeak" or perhaps "Nukethink." Some recent happenings:

Not long ago, a group of private Soviet citizens, believing the public statements of their government, organized an unofficial "Committee to Establish Trust Between the USSR and the USA." Before their dispersal, arrest and punishment, they were denounced as "criminals." Their desire for peace was called "an act of provocation of Western Secret Services."

This, of course, closely parallels President Reagan's accusation that there was "plenty of evidence" that the American peace movement was infiltrated by "foreign agents." Being an activist for peace is equated, in either country, with being unpatriotic and subliminally, a foreign agent. How simple, how neat, how Orwellian.

History has left the Soviet Union with a permanent legacy of paranoia. This, coupled with its brutal repression of any expression deemed "anti-Soviet" (read pro-democratic), makes it a very difficult companion on the path to peace. But the Paranoia has varied with the temper of the times and the quality of leadership.

Meanwhile, in Washington, the myths proliferate. The major ones follow; the excerpts labeled "Fact" are reprinted, by permission of The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, from a March article by Frank Von Hippel, senior research physicist at Princeton University and chairman of the Federation of American Scientists.

MYTH 1: THE SOVIETS HAVE STRATEGIC SUPERIORITY

This myth plays upon the fear that the U.S. has fallen behind in the ability to match the Soviets' destructive capacity.

Fact: "The decline in the megatonnage of the U.S. strategic arsenal between 1966 and 1981 did not occur because of attrition or neglect. It was a by-product of repeated cycles of modernization. Perhaps the most important change has been the replacement

of most of the U.S. ballistic missiles, which carried a single warhead, by missiles with accurate multiple-warheads.

"The average equivalent megatonnage of U.S. strategic warheads is still about seven times that of the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima."

Simply stated, our arsenal is so far in the region of "overkill" that we have enough to destroy the Soviet Union to the point where we can even make "the rubble bounce."

MYTH 2: THE U.S. NUCLEAR DETERRENT HAS BECOME DOUBTFUL

This myth deals with the "window of vulnerability" and states categorically that the Soviet Union could, in the first strike, destroy 80 to 90 percent of our ICBMs. This has been popularized by President Reagan; Caspar Weinberger; the Committee on the Present Danger, an elite, ultra-conservative organization dedicated to maintaining a cold war posture vis-a-vis the Soviet Union; Edward Teller, a scientist of renown and a director of that committee; and fundamentalist Jerry Falwell, who speaks for the mathematically deluded Moral Majority.

Fact: "Each of the three legs of the U.S. strategic triad is designed so that it could, by itself, destroy the Soviet Union. More than 14 U.S. ballistic-missile submarines are always at sea (where they are generally agreed to be invulnerable). These submarines carry about 2,500 warheads, each with two or four times the equivalent megatonnage of the Hiroshima bomb. And the 30 percent of the U.S. bomber force, which is prepared to take off immediately on warning of missile attack, carries about 400 one-megaton bombs, plus a similar number of short-range nuclear attack missiles."

In addition, several hundred carrier-based fighter bombers are dispersed around the periphery of the Soviet Union. This should be deterrent enough against any Soviet first strike, except, possibly, to a certified lunatic.

MYTH 3: DEFENSIVE NUCLEAR WEAPONS CAN PROTECT US

This myth was presented by President Reagan in his now famous "Star Wars" speech. Here we enter a never-never land of science and fiction, in which lasers, particle beams and nuclear missiles stationed in space will protect us. To achieve any part of this defense system would take decades—and astronomical costs which will impoverish us all—if we even attempt it.

Fact: "In any case, defense of the entire nation, or even its major cities, against nuclear attack would be enormously more difficult than defending hard missile silos. Silo defense requires only having a moderate confidence of preventing up to a few nuclear warheads from coming close to a silo for long enough to allow launch of its missile. In contrast, city defense requires almost perfect success for the entire duration of the war in keeping thousands of hostile nuclear warheads miles away from targets which themselves cover tens of thousands of square miles."

MYTH 4: YOU CAN'T NEGOTIATE WITH THE RUSSIANS

Of all the myths, this contains an element of truth, depending on who does the negotiating.

Fact: "The arms control negotiations during the past 25 years have not been entirely fruitless. They included the Limited Test Ban Treaty; The Non-Proliferation Treaty; the ABM Treaty; and the Salt II Treaty. (The last treaty has been ratified by

the Soviet Union but not by the U.S. Senate.)"

What say you then, President Reagan and President Andropov? Will you change the arms control scam to an arms control plan? Will all our unfinished cathedrals end in a single burning? Or will you decide that man is not for burning? ●

THE MORAL NECESSITY OF DEFENSE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress have heard a great deal about the immorality of atomic weapons, we have heard a great deal about "beating our swords into plowshares," we have heard a great many Christian leaders speak of the evils of war. Today I would like to present another interpretation of the Bible which speaks to the morality of our defense and the moral necessity for weapons of war.

The Reverend John E. Boyles, a minister at the National Presbyterian Church, in 1982, here in Washington, presented this latter view in his sermon, a copy of which he was kind enough to send to me. What follows is a brief review of some of Reverend Boyles' thoughts and interpretations of the scriptures so often quoted during debate on military matters.

We are all familiar with the verse from Isaiah calling upon us to beat our swords into plowshares, our spears into pruning hooks and "not know war anymore." But how many of us know a verse from Joel 3: 10: "Beat your plowshares into swords and your pruning hooks into spears"? Isaiah is calling upon the forces of good and morality to arm in order to defend themselves and protect their homeland against attack by forces that seek only their destruction.

"Those who say that swords being beaten into plowshares means that we should abolish all nuclear weapons, or all force of arms are misusing the vision of the text, for peace is also maintained, particularly today, by the deterrent effect of retaliation whether by armies and arms, or by economic sanctions. Evil is being resisted before it can act," Reverend Boyles tell us.

Another verse that is often misinterpreted, according to Reverend Boyles, is in the New Testament when Jesus tells us to "turn the other cheek" to our enemies. Jesus' words have been misinterpreted here to mean "passive resistance or cowardly yielding to evil," and such interpretations of scripture "are parodies of his teachings," he says.

When Jesus said "turn the other cheek," he was telling us to stand firm for values, for convictions, for faith.

He is most certainly not talking about standing defenseless and letting our enemies destroy us, such an act would be tantamount to acceptance of wrong.

Not to defend is to condone. Would Jesus condone the immoral, lawless, senseless taking of your sacred life?

Jesus does not tell us to accept or be lenient or tolerate totalitarianism. There can be no complicity with an evil act, which is what we would be doing if we did not defend ourselves and our homes and those we love. Jesus is telling us to defend and protect.

This is part of the thrust of the passage from the Old Testament, from Joel—a time to beat plowshares into swords to save the world from injustice, to defend against oppression.

Our weapons exist for deterrence which is "not coercion, it is defense. It doesn't force an opponent to do something, it forces him to refrain." Deterrence has prevented war for the past 37 years, even with nuclear weapons.

It should be remembered that had Britain followed a policy of deterrence Hitler would never have brought war to Europe and the rest of the world in 1939. We must not make the same failure again today.

"We cannot turn the nuclear knowledge clock back now," Reverend Boyles counsels, "we can only control it and not panic and tremble before it. For if we do not control it then madmen will. Would you want only totalitarians and terrorists to have use of the world's most destructive force? Our anxiety is, I am afraid, the price we must pay for our freedom."

The father of an infant son and a 2-year-old boy, Reverend Boyles understands those who fear for their children's well-being in a world where peace depends upon nuclear deterrence but says:

If I believed that nuclear weapons could be removed from this planet I would work toward that end, for the sake of my sons and other's children. But the reality is that we have eaten of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The whisper of the serpent is real, and it still whispers today. Cain may slay Abel again and all swords will not become plowshares even as we pray that all wars will cease.

But our faith is intact, and can be more real to us than our fears. Our fear and anxiety are the price we pay for our freedom, and we must live with their reality while never, never, selling our souls.

Once again I thank Reverend Boyles for forwarding to me this fine sermon. I hope that the Members will carefully consider his words.

FEAR NOT

(Sermon preached by the Reverend John Boyles, August 15, 1982, at the services of the National Presbyterian Church)

SCRIPTURE LESSONS

"When a man causes a disfigurement in his neighbor, as he has done it shall be done to him, fracture for fracture, eye for eye, tooth for tooth * * *"—Leviticus 24: 19-20.

"Beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruning hooks into spears * * *"—Joel 3: 10.

"You have heard that it was said, 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth' But I say to you, Do not resist one who is evil. But if any one strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also; and if any one would sue you and take your coat, let him have your cloak as well; and if any one forces you to go one mile, go with him two miles. Give to him who begs from you, and do not refuse him who would borrow from you. 'You have heard that it was said, 'You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.' But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you,"—Matthew 5: 38-44.

"On that day, when evening had come, he said to them, 'Let us go across to the other side.' And leaving the crowd, they took him with them, just as he was, in the boat. And other boats were with him. And a great storm of wind arose, and the waves beat into the boat, so that the boat was already filling. But he was in the stern, asleep on the cushion; and they woke him and said to him, 'Teacher, do you not care if we perish?' And he awoke and rebuked the wind, and said to the sea, 'Peace! Be still!' And the wind ceased, and there was a great calm. He said to them, 'Why are you afraid? Have you no faith?' And they were filled with awe, and said to one another, 'Who then is this, that even wind and sea obey him?'—Mark 4: 35-41.

The age-old question of violence and a Christian response to it—and the question, then, of who is friend and who is enemy—who is brother and sister, and who is not.

Recall the first two brothers—Abel and Cain. Cain rose up against Abel and killed him, and God looked for Abel, and Cain answered, "I do not know, am I my brother's keeper?"

Surely, one of the most chilling phrases of all time:

"Am I my brother's keeper?"

And an even more chilling response from God:

"What have you done? Your brother's blood is crying to me from the ground!"

And so Cain, like Adam and Eve, is driven away, to be a fugitive and wanderer on the earth, and to bear a mark so that he would not be subject to being slain. God says, "If anyone slays Cain, vengeance shall be put on him sevenfold."

Sevenfold vengeance. But this was vengeance in the Old Testament—God's vengeance. It was an ancient form of blood vengeance and revenge.

Excessive blood feuds of warring tribes and the revenge of killing for lesser crimes was the pattern of life before Old Testament times. "An eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth" may seem barbaric, but it was really an ethical advance from the days when a man would automatically be killed, and perhaps his family, too, for stealing a single goat.

Even the Old Testament reflects some of this. For example, Exodus 21 says that whoever strikes or curses his father or mother shall be put to death. It says if a man steals an ox or a sheep, he shall pay restitution: 5 oxen for an ox and 4 sheep for a sheep, but if he has nothing, then he will be sold to pay for his theft.

These appear excessive punishments, but basically, the ideas of "eye for eye, tooth for tooth" were an attempt by the Hebrew judges to establish a better, more uniform code of criminal justice. Leviticus 24 defines it this way:

He who kills a man shall be put to death. He who kills a beast shall make it good, life for life. When a man causes a disfigurement on his neighbor, as he has done, it shall be done to him, fracture for fracture, eye for eye, tooth for tooth; as he has disfigured a man, he shall be disfigured.

So now comes Jesus with a response to "eye for eye, tooth for tooth" which has proved most troubling for people focused to live in the real, urban, practical world of modern life, in modern cities, in Washington, D.C., in a world where nuclear warheads threaten all of us with retribution.

Jesus says: "Do not resist one who is evil. But if any strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also, and if anyone sues you for your jacket, let him have your overcoat as well, go the second mile . . ." and so on.

Well, as always, we read what we want to read in the Bible, making it so "heavenly" it is of no earthly good, or else reading a particular verse out of context and living it to death by an excessive literalism.

Let's look at "turning the other cheek." (Matt. 5: 39). But let's remember first that Jesus was, in Matthew's gospel, fulfilling the Law of Moses. Just 20 verses earlier, Jesus introduced his remarks by saying:

"Don't suppose I came to abolish the law or prophets; I did not come to abolish but to fulfill."

It is important to understand that context and its spirit. Remember too that the first part of Chapter 5 is the Beatitudes, one part of which is "blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth"—not a statement meant literally but as an indication of an ethic of humility and service to others. This is important to remember.

So back to turning the other cheek. Jesus here is continuing his comments on humility and the duties of man under law. He is giving an added spiritual dimension to the Mosaic law, the code of Hammurabi, and the Roman law. He is not abrogating them but fulfilling them.

If a fight is about to start on a playground, what is the first rule of the jungle gym? "Lead with your right." And, in this right-handed world (apologies to you lefties) the right hand, or fist, usually leads. And in face-to-face combat then, where does a right-handed punch land? On the right cheek? No—on the left.

So what is Jesus talking about here? He is talking about someone giving the back of their right-hand as an insult, a direct challenge, as in the movies, "Sir, I challenge you to a duel" and a slap of the gloves to the cheek.

The back of the right-hand was the insult, and the right hand was then ready for the first real blow, a punch to the left cheek.

The meaning here is not literal, but metaphorical: absorb the insults and the hatred. It is clearly not meant as a literal turn-your-cheek, or your back, to an attacker.

Similarly, in the next verse "If any one would sue you and take your coat, let him have your cloak as well."

The coat is the tunic or jacket, in a sense, like our modern sweater or sport jacket. The cloak was the outer garment. To give it up would mean real suffering for it was a blanket by night as well as garment by day. Again, and especially in any legal sense, Jesus was not expecting anyone to give up their blanket—a necessity for survival in the ancient Near East.

The next verse "going the second mile" refers to the Roman Army's use of conscripting the conquered people of Judea and

Galilee to carry their armor and supplies or mail for certain given distance, usually a mile.

So what we see here is Jesus' clear message of metaphor—examples he could not demand in a literal sense but one his listeners could understand, just as they understood his parables, which were not literal.

We are always looking for cheap grace and easy answers. Looking for the easy verse of scripture, rather than the tough job of understanding an entire chapter, or a book, or the Bible as a whole, in its message of salvation, in its total revelation for our lives.

After all, how do we interpret the verse just five chapters later in Matthew 10: 34? "I come not to bring peace, but a sword." Well, that's another metaphor. Jesus is talking there about what happens when people truly follow him and may have to leave even family aside to do that, causing strife. He is talking about standing firm for values, for convictions, for faith.

You see, Jesus is Lord and Master and Teacher. He is not simple and naive. Oh, sometimes, we'd like to have him that way. It would give us the simple way out, the way out on not following him by knowing him and hearing his words.

Jesus here in talking about turning the other cheek, is not talking about passive resistance or cowardly yielding to evil. Those are parodies of his teaching.

Jesus is Lord of all life. He is sent of God the Father, Creator Redeemer, Sustainer of life itself. Can you believe that the Lord of all life wants you to give up your own life for no reason?

Some Christians seem to believe this. I do not. He is saying, "Love your enemies, but don't let them destroy you." Love, you see, is not acceptance of wrong. Not to defend is to condone. Would Jesus condone the immoral, lawless, senseless, taking of your sacred life? That is not the Lord I know.

I love the Lord who loves me, walks with me, sustains me, who loves my life, my basic biological human frail life of flesh and blood—he does not will that it depart from us for no reason.

Love of enemy and neighbor does not mean leniency or license or tolerating totalitarianism. There can be no complicity with an evil act which is what we would be doing if we did not defend ourselves and our homes and those we love.

Jesus is talking about loving enemies, by not letting them be destructive, of us and of themselves. Can you imagine Jesus saying, like a modern hip psychologist would: "Go ahead, kid, work out your anti-social criminal impulses, go destroy a few people's lives and your own psyche, then come back for a consultation?" Not my Lord.

Jesus cleanses us of hatred and revenge. Jesus would prevent crimes of violence by rooting out elements in character which make someone kill: can you imagine on the road to Jericho if Jesus had come along before the man was beaten. Do you believe the Son of God who came to save man would not have intervened to help save that helpless man from a bloody beating or from a senseless death? Also, we should note that Jesus used violence for ethical purpose, as he did when he threw the moneychangers out of the Temple.

Jesus again, was not naive, not blind to evil. He met with the Devil and discoursed with him, met him directly and defeated him. He resisted.

Jesus is Lord of life itself and wants you to live—"for the Son of man came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them."

Live life fully, do good, love neighbors and enemies, but resist evil and death—and protect your God-given, sacred, and precious life.

Defend and protect.

This is part of the thrust of the passage from the Old Testament, from Joel—a time to beat plowshares into swords, to save the world from injustice, to defend against oppression.

Many of you will now ask whether you have heard Joel correctly—for aren't we all accustomed to the words of Isaiah—the very opposite words of beating swords into plowshares?

Well, you might wish to ask yourself who is always quoting Isaiah selectively, and to what end they wish you to believe this is the total message of biblical revelation.

Let me tell you more about this little quoted message from Joel.

The passage is about the Israelite exiles being restored, and the pagan nations are judged harshly for their cruelties to God's people. The pagans are here assembled for the final battle with the host of heaven. And God and his angels will execute judgment on the heathen as the sun and moon and stars darken and the heavens and the earth shake.

Joel's message here is one in which judgment is rendered against those who have sinned against humanity, and against God. Here in Chapter 3 all the nations of the earth are summoned to be judged by God as they are in Matthew 25: 31-46 when the Son of Man comes in his glory to separate them as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats.

So here in Joel we see judgment by force of arms, just as in Isaiah we see universal longing to convert weapons into tools, swords into plowshares. But if Isaiah can be cited as a text for disarmament, then Joel can be cited as a text to bear arms, to resist evil in the world.

Both Isaiah and Joel are prophets, and they write about the same time: in the late period of Israel's exile or just after, four or five hundred years before Christ. Their hope is similar in a way—the restoration of Israel in peace, the judgment of its enemies, the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and an era of peace under God's rule.

But one must be careful about how we use passages like these, especially if we are using them to support our own earthly ideologies and beliefs.

Together they suggest that we should strive for both peace and justice but they are also not an exact literal plan for peace or for war. Those who say that plowshares being beaten into swords means we should abolish all nuclear weapons, or all force of arms, are misusing the vision of the text, for peace is also maintained, particularly today, by the deterrent effect of retaliation whether by armies and arms, or by economic sanctions. Evil is being resisted, before it can act.

We should also note that today, these Old Testament passages are the scriptures of a nation that is descended from those who first experienced them and wrote them down, and they now refer to them as they wage their current war in Lebanon against the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Going back three thousand years ago, we should note that the Israelites had so little metal that plowshares were literally beaten into swords, and vice versa.

You can read in I Samuel 13 how the Israelites had so little talent for metallurgy that they had to go to the Philistines to have their plowshares sharpened.

You might also recall the crude way in which David slew a Philistine at that time—not with a sword but with a slingshot.

That same battle, based on the same scriptures and a belief in them, is still very real in the mideast. The same ancient issues, the same animosities, the same enemies still battle today.

For Goliath was a Philistine, and the modern-day descendants of the Philistines are the Palestinians, it is the same word. The Star of David is still lashing out against an ancient people who claim the same land, and we should consider how ironic it must seem to the Palestine Liberation Organization to speak of the Camp David accords.

War and peace in the middle east—the source of the Star of David and the Star of Bethlehem and Prince of Peace yearned for by the same Isaiah who had a vision of swords becoming plowshares. The middle east—a place of volatile passions that could result in a literal Armageddon.

We all fear war there—that it might broaden and drag in other nations, even ours. We fear war there also over oil. We see how small lands, even islands, can embroil both dictatorships and democracies, in strife. We all are weary of war, and fearful of death, and yet what is the answer for a Christian?

We must examine the reality of our fears. Look at some simple ones. We fear disease, and yet drunken drivers kill 86 times more people than polio killed in its worst years, and these same drivers kill more people than violent crime does. We fear flying but driving home from the airport is more dangerous. Nuclear power plants have killed no one but cigarettes kill one-third of a million people per year.

Some of these fears are real, but some are not. And what we should understand is that there are those who are playing upon the natural fears we all have, either because they have other goals or because they don't understand the issues.

Many of you are fearful of the weapons of war stockpiled by the U.S. and by the U.S.S.R. and one widely quoted idea leading to fear of nuclear war is that there is a single nuclear "button" which could be pushed by a single maddened General or President. Some think this is a button on the President's desk. Some think a military aide carries it as he follows the President around.

This button is a myth. There is no button. What is the truth then? The truth is that there are a series of codes and radio communication equipment carried around. The truth is that no single crazed person could get this country into a nuclear war, there are too many safeguards, involving authorization from many high officials. Yet, why does talk persist in the news media of a nuclear "button"?

Perhaps there are those who are trying to make you afraid. Consider all the television programs of the last year; the documentaries about specific cities such as San Francisco, Detroit, or Washington and what happens to them in graphic and gory detail under nuclear attack in 1982 or 1984 or 1990.

But where is the documentary which asks about the atomic bomb being dropped over London in 1944, over Moscow in 1949, or over Denver in 1958, or over Washington in 1972? You say, "there were no bombings then."

Precisely. Correct. And we have had 37 years, while possessing nuclear weapons, in which they have not been used and during which they have deterred war.

We hear much about the "immorality" of nuclear weapons. But where do we hear of their morality, and of the aggressive actions they deter. And are conventional weapons then to be considered "immoral" too, or are they "moral"?

Some suggest merely having nuclear weapons is immoral. But nuclear deterrence is conditional, not coercive. It is not the same as a loaded gun held by a criminal as he robs a bank. Rather, it says to a foreign power: if you do "X" (attack us), we will do "Z" (destroy you). This is therefore no coercion, it is defense. This doesn't force an opponent to do something—it forces him to refrain.

Indeed, it should be asked of some why, if the United States is to be portrayed as an aggressive, immoral power, a Dr. Strange-love figure, why a bomb was never dropped on Moscow when only America had the bomb, or why it has not been used in the last thirty-seven years elsewhere?

Recall the conditions under which the bomb was developed. The technical knowledge and groundwork were there in the 1930's. Nazi Germany, under Hitler, was developing atomic weaponry. Does anyone here doubt that Hitler would have used the bomb for world domination, or, in a final and fiery *Götterdämmerung* have immolated himself and Berlin and the advancing Allied troops in an atomic funeral pyre? This was a man who, in the 1930's said "Wir wollen Frieden haben"—"we want peace" as one of his slogans.

Hitler was a totalitarian dictator bent on world domination. So is the Soviet Politburo, a dictatorship of fourteen old men who rule not only Russia but subject peoples from the Arctic Circle to the Middle East, from European Germany to Asian Mongolia.

I have seen this totalitarian empire over the years; first in the grim reality of the bullet-pocked Berlin Wall in 1966, the first time a power has had to contain its own peoples from leaving, and then in Prague city square in 1969, viewing the bullet holes in walls where the brave rebellion of 1968 had been brutally repressed by Russian troops and tanks. And now, this year, having seen and felt the total oppression of the Soviet Union in a trip there in May and June, an oppression in which so many millions have already died that the remaining millions understand that any resistance is futile. And many do flee; soccer spectators from Poland, tennis players from Czechoslovakia, dancers from Moscow, voting with their feet.

How hard it is then, to hear today voices that counsel literal nuclear disarmament out of fear and panic, and the willingness of some to capitulate to Soviet might out of fear of a nuclear holocaust. "Better red than dead" is the reworded slogan. But you should know that that would probably mean both red and dead. You need only ask the Afghan peasants that. Or the workers of Solidarity who know what will happen if Russian troops should replace Polish troops in the streets of Warsaw. Nuclear disarmament: at what price to our souls, and the souls of those whom we defend?

Are we to be driven by fear?

There is certainly reason to fear, and Jonathan Schell's book *The Fate of the Earth* is a sobering and fearful book. For his argument is persuasive that, in a nuclear exchange between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., the two nations would be completely destroyed. But beyond that that the entire world would be destroyed—by radiation and

fallout, by fires and blinding, by pollution and global epidemic and poisoning—and life on earth would cease.

At the root of this potential destruction, Schell points out, is not a bad thing but, amazingly enough, a good thing. Man's scientific knowledge, which has so enriched us all, is also the source of atomic power. Man has eaten of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Man has tasted of the most elemental of God's power, those forces which hold matter and energy together.

Once tasted, they are released forever, we know the knowledge of the nucleus is there. We cannot turn the nuclear knowledge clock back now. We can only control it and not panic and tremble before it.

For, if we do not control it, then madmen will. Would you want only totalitarians and terrorists to have use of the world's most destructive force?

Our anxiety is, I am afraid, the price we must pay for our freedom. We should offer it willingly. Recall those millions of American men who, in this century gave their lives in Flanders field and trenches in France, at Anzio and on Iwo Jima, in the cold winters of Korea and the steaming jungles of Vietnam. It does not justify a particular war or cause to say that the death of these men was noble for it was more than noble. For, in dying, they said that there was a higher value than life itself, a more supreme dignity than their existence as individuals. The idea of sacrifice as the highest ideal is seen most centrally in Jesus' saving death.

Because of the possible sacrifice of human life in nuclear war, we are, as human beings, perhaps now even more aware of the miracle of life, and of birth. Knowing all life can be extinguished, we know even more clearly how sacred life is—"For unto us a child is born" and how heaven still rejoices.

My wife and I have been blessed, just three weeks ago, with the birth of a baby, Christopher. We have another son, Jay, who is two and a half. These are not rag-doll babies, but flesh and blood boys, precious little human lives, with wills of their own, and personalities too.

If I believed that their survival, and their future fullness as free human beings, would be insured by disarming the nuclear weapons of this country, I would work toward that end. If I believed that all weapons of war could be removed from this planet, I would work toward that end, for the sake of my sons and others' children.

But the reality is that we have eaten of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The whisper of the serpent is real, and it still whispers today. Cain may slay Abel again and all swords will not become plowshares, even as we pray that all wars will cease.

But our faith is intact, and can be more real to us than our fears. Our fear and anxiety are the price we pay for our freedom, and we must live with their reality while never, never, selling our souls for them.

The poet John Donne wrote:

Eternal and most glorious God, suffer me not so to undervalue myself as to give away my soul, Thy soul, Thy dear and precious soul, for nothing; and all the world is nothing, if the soul must be given for it.

Preserve therefore, my soul, O Lord, because it belongs to Thee, and preserve my body because it belongs to my soul.

And then in words reminiscent of Jesus on that turbulent Sea of Galilee, Donne prays:

Thou alone dost steer my boat through all its voyage, but hast a more especial care of

it, when it comes to a narrow current, or to a dangerous fall of waters.

Thou hast a care of the preservation of my body in all the ways of my life; but, in the straits of death, open Thine eyes wider, and enlarge Thy Providence towards me so far that no illness or agony may shake and benumb the soul.

"Don't be afraid" said our Lord to his wavering disciples on that turbulent sea.

"Fear not" said an angel, "I bring you good tidings."

You do not have to fear, in the face of illness, agony, or even death. For as Dylan Thomas has written, death has "no dominion."

AND DEATH SHALL HAVE NO DOMINION

And death shall have no dominion.

Dead men naked they shall be one
With the man in the wind and the west
moon;

When their bones are picked clean and the
clean bones gone,

They shall have stars at elbow and foot;
Though they go mad they shall be sane,
Though they sink through the sea they
shall rise again;

Though lovers be lost love shall not;
And death shall have no dominion.

And death shall have no dominion.
No more may gulls cry at their ears
Or waves break loud on the seashores;

Where blew a flower may a flower no more
Lift its head to the blows of the rain;
Though they be mad and dead as nails,
Head of the characters hammer through
daisies;

Break in the sun till the sun breaks down,
And death shall have no dominion.●

A TRIBUTE TO ELTON B. STEPHENS

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity and pay tribute to an outstanding businessman of the great State of Alabama, Mr. Elton B. Stephens.

Elton is chairman of the board and founder of EBSCO Industries in Birmingham, Ala. His wonderful success is the story of the American dream of hard work and dedication. And even though he has reached a pinnacle of achievement in the business world, Elton has not forgotten the people who assisted him along the way to the top.

It is with the greatest honor that I share some insight about Elton B. Stephens with my colleagues in the House of Representatives. Following is part of an article written by Elma Bell of the Birmingham News staff about Elton's new offices:

The new international headquarters building of EBSCO Industries, Inc. is a sophisticated, dramatic structure of glass and wood clinging to the side of a mountain off U.S. 280.

Hung on walls throughout the enormous building are prints and paintings of ancient street peddlers. It is Elton B. Stephens' way of acknowledging that this giant conglomer-

ate he founded and serves as board chairman grew from his own days as a street peddler.

"I put myself through college at Birmingham-Southern and then at the University of Alabama Law School selling magazines door to door," Stephens says.

After he got his law degree, he decided to keep on selling magazines.

"When I graduated, lawyers were making \$65 a month," he says. "I was saving \$100 a month from what I made selling magazines."

That was in 1936. Today, EBSCO Industries, Inc. prints 75 national magazines, is the world's largest manufacturer of fishing lures, and operates the world's largest subscription agency.

"And we still sell magazines door to door," Stephens says.

A partial list of the other things EBSCO does is manufacture carpet, office furniture, pool tables, steel building joists, display cases and loose-leaf binders. It has offices all over the United States and in Canada, Australia, Brazil and the Netherlands.

"We knew what we wanted and they worked with us," Stephens says. "The building is really the product of the imagination of my son, J. T. Stephens, who is president and chief executive officer of EBSCO."

The building overlooks 10,100 acres of forest, studded with an occasional lake and rimmed with mountains.

"We own 160 acres. The view is courtesy of Oak Mountain State Park, which covers the rest of the acreage," Stephens says.

The building is positioned to take advantage of the breathtaking view.

"We hung it right on the corner of the mountain," Stephens happily points out.

The result is that many of the interior spaces have interesting angular shapes, including Stephens' office. Its two largest walls are glass.

"For 17 years, I had an office without a window so I thought I would make up for that in this office," he says. "The sunset seen from here is one of the most beautiful things you could imagine."

"That's the company my wife Alys and I formed first," he says. It still supplies recreational products to the armed services.

He points out the office of Elton B. Stephens Jr., vice president and general manager of one of EBSCO's newer companies, EBSCO Realty.

And, finally, Stephens shows the computer room, where row after row of gleaming machines contain information about the 160,000 titles in EBSCO's subscription service. One wall holds a map of the world, surrounded with clocks giving the time in Birmingham and all the major cities throughout the world where EBSCO does business.

"If a large library, such as the Library of Congress in Washington, wanted to subscribe to everything published in the world in any language in the world, this operation makes it possible for it to order it all on one purchase order and receive one invoice and pay with one check," Stephens says.

Impressed as he admits he is with such scientific equipment, Stephens doesn't see it as EBSCO's greatest asset.

"That title goes to our employees," he says. "They are the finest in the world."

Elton B. Stephens is a giant among men when it comes to corporate contributions to his community. In an effort to encourage corporate giving to charities, Elton started the Alabama 5 Percent Club. To become a member, a

business must pledge 5 percent of its earnings before taxes, to the charities of its choice.

So far, 42 companies have joined. For those who wish to give more or less than 5 percent, he has established the 10 and 2 Percent Clubs.

Elton explains his views or recognizing corporate responsibility in the following way:

I think corporate responsibility issues a challenge to the business community to support, not only the educational institutions and the health institutions, but the arts as well. We have a responsibility to the community in which we live to support and do things for that community that are not being done by political entities.

In my opinion, you can't go to the Federal Government for everything you want done. We have to face up to the fact that the Federal Government does not have any money. They have been operating on a deficit for years and we've got to figure out a way to support and run this country without the Federal Government.

One way to do this is for business to step forward and give a certain percent of the earnings they have to worthwhile agencies as well as educational institutions, the arts, etc. This would benefit their communities. In my opinion, that is what corporate responsibility is all about.

Elton's energy and devotion in civic and civic/business-related activities is quite admirable. Recently he has been involved chairing the Wastewater Facilities Development Committee, as requested by the Jefferson County Commission; serving on the board of trustees for the Birmingham Metropolitan YMCA; and serving on the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees for Birmingham-Southern College. His term as chairman of that committee has just ended.

Other organizations which have been served by his leadership include the Future Farmers of America, Red Cross, American Cancer Society, United Way, the Birmingham Festival of Arts, and the Alabama Development Office.

Recognized by his peers and rewarded for his untiring efforts to help his community, State, and Nation, Elton has received numerous awards and honors, among which are being listed in Who's Who in America, in the South and Southwest, in Alabama, in Commerce and Industry; being voted one of 100 Birmingham's Outstanding Citizens of the First 100 Years; having an expressway in Birmingham named after him; serving on staff as colonel under Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama; and being recognized for distinguished service in trusteeship nomination, association of governing boards of universities and colleges.

Elton and his lovely wife, Alys, have 4 children and 13 grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly honored to know a man such as Elton B. Stephens. He is a shining example of the backbone of this country's business community which has made America

such a great land of opportunity. Alabama and the city of Birmingham are extremely fortunate to have a man of his caliber on "their team."

All of us here in Congress should take a moment and reflect on his philosophy and business attitude. We need more men like Elton B. Stephens who have given so much of themselves in helping others. He knows the meaning of hard work and exemplifies the true idea of the American dream of success.

It is with the greatest pleasure that I share these words with my colleagues in the House of Representatives. Elton B. Stephens can never receive enough praises for all his work and time to so many worthy causes. He is a fine father, conscientious businessman and leader in his community. There is no doubt in my mind that this tribute is well deserved by this outstanding individual. ●

EGGS WOULD BE BROUGHT WITHIN PURVIEW OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT OF 1937

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce legislation which will bring eggs within the purview of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

Under the act, producers and handlers of certain commodities may voluntarily agree to establish programs within their industry which are designed to cure certain problems from which the industry may suffer. Most agricultural commodities are included within the act and the producers of these commodities may develop marketing orders. Eggs are specifically excluded from the act, and this legislation would merely provide the egg producers with the same opportunity most other commodity producers currently have to develop a marketing order to deal with the marketing problems in their industry.

Marketing orders, which are authorized under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, have made valuable contributions to the stability of many of our agricultural commodity markets. In addition to assuring orderly markets for both producers and consumers, marketing orders have provided for quality control assurance, research and promotion, and other market support activities.

It is quite clear that the egg industry should have the opportunity to consider this alternative. Our egg producers, particularly small and independent producers, are suffering through one of the most difficult periods in their

history. Because egg producers have had to sell their eggs at below the cost of production for an extended period, egg producers have gone out of business in record numbers. In less than 1½ years, ending in December 1982, the number of egg producers dropped from more than 6,000 to less than 4,000, a decrease of more than one-third.

Recently, one of the factors which has injured egg producers dramatically was a program implemented by the USDA, the grain PIK program. This program resulted in drastically higher grain costs, grain which egg producers must buy to feed their flocks.

The industry has recognized that it cannot control these factors which are artificially produced in the market system. The PIK program and the loss of export markets to foreign subsidized eggs has left the industry with grave problems which require the more organized structure of a marketing order.

This legislation will not implement a marketing order for the egg industry, nor will it require that the industry develop one, it will merely provide the industry the opportunity to consider whether it wants and needs the types of programs provided for under the act. If the industry does decide that a marketing order is required, the order will be developed by the industry in cooperation with the USDA and under the guidelines established by the USDA. The order must be approved by two-thirds of the domestic egg producers or those producers responsible for two-thirds of total eggs produced in the United States. It is important that we provide our egg producers with this opportunity to help themselves.

The egg industry has carefully considered the pros and cons of a marketing order for their industry. In early May of this year, an all-industry task force of egg producers urged that the industry support an amendment to include eggs in the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. This was an emergency task force that was appointed to deal with the economic crisis which gripped the industry.

After this task force recommendation, the United Egg Producers and its member cooperatives began to poll their membership on marketing orders. The four regional cooperatives, West Coast Egg Producers, Midwest Egg Producers, Northeast Egg Marketing Association, and the National Egg Co., cover the commercial egg production of the entire Nation. The producers in these cooperatives voted overwhelmingly for an amendment to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. Then, in a board meeting held last week, the board of directors of United Egg Producers voted to seek an amendment to the 1937 act to include eggs.

My amendment is very simple. It merely amends the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to remove the language that excludes eggs. I wish to note that it is the intent of my amendment to include in the act not only eggs, but also the hens that lay the eggs.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this legislation, which will cost the Government no money and which will not force the USDA to adopt any questionable program, will receive favorable consideration by Congress and the support of the administration. ●

ACID RAIN

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, throughout the country, environmental issues have become increasingly important. This concern for hazardous waste, our national parks, and clean water and air has been reflected in recent congressional action. The House voted to add \$220 million to the operating budget of the Environmental Protection Agency. This body has also approved several bills designating thousands of acres—in all parts of the country—as wilderness areas. There is one growing problem, however, that has not been addressed. The acid rain problem is an "environmental time bomb" ready to explode. The effects are widespread, devastating, and well documented.

Already, acid rain has made a significant impact on the environment. There is well-documented evidence supporting this assertion. I invite my colleagues to examine the facts:

Approximately 3,000 lakes and 25,000 miles of stream in the Northeast suffer from acid damage. Over 200 lakes in the Adirondacks are officially "dead";

Last December, "acid fog" at Corona del Mar, near Los Angeles, was found 100 times as bad as most acid rain;

According to the Office of Technology Assessment, rain falling in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Maine is now almost always acidic. The agency reported that acid rain has affected 9,400 out of 17,000 sensitive eastern lakes, and 51,000 out of 117,000 miles of sensitive streams; and

In Montana, Wyoming, and Arizona rain and snow are 2.5 to 5.0 times more acidic than normal.

And there's more, Mr. Speaker.

In my own State of Massachusetts, this quiet killer has made a significant impact on the environment. A recent study, conducted by researchers at the University of Massachusetts, tested

1,173 waterways throughout the State. The lakes, streams, and reservoirs tested compose one-quarter of all waters in Massachusetts—in Holyoke and Chicopee, as well as the Connecticut River and the Quabbin Reservoir.

The conclusions were disturbing. The 916 waterways surveyed were showing the effects of acid contamination. That is 80 percent of all the lakes, streams, and reservoirs tested, waters which have nearly lost their ability to neutralize the acid precipitation. In fact, scientists predict—if the acid rain problem continues much longer—these waterways may lose their ability to counteract additional acid deposits.

The effects of acid rain, as I have stated, are well documented. The causes of the problem have also been scientifically identified. The recent National Academy of Science report concluded that there is a direct relationship between SO₂ emissions—primarily from utility companies—and the overacidic rainfall throughout the country and Canada. The data is available and conclusive. It is time to defuse this potentially devastating "environmental time bomb."

On a more parochial note, let me take this opportunity to inform my colleagues of events to take place in Massachusetts. Next week is "Acid Rain Awareness Week." State officials, especially the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor, have taken a leadership role in this issue to work for an acceptable solution. Besides the traditional ceremonies, hundreds of volunteers will be honored for their work in collecting water samples for the University of Massachusetts study. Through their unselfish efforts, this extensive research project was conducted to document the effects of acid rain. This information will be invaluable not only to the scientific community, but to the policymakers trying to solve this environmental nightmare.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress must move forward and seriously address the problem of acid rain—before it is too late. ●

WILLIAM L. GREEN, JR.

HON. TIM VALENTINE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, for the better part of 13 years Bill Green has been serving the academic community of Duke University with great distinction.

His career has been marked by numerous and varied achievements. A graduate of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, he worked as a reporter and editor for newspapers in North Carolina before joining the

U.S. Government in the Foreign Service, the U.S. Information Agency, and NASA. Many of my colleagues may remember the all too brief period during which he served as ombudsman for the Washington Post.

Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Raleigh News and Observer outlines Bill Green's many accomplishments, and I would like to insert it in the RECORD.

The article follows:

DUKE UNIVERSITY'S MAN WITH A "THREE-HAT JOB"

(By Guy Munger)

DURHAM.—Bill Green came to his current "three-hat job" at Duke University by way of Zebulon and Bangladesh, with a couple of stopovers in the wonderland of Washington.

It has not been an uneventful journey.

Born 58 years ago in Asheville, William L. Green Jr. grew up in Zebulon, where his parents still live and where his father, who is 84, still goes to work daily at the seed and feed store of which he is part owner.

The younger Green served in the Air Corps during World War II, flying reconnaissance missions out of Italy in P-38s, then graduated from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1949 with a degree in journalism.

Green worked as a reporter in Durham and Morganton and served as editor of the Shelby Daily Star from 1952 until 1957, when he began what he calls "six indelible years" overseas.

He was press officer for the U.S. consulate general in Dacca, Bangladesh, from 1957 to 1960, then press attache at the U.S. Embassy in South Africa from 1960 to 1963.

It was an educational experience. "Some countries, like South Africa, have continuous problems, like race," Green said in a recent interview at his Duke office. "But whatever problem you decide, Bangladesh has it—in multiples. It is a place where hope just doesn't exist."

In 1963, Green returned to the United States and for one year was special assistant to the deputy director of the U.S. Information Agency in Washington.

"By the luck of the draw, it was a glorious year," Green said. "Jack Kennedy was in the White House. Ed Murrow was director of the USIA, and we were going to set it all right. The government would do it and do it right."

Green paused, then added: "It lasted one year. Murrow died of cancer and Kennedy was assassinated."

Green remembers vividly his USIA boss, Edward R. Murrow, North Carolina native, famed radio and TV newsman.

"He represented the best that this profession I've been in and around all of my life can be," Green said. "He was truly awesome. . . . Murrow was the conscience of the Kennedy administration. That's the kind of fellow he was."

Green next moved to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, where he was deputy assistant administrator for public affairs during the exciting years of the Gemini space flights and the first moon landings.

In 1970, he was named director of university relations at Duke University and began developing his present "three-hat job"—overseeing Duke's contacts with the media and the public (including supervision of the

Duke news bureau), teaching Duke's only regular journalism course (basic news writing), and running the visiting journalists program (what Green calls "Western civilization's last unstructured relationship").

Over the years, Green has made many contacts with news agencies and newspapers around the world and he works them regularly to help students find jobs and internships.

Sounding a bit like Mr. Chips, he said in a tone of wonderment, "To my surprise—I'm not a teacher or a professor—it's a wonderful thing to see these kids get started in a career. Then they come back a few years later and say, 'Hey, what do I do now?' And you sort of track them."

Green also finds rewards in the visiting journalists program. The Washington Post and Time magazine send about six staff members to Duke each year for one-month visits. They are free to study, write, teach and do research. The program was recently expanded to include staffers from the Canadian Broadcasting Corp. German and Japanese journalists will be added later.

Green had a unique opportunity to take a broader look at journalism in 1980-81 when he was granted leave from his Duke job to be ombudsman of The Washington Post.

He got more than he bargained for. It was the year in which a young Post reporter, Janet Cooke, won a Pulitzer Prize for a story about a supposed 8-year-old heroin addict, only to be forced to return the prize when her story was exposed as a fabrication.

Green's 18,000-word report on the incident was printed in full by the Post and drew praise for its clarity and candor. But the experience left Green deeply disturbed about the relationship between newspapers and their readers.

In the recent interview, Green said newspapers need to find a better way to let their readers be heard and do a better job of explaining how they operate.

"What I find disturbs me, distresses me," he said. "There is some distrust, suspicion, uneasiness, in some cases, fear of the press."

He said the answer is not necessarily an ombudsman, someone to whom readers can take their complaints, and he acknowledged there will be difficulties in encouraging readers to speak up: "There'll always be the little old lady whose hen has laid an egg that contains the continuation of the Sermon on the Mount. But we're dealing with the most literate of societies now, and they're thoughtful, concerned people who, if they know they will be heard graciously by newsrooms, will speak up."

As for explaining how newspapers operate, Green said: "The news media have not found the means—and maybe they don't have the will—to report on themselves, how they do what they do and why they do it. . . . Maybe it would appear on the editorial page or maybe it would be a sidebar to the story itself. . . . It should not be an apology, but simply a description, never telling how well something has been done—let the reader decide that—just telling how and why a newspaper did something a certain way."

Green said there is an urgency to the question of better relations between newspapers and their readers: "I don't think we'll be forever tolerated . . . and the frightening thing is that the idea of some kind of controls is not very far below the surface."

As for himself, Green is a newspaper addict. Everyday he reads all of the larger

North Carolina papers, the New York Times, the Washington Post and the Wall Street Journal. He also checks trade publications like Editor and Publisher, Columbia and Washington journalism reviews and Channels, a broadcasting industry magazine.

For relaxation, Green does a lot of what he calls "random reading—like everything John Le Carre has ever written and I loved it all."

It's part of Bill Green's approach to life: "it has been—and still is—a crooked road to where I am, but it has never been dull."

FOR THE RECORD

WILLIAM L. GREEN JR.

Born: Asheville, Nov. 11, 1924.

Family: Wife, Isabel Yates Green; daughters, Lisa Green Goodling, Claudia and Audrey Green; sons, Eric and Bryan.

Education: B.A. in journalism, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1949.

Military: Air Corps, 1943-45, Italy.

Career: Reporter, North Carolina newspapers, 1949-52; editor, Shelby Daily Star, 1952-57; U.S. press officer and attache, Bangladesh and South Africa, 1957-63; special assistant to deputy director, U.S. Information Agency, 1963-64; NASA, deputy assistant administrator for public affairs, 1964-70; Duke University, 1970-present, now vice president for university relations; ombudsman, Washington Post, 1980-81, on leave from Duke.●

1983 CONGRESSIONAL CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, today Members of this Congress have pledged tangible support to the plight of Soviet Jews. Of course, I am referring to the Congressional Fast and Prayer Vigil for Soviet Jewry.

Imprisoned Soviet Jews—those in work camps and confinement, and those imprisoned by fear and desperation—have seen their hopes for fulfilling lives mocked because they seek to live in a free society. They have always needed our help, however, our support is even more urgent now in light of the severe reduction in emigration.

Soviet authorities claim the emigration of its Jewish citizens has slowed to a trickle because the majority of those who wished to leave have already done so. Do they also expect us to believe that the formation of a Soviet anti-Zionist organization is a genuine expression of the Soviet citizenry? That its platform which links Zionism to Nazism is in no way motivated by the government's desire to promote anti-Semitism while simultaneously suppressing the desires of individuals who seek to emigrate to Israel?

Mr. Speaker, our Government, our Nation and the worldwide community are expected to accept these flagrant

falsehoods. Participation in today's Congressional Call to Conscience Vigil is a dramatic way of telling the Soviets the time has come to end the lies. We are only too well aware of the thousands of cases like Isaak Shkolnik's.

Following the Six Day War in 1967, Isaak Shkolnik decided to pursue his lifelong dream to emigrate to Israel with his family. The required invitations from relatives in Israel never reached Isaak until they were presented as evidence against him at his trial on the charges of "hooliganism" and disloyalty to the Soviet Union. The documents were used again later as the basis for the charge that Isaak was an Israeli spy. When Isaak refused to abandon his request to emigrate to Israel, he was sentenced to 10 years in prison. After world-wide outcry the sentence was reduced to 7 years. While serving that time, Isaak's wife and daughter were granted exit visas and left for Israel. Following his release, Isaak once again applied for his exit visa. He is still waiting. As recently as March, immigration authorities told Isaak that he had no chance of receiving the visa anytime soon. He has not seen his family in 10 years.

It is cases such as the Shkolnik family's that remind us of the importance of our work. We cannot be deterred, just as the courageous in the Soviet Union have not been dissuaded in their struggle for freedom. Let the Soviet Union heed this warning in the form of our united protest.●

AIDS AND MORAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact in this world that as we stamp out or are able to control various diseases, new strains of bacteria, resistant to known antibiotics, arise. One of these new manifestations is the rise of AIDS—acquired immune deficiency syndrome. Investigation has disclosed that this is spread by sexual contact, primarily, and that the principal carriers are homosexuals. In prior such cases, health officials have resorted to quarantine measures as a first step when no cure was available, in order to protect the remainder of the population. We have not taken that approach to AIDS and columnist Patrick Buchanan recently asked why in a column that appeared in the "Washington Times" on June 29, 1983. In my view, his column deserves careful reading for the questions it raises as to whether we are approaching this problem correctly.

AIDS AND MORAL IRRESPONSIBILITY (By Patrick Buchanan)

The refusal of the politicians and public health officials of New York—including Gov. Mario Cuomo and Mayor Ed Koch—to cancel yesterday's "Gay Pride March," or to shut down and board up those incubators of disease, the gay bathhouses, means they should be held personally and publicly accountable for the spread of the AIDS plague across these United States.

By the thousands the homosexuals trooped yesterday into the gay bars and bathhouses, the *raison d'être* for which is casual, promiscuous and anonymous sex. Conceivably, hundreds returned home carrying this transmissible and deadly disease within their systems.

Yet, not a single major state official, or national official, demanded cancellation of this homosexual convention.

Years ago, it was common for public health officials to come around and post upon the door of a household the proclamation that scarlet fever or chickenpox was present in this house. Families were quarantined for days, weeks. This was not done because public health officials sought to discriminate against children; but because they cared about children. Their job was to isolate the infected, to control the disease.

All those lachrymose commentators and politicians—like Mario Cuomo—who have trashed this writer as uncaring, uncompassionate and insensitive—how much can they truly care about the homosexuals to whom they pander if they lack the guts to shut down these hothouses for a disease that is killing their constituents?

Politicians not only in New York but in Washington are placing their reputations for progressiveness above the public's right to maximum protection from an incurable, infectious and killing disease.

In New York City, morticians have refused to embalm the bodies of deceased AIDS victims. Instead, they have sealed the bodies in plastic bags and put them in closed caskets, which is consistent both with common sense and medical practice. Yet, Mayor Koch is threatening a withdrawal of licenses if they continue to balk.

Margaret Heckler, Secretary of Health and Human Services, is of a similar mind. There is no evidence, she told this writer, that the general population is threatened by Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome. The only known means of transmitting the disease are direct sexual contact with an AIDS victim, dirty needles or contaminated blood.

But that position is challenged by Dr. Anthony M. Fauci of the National Institutes of Health. In the May 6 issue of the American Medical Association Journal, JAMA, he wrote:

"The finding of AIDS in infants and children who are household contacts of patients with AIDS or persons with risks for AIDS has enormous implications with regard to the ultimate transmissibility of this syndrome. First it is possible that AIDS can be vertically transmitted. Perhaps even more important is the possibility that routine household, can spread the disease . . . Given the fact that incubation period for adults is believed to be longer than one year, the full impact of the syndrome among sexual contacts and recipients of potentially infective transfusions is uncertain at present. If we add to this the possibility that non-sexual, non-blood-borne transmission is possible, the scope of the syndrome may be enormous."

To date, 1,500 cases have been reported, 40 percent fatal, with an 80 percent death rate over two years, and none cured. If the current incidence of the disease continues—five or six new cases a day, with the rate of discovery doubling every six months—we are talking about the wholesale destruction and scattering of the "gay communities" of America within several years.

With no known cure, the sole deterrent is prevention, i.e., reduction of the number of casual sex contacts through which the disease is known to be passed.

If 35 years ago, there had been an epidemic of polio among New York children, would we have hailed as "progressive" a mayor who refused to close the municipal swimming pool, or a governor who declared that the rights of children dictated that the Boy Scout Jamboree in Central Park go forward on schedule?

"The lifestyle of homosexuals is not at issue here," said James Weschler in a column critical of this writer. Excuse me, Jimmy, but it is precisely "lifestyle" that is at issue. It is not the proclivities of male homosexuals that are infecting them; it is their practice. What they do. In the way they define themselves, they are killing themselves. Homosexuals did not invent AIDS; but they are the primary carriers, and spreaders of the disease. And it is not an act of compassion to deny this; it is an expression of ideological blindness, a manifestation of moral paralysis. Over to you, Governor.●

CONSUMER TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND RATEPAYER PROTECTION ACT OF 1983

HON. WILLIAM HILL BONER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, I introduced the Consumer Telecommunications and Ratepayer Protection Act of 1983, H.R. 3522.

The divestiture of AT&T heralds a new era for telephonic communications in our Nation. Like many of my colleagues, I have looked with great enthusiasm and encouragement at the emerging technologies and the growth of competition. Ideally, the divestiture means low-cost telephone service.

Unfortunately, decisions are already being made which undermine the goals and positive consequences of the divestiture. As many of my colleagues know, the Federal Communications Commission announced a decision in March that is plainly contradictory to the divestiture consent decree. That FCC decision will result in huge access charges being assessed telephone users who do not use long-distance lines. That decision must be postponed, if not rescinded altogether.

The Consumer Telecommunications and Ratepayer Protection Act of 1983 effectively postpones the FCC access charge decision. In its place, I am proposing that access charges be borne by the interexchange carriers until Con-

gress has had the opportunity to make the necessary policy evaluations with respect to who should bear the cost of accessing long-distance lines. My own recommendation would be that costs be borne by interexchange carriers and users.

My bill also addresses several other important issues resulting from the divestiture and recent FCC decisions. These include clarification of the State utility commissions' authority to regulate equipment depreciation rates and ownership of customer telephone equipment already in place. Lastly, my bill meets the potential threat posed by attempts by interexchange carriers to bypass local operating companies. It prohibits such bypass attempts, though permits internal corporate interexchange communication networks.

My bill will help insure that basic telephone service will be available to all our citizens at reasonable charges. I urge my colleagues to join me in its passage.●

BOY SCOUTS HONOR TWO COMMUNITY LEADERS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, we are all often called upon to give a few words of praise to community leaders at various recognition dinners. Sometimes the event and the honorees strike us as especially significant, and we are moved to make special mention of the occasion. This is one of those times for me.

I am pleased to join the Boy Scouts of America's California Inland Council in honoring two of the Inland Empire's best known and respected community leaders, Martin Matich of San Bernardino County and Les Richter of Riverside County, for their work on behalf of the Inland Empire generally, and the Boy Scouts of America in particular. For those who may not know either gentleman, a few words of background are in order.

Martin Matich is a major contractor in California, active in numerous professional societies (including the Associated General Contractors of America), a former mayor of the city of Colton, and an active lay member of the Catholic Church, where he has helped with numerous community causes. He has earned, through this selfless dedication to these groups and the Boy Scouts, this honor.

Les Richter is the moving force behind the Riverside International Raceway, but is perhaps better known for his still famous years with the Los Angeles Rams, where he was team captain and linebacker. He also serves on numerous boards and commissions, in-

cluding the elective post on the board of trustees of Riverside City College. Besides his sports activities, Les was an Eagle Scout and a long-time friend of the Boy Scouts of America.

The Boy Scouts are fortunate to have supporters of this caliber willing to give of their valuable time. Martin Matich, Les Richter and all the other men and women who have given their time to help make institutions like the Boy Scouts of America a success deserve our praise and recognition.●

DIRECTIONS FOR CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, as debate on Central America continues, we find ourselves still searching for a solution. There are certainly no easy answers, and as the conflict becomes more heated, we find it even more difficult to extinguish a policy in flames. Now we must strive for compromise, and conduct a coherent and effective policy for that region.

Briefly, I would like to outline two of the predominant schools of thought on the issue. The first belief is that of the administration. They contend that Marxist forces continue to infiltrate the region, paving yet one more road in their highway of hostility and domination. The President has outlined this view in his address to the Congress. On the other hand, there are those who question the direction of the administration. These individuals argue that the people in Central America are fighting against right wing dictators who have violated their human rights for many years. The conflict, they contend, cannot be looked upon as an "us" against "them" situation; there are too many factors involved.

It is now time for both sides to come to the realization that it is far better to make a sacrifice for a compromise than to compromise for a sacrifice. All Americans share the fear and oppose the spread of Marxism in the region. The proof of Soviet and Cuban military apparatus along with military advisers, gives concrete evidence to this vivid threat. There is no denying that if the Communist exploitation of this region were nonexistent, we could better face the more crucial economic problems. By the same token, however, the President has made a great military commitment to El Salvador, naming them the leaders of our fight for freedom in the area. In making such a commitment, the President has locked himself into a policy that unfortunately will lead only to greater U.S. military involvement, perhaps ultimately utilizing American troops.

Former U.S. Senator Dick Clark, a member of the Commission on Central American Relations has clearly characterized Mr. Reagan's state of mind in the following statement:

This anti-communist theme is the central focus of the Reagan administration's foreign policy. To expect the President not to certify that the situation in El Salvador is not improving, . . . is to expect him to reject his own most deeply held beliefs. Consequently, he will be prepared to make whatever commitment he deems necessary to pursue his policy to the bitter end. . . . It must be remembered that the President honestly believes that we would have won the war in Viet Nam had we only been willing to make a greater commitment and a more determined effort there.

We must urge the President to be less dogmatic and to weigh all consequences for alternative policies if we expect to attain any peaceful and permanent solution to the situation in Central America. Military aid and clandestine operations offer only more violence, human suffering and disorder.

Furthermore, even if a continued military commitment to the Government of El Salvador were deemed necessary, there is still the question over the legitimacy of that government. The Boston Committee for Medical Aid to El Salvador has observed the human rights situation. They describe the grim condition as follows:

The institutionalized violence in El Salvador perpetuated through the structures of a feudal society and bolstered by a government which acts on behalf of oligarchic interests, must be measured not only in terms of innocent people slaughtered, but also in terms of the daily violence of hunger, poverty, and malnutrition which has produced in El Salvador the highest child mortality rate of 24 western hemisphere areas surveyed by the Pan American Health Association.

We must start to force the Salvadoran Government to rectify these unwarranted abuses, not only by showing them how to do it, but also by watching them do it.

The answer to these problems is not a military one. It is one that will be a product of negotiations among all sides. By recognizing the Communist threat on the one hand, we must also not alienate those who truly want democratic freedom and a better life for their people. We must get all people who are genuinely concerned about attaining justice for their country, together to form a workable and honest form of government.

To this end, it is vitally important to get our country actively involved in the overseeing of the economic welfare of these nations. We must remain as good neighbors to gain their respect.

This can only be done by concentrating on economic assistance. There are thousands of starving people in this region who must be fed. The farmers of these countries are quite inefficient, as they are not as advanced in the art of farming. By teaching these farmers

modern and upgraded techniques, we will be contributing to the improvement of a battered economy that needs much help. Moreover, better education should be extended to all people, allowing them the opportunity to provide a better life for themselves. This will, in turn, produce more responsible leaders, and allow for individuals to specialize, creating a natural industrialization process.

President Kennedy's "Alliance for Progress" serves as a model of what we should be doing in Central America. This plan was geared to unite people in all the Americas, and to give them the opportunity for freedom and prosperity. One of President Kennedy's aides clearly described the need for such a plan:

The situation in Latin America resembled that of Western Europe in 1947. The communists had failed then because the Marshall plan restored Western Europe economically while their own opposition to economic recovery discredited communism politically. The need now was to confront the Latin American communists with a similar dilemma by offering, so to speak, a moral equivalent of the Marshall plan, but of course a plan for the development of a continent held down by ignorance and poverty rather than for the reconstruction of a continent rich in managerial and labor skills.

This statement is just as true today, as it was then. It is not until the urgent economic concerns of Central America are addressed, will we be able to feel confident about the stability of our southern neighbors.

I have outlined my suggestions to the overall concerns. These suggestions are not meant to be inclusive analysis, but rather overviews of the root of all our problems in this region. It is now time that we, as Americans, and leaders of the free world, find the key to unlock that heavy door to peace. This key can only be found through negotiations not only with Central America, but also with the Soviet Union. It is time to be realistic about the problems and face them head on. I will close by quoting Pope John Paul II, who said during his recent trip to Central America that, "No one must be excluded from the dialog for peace." Let us now turn these valuable words into actions.●

TRIBUTE TO FLORENCE ELSTON

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to honor Florence Elston—"Santa Monica's Teacher of the Year."

Mrs. Elston is a fourth grade teacher at Santa Monica's McKinley School. She presently holds the record as the

school's longest serving instructor—35 years. Simply having taught for this length of time, however, was not what compelled the entire McKinley staff to nominate her for this award. It was, instead, the longstanding love and enthusiasm for education that she has continually displayed to her students over the years.

Florence Elston has been both innovative and creative in her approach to curriculum. Moreover, she has refused to allow inadequate financial support for California's public schools to interfere with her teaching. Every year Mrs. Elston takes her students to the San Fernando Mission as a culmination of months of study on California history. Although all field trips were eliminated 4 years ago due to district budget cutbacks, Mrs. Elston has continually found ways to finance the adventure. This year under the direction of Mrs. Elston, students recycled aluminum cans to pay for the cost of the field trip.

During her 35 years at McKinley, Mrs. Elston has attended every school event and PTA meeting, and has only missed 10 days of classroom instruction. Furthermore, she has continually sought to improve her teaching skills and knowledge. In 1976, after attending Pepperdine University classes at night and on the weekends for over 1½ years Florence Elston received her masters degree along with seven other McKinley instructors. This continued pursuit of her own education is still further evidence of her commitment to high academic standards.

Aristotle was to have wisely stated: "All who have meditated on the art of governing mankind have been convinced that the fate of future societies depends on the education of youth." This idea is still true today. Indeed, our youth hold this Nation's future in their hands. It is imperative that our youth be provided with the best possible academic instruction and guidance to insure they will become this Nation's best possible citizens and leaders.

Mr. Speaker, as representatives of the people, it is important for us to commend individuals who have provided our youth with quality education. Indeed, Florence Elston is one such individual. Her time has been solidly invested in our youth, and thus in the future of our Nation. Therefore, it is with great pride that I invite my colleagues to join with me today in saluting Florence Elston—"Santa Monica's Teacher of the Year." I wish Mrs. Elston continued good health and happiness so that countless more students will be able to benefit from her outstanding guidance and leadership.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WATERFORD TOWNSHIP
SCHOOL DISTRICT RECEIVES A
GOLD STAR

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks our President has criss-crossed the United States carrying with him the message that our educational system is rapidly deteriorating before our eyes. The finger is pointed at poorly paid teachers, undisciplined classrooms, less rigorous curriculum standards, and a deemphasis of basic skills, to name a few.

At a time when it is easy for one to become discouraged by reports that education is failing, it is important that we in Congress acknowledge those who have displayed exemplary efforts in achieving the goal of quality in education. With this thought in mind, I would like to commend the Waterford Township School District on receiving a gold-star review from the New Jersey Department of Education for the academic 1982-83 school year.

The school district was commended for:

Continued consistent and regular participation and involvement in regional administrative and curriculum articulation meetings.

Its leadership in developing computer education programs for students in both the regular and special education classes and developing computer literacy skills of both students and staffs.

Continued efforts in developing communication strategies with the community and distribution of an attractive and informative newsletter to residents.

Ongoing and effective utilization of parent and community representation and input in developing and implementing family life curriculum in the Waterford Township Schools, including revising existing curriculum to incorporate sensitive areas of the law.

Implementing an introduction to vocation programs for regular students at the Thomas Richards School to meet their career exploration needs.

Continued high levels of student achievement over the years in the basic skills as measured by both local and State testing instruments.

Continued instructional emphasis on the basic skills as evidenced by continual revision of the objectives of the program, comprehensive analysis of the local commercial test results, and development of student checklists for writing skills.

Utilization of an ongoing administrative management team to provide leadership and direction for all areas of the curriculum in the school district.

July 14, 1983

Due to the school district's success at meeting and exceeding State educational standards, the New Jersey Department of Education offered no recommendations for improvement. Mr. Speaker, the example set by the Waterford Township School District gives us hope that all has not gone bad in our Nation's schools.●

WE TRIED TO ACCEPT
NICARAGUA'S REVOLUTION

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, there is a saying that the truth will out, but the truth is taking a painfully long time to show itself in Nicaragua today. Lawrence Harrison, former AID Director in Nicaragua, details some of his experiences in that country in the June 30 edition of the Washington Post, and I hope that every one of my colleagues takes the time to at least glance at his following account of blind anti-Americanism, public deceit, and herd mentality in that country.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we on both sides of the aisle stopped making policy on the basis of empty slogans and trendy pseudointellectualism. Certainly we have made mistakes in that region, and American real and implied support of the Somoza regime certainly gave the Sandinistas grist for the propaganda mill. But our foreign policy must be based on, above all, truth—even if the surprising conclusion is that American actions and intentions are not all bad.

WE TRIED TO ACCEPT NICARAGUA'S REVOLUTION—THE SANDINISTAS COULDN'T LIVE WITH A POSITIVE IMAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Lawrence E. Harrison)

The Sandinista Government of National Reconstruction was installed four years ago, on July 19, 1979. Three days later, I arrived in Nicaragua in a Flying Tigers DC-8 stretch jet loaded with food—the first of many such flights—to take charge of U.S. assistance programs, the most tangible evidence of our commitment to build a new relationship with Nicaragua.

I left Nicaragua two years later, on July 1, 1981. During those two years, the U.S. government was the most important source of food aid and one of the most important sources of financial aid to revolutionary Nicaragua. We provided assistance valued at \$120 million, including 100,000 tons of food. We had tried very hard to build that new relationship. But the effort failed, principally, I believe, because the Sandinistas could not live with a positive image of the U.S. government. They did not try at all. And many in the United States cheered them on.

Within a few months, of the installation of the Government of National Reconstruction, an article appeared in the Sandinista newspaper *Barricada* announcing, the imminent arrival of 600 Cuban teachers. I called on the minister of education, with whom I

had been working to reactivate an old school construction loan, to express concern that so large a number of Cuban teachers would be interpreted in the United States as a Cuban takeover of the Nicaraguan education system. The minister replied that the government would welcome qualified teachers from any country.

I told him that the United States would certainly be interested in sending teachers, possibly through the Peace Corps. He responded, somewhat apologetically, "You know, we Latin Americans have a view of the Peace Corps which would make it an inappropriate vehicle." (He meant, "We Latin Americans of the Left.") What he had in mind was symbolized by the move "Blood of the Condor," which depicts Aryan-looking Peace Corps volunteers engaging in genocidal sterilization programs in Bolivia.)

At the end of 1979, as a result of the intervention of then junta member Alfonso Robelo (who is now allied with ex-Sandinista Eden Pastora's guerrilla movement), we received Sandinista approval in principle to start a Peace Corps program. After a lengthy study, the Peace Corps sent in a husband-wife team as co-directors. Both were experienced in Latin America, altruistic and totally committed to building a new relationship with Nicaragua. After six months of being fobbed off by the Sandinistas, they left. Not one Peace Corps volunteer was accepted.

We often expressed our concern to Sandinista officials about the line in the Sandinista anthem, "We shall fight against the Yankee, enemy of humanity." In November 1979, Jaime Wheelock, one of the most influential comandantes and a person with whom I sustained a very frank dialogue through my two years in Managua, told me that the word "poverty" was going to be substituted for "the Yankee." Soon thereafter, I was told the same thing by then economic czar (and Stanford MBA) Alfredo Cesar, who has since defected. The change was never made.

At about the same time, a U.S. congressional delegation, led by Rep. Dante Fascell (D-Fla.), visited Managua at Ambassador Larry Pezzullo's initiative. Fascell was extremely effective, as were his colleagues, Lee Hamilton (D-Ind.), Matthew McHugh (D-N.Y.) and David Obey (D-Wis.). They pressed hard on the issues of political pluralism and nonalignment in very intense meetings with both the junta, which was increasingly becoming a figurehead, and the Sandinista National Directorate, which is where the real power resides. The congressional group was particularly forceful on the question of elections. In each session they were told that national reconstruction had to be the first priority but that the Sandinistas were committed to elections.

When Alfonso Robelo resigned from the junta in April 1980 and went into opposition, he was promptly labeled a traitor by the Sandinistas. In a conversation with Jaime Wheelock, I tried to explain our concept of dissent. I got nowhere—there is a Spanish word that accurately captures the nuances of "dissent." A day or two later I experienced similar frustration in a conversation about dissent with a young U.S.-trained cabinet minister who had on his desk a bottle of Cuban rum and a copy of "Das Kapital." At one point, he suddenly beamed and said in English, "Now I know what you're talking about—civil disobedience."

He has since defected.

A few months later, Larry Pezzullo and I were in Washington to a lobby in Congress

for the much-delayed \$75 million special appropriation for Nicaragua. The Sandinista minister of health, with whom I was working on several programs, was also in Washington, and we had dinner together. During the conversation I complained about inaccuracies and distortions in *Barricada*, the official Sandinista newspaper, and *El Nuevo Diario*, which closely followed the Sandinista line. Both sounded very much like Cuba's official newspaper, *Granma*, particularly in their treatment of the United States. The minister's response: "You don't understand revolutionary truth. What is true is what serves the ends of the revolution."

The August 1980 ceremony to celebrate completion of the literacy campaign was a chilling experience. I had been invited to sit with the comandantes and the cabinet because AID had contributed food and some vehicles to the campaign. The ambassador sat in nearby stands with the diplomatic corps.

The Plaza of the Revolution was mobbed with kids in uniform shouting slogans in response to the urgings of leaders on the platform. I was reminded of films I had seen of Nuremberg in the 1930s.

Comandante Humberto Ortega gave the principal address. In the midst of a series of attacks on the United States, he announced the elections would not be held until 1985, thereby reneging on a commitment to opposition groups for early elections. Moreover, he assured his audience, the elections of 1985 would be nothing like the corrupted elections held in the United States. Larry Pezzullo and I both walked out.

My youngest daughter, Amy, then 16 years old, worked during the summer of 1980 as a volunteer with a Nicaraguan organization, *Genesis II*, which promoted breastfeeding and provided help to orphanages. The head of the organization was Geraldine Macias, a former American Maryknoll nun married to Edgard Macias, vice minister of labor. At the end of the summer (shortly after the completion of the literacy campaign), we had a get-together at our house for Amy and her co-workers. The evening was a little strained because of some of the *Genesis II* people were totally committed to the Sandinista cause and doubtless felt uncomfortable being in the USAID director's house. The Maciases may have felt that way.

Two years later, after the Sandinista security police threatened his life, Edgard sought asylum in the Venezuelan embassy. The Maciases and their children arrived in Washington soon thereafter. They were treated as lepers by many left-leaning church people in the Washington area who had formerly been their friends. The Maciases have found it very difficult to get work and have been living on a shoestring ever since.

In a recent letter to friends, they said: "Since leaving Nicaragua we have had access to documentation of [the Sandinistas] and some of [their] former members that proves beyond a doubt that their plans from 1979 on were to deny political and religious freedom. Documents that also show how their methods resemble Somoza to the point they appear as a mirror image: rapes, torture, disappearances, murders, threats, and control of unions and community groups through the formation of their 'elite' political party."

During the last part of 1980, the Partners of the Americas program between the state of Wisconsin and Nicaragua, which had en-

dured for some 15 years, ran into trouble. Most of the activities were focused on the Atlantic Coast. Among other problems, the Sandinistas attempted to take over the Partners' educational radio station (they subsequently did take it over); two Wisconsin plastic surgeons were harassed during a visit to Puerto Cabezas, where they did some highly complicated surgery free; and the Sandinistas circulated the word that Partners personnel were CIA agents.

The ambassador sent a letter to the junta expressing his concern, and I called on the *comandante* responsible for the Atlantic Coast. After I ran down the litany of problems, the *comandante* said, "You have to understand, Mr. Harrison, that Americans are not very popular in this country." I replied that I had lived in Nicaragua for 18 months, traveled intensively, and had the impression that, notwithstanding Sandinista efforts to paint us as devils, most Nicaraguans liked Americans. I added that this seemed to be particularly true on the Atlantic Coast.

He paused for a few moments, then broke into a broad grin and said, "You're right."

Norma Pineda, an accountant, was the senior Nicaraguan employee of the USAID mission, an admirable professional and human being. Her husband, Byron, had been a lieutenant colonel in a noncombatant unit of the National Guard. Just prior to their triumphal entry into Managua, the Sandinistas announced that National Guard members who had committed no crimes had nothing to fear. Despite the pleadings of family and friends to seek asylum in a nearby embassy, Byron Pineda chose to stay in his house because, as he told his wife, "I have done nothing wrong."

About two weeks after the installation of the Sandinista government, Pineda was arrested and much of his property was confiscated. He was tried some six months later and sentenced to 11 years in jail. As in thousands of other cases, all that was proven by the prosecution was that he had been a member of the National Guard.

A few months later, the Sandinistas told Pineda that he would be freed if his wife would provide information on USAID activities to the government. She refused. He was, however, released to house arrest toward the end of 1980, perhaps because of representations the ambassador and I made at high levels of government. Shortly after, he was told that he would be returned to prison if he failed to persuade his wife to become a spy and if he refused to engage in spying activities himself.

A few weeks after that Norma Pineda left Nicaragua. Byron Pineda sought asylum in the Peruvian embassy in Managua, where he has lived for more than two years.

Late in 1980, the Latin American Studies Association, an organization of U.S. intellectuals interested in Latin America, held its annual meeting in Bloomington, Ind. Junta member Sergio Ramirez and Foreign Minister Miguel d'Escoto attended and were given a hero's ovation. James Cheek, then deputy assistant secretary of state for Latin American, was jeered and heckled. (Cheek, one of the Foreign Service's most distinguished and enlightened specialists on Latin America, had played a crucial role in U.S. disengagement from Somoza as far back as 1974.)

In a subsequent Latin American Studies Association newsletter, Harvard Professor and Association President Jorge Dominguez described the Bloomington meeting as "one of the darkest moments of my professional

life . . . appalling . . . scandalous . . . damnable."

I returned to the United States on July 1, 1981, and retired from AID early in 1982. I have been at Harvard working on a book on the relationship between culture and development. In December 1982, I was asked to appear on a panel at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard. The principal speaker was Francisco Fiallos, then Nicaraguan ambassador to the United States. Despite a subdued speech on Nicaragua's economic problems, Fiallos was given a hero's ovation by the 300 people in attendance. My comments focused on Sandinista human rights abuses and, in particular, Sandinista reneging on commitments to pluralism and nonalignment. I was booed and jeered repeatedly.

One week later, Fiallos defected. ●

PARRIS REQUESTS SUPPORT FOR MILITARY RETIREMENT AMENDMENT

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD an amendment which I plan to offer to the Department of Defense authorization bill. The purpose of my amendment is to prevent any further erosion of benefits for retired military personnel.

Quite simply, my amendment to H.R. 2629 would strike out sections 1011 and 1012 to title X of H.R. 2669. These two sections create inequities which military retirees should not be required to endure. Section 1011 would make permanent the 6-month delay in cost-of-living adjustments for retired pay and section 1012 would keep the limitation on COLA's for persons under age 62 in place for fiscal year 1986. My amendment would strike these sections from the bill, preventing these provisions from being implemented.

It is unfortunate that the retired military have been a convenient target for reductions. By approving these types of reductions, the Congress is failing to recognize the fact that these are earned benefits which the Federal Government has a contractual and moral obligation to protect from reductions and prevent delays in their receipt.

Military personnel are required to make a great many sacrifices throughout their careers. Many times, military families are required to pull up stakes, disrupt family lives and move to another section of the country or some distant corner of the world. Now that they are retired, they should not be requested to sacrifice further. But that is what the Congress has been doing. We eliminated the bi-annual COLA and we reduced benefits for those retirees under age 62, among other changes.

Another point that we should consider is the impact that these types of reductions have on younger officers and enlisted personnel. These individuals are facing career decisions and are very sensitive to the weakening of their retirement system and the recent trend in benefit reductions. We must keep in mind that our armed services are suffering from severe shortages of skilled officers and enlisted personnel in critical combat and operational positions. Those individuals with skills in great demand in the private sector would be encouraged to leave the military. This would affect great numbers of military people who work in the fields of aerospace, electronics, aviation, and computers.

While I am a strong supporter of reducing Federal spending and deficits, I do not believe that it is wise nor equitable to require one group to bear an unfair burden in reducing expenditures. Military retirees have already endured reductions in their earned benefits and it is time for the Congress to draw the line and stop the constant chipping away. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting my amendment. ●

A STORY ABOUT NICARAGUA

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the debate about Central America that has consumed the Nation poses complex and difficult questions. In fact, if there is one truth about Central America it is that finding the answers to the questions and developing prescriptions for the region is not a simple exercise. There are a multiplicity of responses to the multiplicity of conditions within the countries, all of which must be addressed if those societies and U.S. security are to be satisfied.

Lawrence E. Harrison, writer and director of USAID in Nicaragua from 1979 to 1981 and currently at Harvard's Center for International Affairs tells about the conditions in Nicaragua following the installation of the Sandinista Government of National Reconstruction July 19, 1979. Harrison arrived in Nicaragua 3 days later to establish U.S. assistance programs and to build a solid positive U.S. relationship with the Government. His story, "We Tried to Accept Nicaragua's Revolution," published in the Washington Post June 30, 1983, is a story of an unwillingness of the Sandinista government to accept that assistance and friendship.

It is a story of Sandinista leadership doing very little to promote pluralism. Harrison relates personal anecdotes of: The comandantes, a U.S. congressional

delegation, a leader of the junta who joined the opposition, Harrison's 16-year-old daughter, a Nicaraguan organization committed to helping children, a cooperative venture between the United States and Nicaragua, and U.S. professors interested in Latin America. It is a story of frustration and disillusionment on the part of all. The anecdotes touch the heart and the mind. The conditions described only add to the questions we must ask as we continue our complicated task of writing prescriptions for Central America.

I recommend the article which follows, to my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, June 30, 1983]

WE TRIED TO ACCEPT NICARAGUA'S REVOLUTION

(By Lawrence E. Harrison)

The Sandinista Government of National Reconstruction was installed four years ago, on July 19, 1979. Three days later, I arrived in Nicaragua in a Flying Tigers DC-8 stretch jet loaded with food—the first of many such flights—to take charge of U.S. assistance programs, the most tangible evidence of our commitment to build a new relationship with Nicaragua.

I left Nicaragua two years later, on July 1, 1981. During those two years, the U.S. government was the most important source of food aid and one of the most important sources of financial aid to revolutionary Nicaragua. We provided assistance valued at \$120 million, including 100,000 tons of food. We had tried very hard to build that new relationship. But the effort failed, principally, I believe, because the Sandinistas could not live with a positive image of the U.S. government. They did not try at all. And many in the United States cheered them on.

Within a few months of the installation of the Government of National Reconstruction, an article appeared in the Sandinista newspaper *Barricada* announcing the imminent arrival of 600 Cuban teachers. I called on the minister of education, with whom I had been working to reactive an old school construction loan, to express concern that so large a number of Cuban teachers would be interpreted in the United States as a Cuban takeover of the Nicaraguan education system. The minister replied that the government would welcome qualified teachers from any country.

I told him that the United States would certainly be interested in sending teachers, possibly through the Peace Corps. He responded, somewhat apologetically, "You know, we Latin Americans have a view of the Peace Corps which would make it an inappropriate vehicle." (He meant, "We Latin Americans of the Left." What he had in mind was symbolized by the movie "Blood of the Condor," which depicts Aryan-looking Peace Corps volunteers engaging in genocide sterilization programs in Bolivia.)

At the end of 1979, as a result of the intervention of then junta member Alfonso Robelo (who is now allied with ex-Sandinista Eden Pastora's guerrilla movement), we received Sandinista approval in principle to start a Peace Corps program. After a lengthy study, the Peace Corps sent in a husband-wife team as co-directors. Both were experienced in Latin America, altruistic and totally committed to building a new relationship with Nicaragua. After six

months of being fobbed off by the Sandinistas, they left. Not one Peace Corps volunteer was accepted.

We often expressed our concern to Sandinista officials about the line in the Sandinista anthem, "We shall fight against the Yankee, enemy of humanity." In November 1979, Jaime Wheelock, one of the most influential comandantes and a person with whom I sustained a very frank dialogue throughout my two years in Managua, told me that the word "poverty" was going to be substituted for "the Yankee." Soon thereafter, I was told the same thing by then economic czar (and Stanford MBA) Alfredo Cesar, who has since defected. The change was never made.

At about the same time, a U.S. congressional delegation, led by Rep. Dante Fascell (D-Fla.), visited Managua at Ambassador Larry Pezzullo's initiative. Fascell was extremely effective, as were his colleagues, Lee Hamilton (D-Ind.), Matthew McHugh (D-N.Y.) and David Obey (D-Wis.). They pressed hard on the issues of political pluralism and nonalignment in very intense meetings with both the junta, which was increasingly becoming a figurehead, and the Sandinista National Directorate, which is where the real power resides. The congressional group was particularly forceful on the question of elections. In each session they were told that national reconstruction had to be the first priority but that the Sandinistas were committed to elections.

When Alfonso Robelo resigned from the junta in April 1980 and went into opposition, he was promptly labeled a traitor by the Sandinistas. In a conversation with Jaime Wheelock, I tried to explain our concept of dissent. I got nowhere—there is no Spanish word that accurately captures the nuances of "dissent." A day or two later I experienced similar frustration in a conversation about dissent with a young U.S.-trained cabinet minister who had on his desk a bottle of Cuban rum and a copy of "Das Kapital." At one point, he suddenly beamed and said, in English, "Now I know what you're talking about—civil disobedience!"

He has since defected.

A few months later, Larry Pezzullo and I were in Washington to lobby in Congress for the much-delayed \$75 million special appropriation for Nicaragua. The Sandinista minister of health, with whom I was working on several programs, was also in Washington, and we had dinner together. During the conversation I complained about inaccuracies and distortions in *Barricada*, the official Sandinista newspaper, and *El Nuevo Diario*, which closely followed the Sandinista line. Both sounded very much like Cuba's official newspaper, *Granma*, particularly in their treatment of the United States. The minister's response: "You don't understand revolutionary truth. What is true is what serves the ends of the revolution."

The August 1980 ceremony to celebrate completion of the literacy campaign was a chilling experience. I had been invited to sit with the comandantes and the cabinet because AID had contributed food and some vehicles to the campaign. The ambassador sat in nearby stands with the diplomatic corps.

The Plaza of the Revolution was mobbed with kids in uniform shouting slogans in response to the urgings of leaders on the platform. I was reminded of films I had seen of Nuremberg in the 1930s.

Comandante Humberto Ortega gave the principal address. In the midst of a series of

attacks on the United States, he announced that elections would not be held until 1985, thereby reneging on a commitment to opposition groups for early elections. Moreover, he assured his audience, the elections of 1985 would be nothing like the corrupted elections held in the United States. Larry Pezzullo and I both walked out.

My youngest daughter, Amy, then 16 years old, worked during the summer of 1980 as a volunteer with a Nicaraguan organization, Genesis II, which promoted breastfeeding and provided help to orphanages. The head of the organization was Geraldine Macias, a former American Maryknoll nun married to Edgard Macias, vice minister of labor. At the end of the summer (shortly after the completion of the literacy campaign), we had a get-together at our house for Amy and her co-workers. The evening was a little strained because some of the Genesis II people were totally committed to the Sandinista cause and doubtless felt uncomfortable being in the USAID director's house. The Maciases may have felt that way.

Two years later, after the Sandinista security police threatened his life, Edgard sought asylum in the Venezuelan embassy. The Maciases and their children arrived in Washington soon thereafter. They were treated as lepers by many left-leaning church people in the Washington area who had formerly been their friends. The Maciases have found it very difficult to get work and have been living on a shoestring ever since.

In a recent letter to friends, they said:

"Since leaving Nicaragua we have had access to documentation of [the Sandinistas] and some of [their] former members that proves beyond a doubt that their plans from 1979 on were to deny political and religious freedom. Documents that also show how their methods resemble Somoza to the point they appear as a mirror image: rapes, torture, disappearances, murders, threats, and control of unions and community groups through the formation of their 'elite' political party."

During the last part of 1980, the Partners of the Americas program between the state of Wisconsin and Nicaragua, which had endured for some 15 years, ran into trouble. Most of the activities were focused on the Atlantic Coast. Among other problems, the Sandinistas attempted to take over the Partners' educational radio station (they subsequently did take it over); two Wisconsin plastic surgeons were harassed during a visit to Puerto Cabezas, where they did some highly complicated surgery free; and the Sandinistas circulated the word that Partners personnel were CIA agents.

The ambassador sent a letter to the junta expressing his concern, and I called on the comandante responsible for the Atlantic Coast. After I ran down the litany of problems, the comandante said, "You have to understand, Mr. Harrison, that Americans are not very popular in this country." I replied that I had lived in Nicaragua for 18 months, traveled extensively, and had the impression that, notwithstanding Sandinista efforts to paint us as devils, most Nicaraguans liked Americans. I added that this seemed to be particularly true on the Atlantic Coast.

He paused for a few moments, then broke into a broad grin and said, "You're right."

Norma Pineda, an accountant, was the senior Nicaraguan employee of the USAID mission, an admirable professional and human being. Her husband, Byron, had

been a lieutenant colonel in a noncombatant unit of the National Guard. Just prior to their triumphal entry into Managua, the Sandinistas announced that the National Guard members who had committed no crimes had nothing to fear. Despite the pleadings of family and friends to seek asylum in a nearby embassy, Byron Pineda chose to stay in his house because, as he told his wife, "I have done nothing wrong."

About two weeks after the installation of the Sandinista government, Pineda was arrested and much of his property was confiscated. He was tried some six months later and sentenced to 11 years in jail. As in thousands of others cases, all that was proven by the prosecution was that he had been a member of the National Guard.

A few months later, the Sandinistas told Pineda that he would be freed if his wife would provide information on USAID activities to the government. She refused. He was, however, released to house arrest toward the end of 1980, perhaps because of representations the ambassador and I made at high levels of government. Shortly after, he was told that he would be returned to prison if he failed to persuade his wife to become a spy and if he refused to engage in spying activities himself.

A few weeks after that Norma Pineda left Nicaragua. Byron Pineda sought asylum in the Peruvian embassy in Managua, where he has lived for more than two years.

Late in 1980, the Latin American Studies Association, an organization of U.S. intellectuals interested in Latin America, held its annual meeting in Bloomington, Ind. Junta member Sergio Ramirez and Foreign Minister Miguel d'Escoto attended and were given a hero's ovation. James Cheek, then deputy assistant secretary of state for Latin America, was jeered and heckled. (Cheek, one of the Foreign Service's most distinguished and enlightened specialists on Latin America, had played a crucial role in U.S. disengagement from Somoza as far back as 1974.)

In a subsequent Latin American Studies Association newsletter, Harvard Professor and Association President Jorge Dominguez described the Bloomington meeting as "one of the darkest moments of my professional life . . . appalling . . . scandalous . . . damnable."

I returned to the United States on July 1, 1981, and retired from AID early in 1982. I have been at Harvard working on a book on the relationship between culture and development. In December 1982, I was asked to appear on a panel at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard. The principal speaker was Francisco Fiallos, then Nicaraguan ambassador to the United States. Despite a subdued speech on Nicaragua's economic problems, Fiallos was given a hero's ovation by the 300 people in attendance. My comments focused on Sandinista human rights abuses and, in particular, Sandinista reneging on commitments to pluralism and nonalignment. I was booed and jeered repeatedly.

One week later, Fiallos defected. ●

SOVIET MORALITY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, during a news conference, his first as President,

on January 30, 1981, President Reagan was asked to comment on "Soviet intentions." In part, he responded:

"... as long as they have openly and publicly declared that the only morality they recognize is what will further their cause: meaning they reserve unto themselves the right to commit any crime; to lie; to cheat, in order to obtain that and that is moral, not immoral, and we operate on a different set of standards, I think when you do business with them—even at a détente—you keep that in mind."

His words were greeted with a torrent of ridicule and abuse from media pundits and other publicly registered wisemen. How could the President make such comments about the rulers of the Soviet Union, who, after all, are just folks?

The President responded by saying that what he said was true. The critics—never presenting evidence to contradict the President—were not satisfied. President Reagan was accused of everything from reviving the cold war to historical distortion.

The distinguished editor of the Wall Street Journal, Robert L. Bartley is currently visiting the Soviet Union. After talking with many Soviet officials on many subjects he states: "... what we are dealing with here aren't misunderstandings. They are lies". He traces this soviet habit to Leninist morality, as proclaimed by Lenin himself and offers Lenin's own words to show that Soviet morality is different from Western morality because it is based on an entirely different set of moral premises.

I hope the President's critics will apologize to the President for becoming hysterically angry when all he did was tell the truth about Soviet morality—a contradiction in terms according to Western values. But I don't think they will.

At this point, I wish to insert in the RECORD, "The Soviets Give Morality to the Lie" by Robert L. Bartley, Wall Street Journal, July 13, 1983.

THE SOVIETS GIVE MORALITY TO THE LIE

(By Robert L. Bartley)

Moscow.—An inquisitive Western visitor is likely to come to the Soviet Union thinking about the military balance and the economic outlook. But he may come away thinking, to his own surprise, about religion and atheism.

People can and do attend church in the Soviet Union. Indeed, it's entirely possible for a troupe of editors and reporters from a newspaper with a most impeccably capitalist name to set off in a convoy of Chaika limousines, garish in their 1957-style tailfins, and mill with worshipers among the golden icons of the Yelozhkovsky Cathedral in Moscow. And the next Sunday to watch the patriarch of the Georgian Orthodox Church lead chanting and processing in his 13th century cathedral in the ancient capital of Mtskheta, near modern Tbilisi. The officially atheistic regime has neither summarily closed all the churches, nor succeeded in its campaign to stamp out religious influences.

Nor, for that matter, is repression evident in the streets of Moscow. The drab but scarcely uniformed crowds do not convey the regimentation of Peking. Instead, this could be Istanbul or Mexico City, the metropolis of a country struggling to escape the poverty of the Third World. And with enough energy and enough telephone numbers, it's even possible to order up a picnic at your hotel, and go off to a park to lunch with a woman who once chained herself in protest to the fence of the American Embassy. Someone familiar with other regimented societies can start to wonder, what kind of totalitarianism is this?

You learn quickly enough that the picnic guest, Irian McClellan, was driven to protest not by cosmic issues but merely because the Soviet government refused to let her leave to join the American she had married in Moscow. You learn that this refusal has now been maintained for nine years, despite pious promises about unification of families the Soviet government signed at Helsinki. You learn from his friends that Yuri Orlov, who dared to form a group to monitor these promises, isn't only in a labor camp but "having a hard time." (He has been beaten and sentenced to a third term in the punishment block of a camp in Perm.) You learn anew of the plight of Andrei Sakharov, exiled and gravely ill in Gorky.

DISSENT HAS BEEN CRUSHED

A visitor recognizes that he is talking to people who could be whisked off to labor camps tomorrow. If you ask them why they can meet Western visitors, you get a rush of answers: "We are finished people," with little more to lose. Organized dissent has of course been crushed, the high point of freedoms is past, and "five years from now this may not be possible." This is Europe, not China. In Russia there has always been a tradition of free thinkers; the czars too imprisoned and exiled to Siberia the likes of Dostoyevsky. Ah yes, the answer lies not in the favor of the regime, but in the current of almost insane bravery that has always played counterpoint to the Russian tradition of arbitrary and autocratic government.

The people at such gatherings, of course, are but the tiniest sliver of Soviet society. The junketing journalist can dream of no opportunity to sample the feelings or even the life-style of the ordinary Soviet citizen. Indeed, this is a formidable task even for the full-time correspondent with good command of the language; overly inquisitive newsmen run the risk of expulsion. Both correspondents and diplomats spend more time than they would like in a hermetically sealed environment, their access limited to each other, a few approved Soviet journalists or propagandists and a few delegated Soviet officials, often themselves uninformed. Conversations with officials of any rank are arranged seldom and with extreme difficulty.

Once arranged, too, such conversations aren't likely to be especially revealing. Yuri Marchuk, chairman of the State Committee for Science and Technology, will elaborate on efforts the Soviet Union is making to overcome problems resulting from suspension of technical exchange agreements with the West. But on such underlying issues as his own role in Sakharov's exile, Soviet abuse of psychiatry, the quest for military technology and the theft of Western technology, he turns entirely bland: "I wouldn't like to enter into discussion of such a concrete, specific area of our relationship."

A discussion at the Institute of the USA and Canada turns into, as strategic arms ne-

gotiations sessions have recently been described, a shouting match over the military balance. After half an hour you reach a bedrock observation: If the Soviet Union is at "parity" with the West now and was not 10 years ago, it must have been building arms faster than the West has. The Soviet experts start to object even to this, but are willing to be laughed down. Still, they claim it is the U.S., with the far-off MX missile, that is building a first-strike capability. They find evidence of aggressive intention in Secretary of State Shultz's congressional testimony referring to hopes of internal change in the Soviet Union, though surely some degree of internal change is what the Helsinki treaty was about. Deputy Director Radomir Bogdanov complains, "We believe this administration is out to destroy us." An American visitor starts to wonder how such deep misunderstandings can possibly be bridged.

As a visitor from this newspaper travels about Moscow, he naturally is curious about "yellow rain" and asks about chemical and biological warfare. Melor Sturua, an Izvestiya correspondent recently expelled from Washington in retaliation for the expulsion of a U.S. correspondent from Moscow, brushes off the topic by saying even U.S. scientists disagree: Some charge that "a Soviet battalion used some kind of chemical weapon," but others talk of bee excrement. At the USA institute they tell you U.N. investigators said there was no evidence, and shrug when the quote is corrected to say that even the U.N. team found "circumstantial evidence." Prof. Henry Trofimenko of the USA institute proclaims "It's up to you to prove the charge"—though in fact Soviet refusal to cooperate in investigating the charges is itself a violation of the biological weapons agreement the Soviets signed in 1972.

As it happens, "yellow rain" and The Wall Street Journal appear in the Soviet press while we are in Moscow. A Tass report from the U.S., published in Pravda and broadcast by Radio Moscow, proclaims, "The Wall Street Journal exposes the falsity of the testimonies of the 'witnesses' and 'victims' of the 'yellow rain' on which the U.S. government relies. The Wall Street Journal writes that all the 'proofs' contained in the reports of the State Department had been obtained by the U.S. foreign policy department in one and the same village in Thailand which has long been turned into a base of the CIA." Poor Alexander Cockburn has a beef with Tass; it really should have cited his byline. How well do Tass correspondents understand the U.S. press, I have an opportunity to ask Vladimir Posner, a Western-raised Radio Moscow correspondent noted for his appearances on ABC-TV. Oh well, he responds, we didn't use that item on domestic television. Surely Tass understands full well Mr. Cockburn doesn't speak for The Wall Street Journal. Radio Moscow's Mr. Posner smiles, "That's the way the cookie crumbles."

Ah, yes, what we are dealing with here aren't misunderstandings. They are lies. This is scarcely a new reaction for visitors to Russia. Shortly after de Tocqueville visited America, an eccentric but brilliant French nobleman, the Marquis de Custine, wrote a similar account of Russia. His most profound impression was, as described by George Kennan, of "the terrible, cynical, demeaning contempt for the truth that seemed to pervade Russian government and society." Back in 1839, Custine remarked, "The political system of Russia could not

stand 20 years' free communication with the West of Europe."

DESTROY THE OLD

Still, today's visitor can scarcely help but reflect on the statutes of Lenin on every street corner (Karl Marx gets comparatively short shrift). You see the armored car Lenin used as a podium when he arrived at the Finland Station after being smuggled back to Russia by the Germans during World War I in the hope that he would subvert the democrats who had unseated the czar. The crowds stand in hour-long lines to enter Lenin's tomb, and a guard gestures for visitors to button their jackets before entering the presence of the waxy corpse.

The Lenin thus worshiped proclaimed, among other things, a new view of morality. Loosely put, he taught that the ends justify the means. "It is often suggested that we have no ethics of our own; very often the bourgeoisie accuse us Communists of rejecting all morality," he told the Komsomol, or Communist Youth League, in 1920. "In what sense do we reject ethics, reject morality? In the sense given to it by the bourgeoisie, who based ethics on God's commandments." He added, "We say: Morality is what serves to destroy the old exploiting society and to unite all the working people around the proletariat which is building up a new, Communist society. Communist morality is that which serves this struggle and unites the working people against all exploitation, against petty private property."

This view of morality, obviously, erects no inhibition against exterminating the kulaks, or purging the party faithful, or striking alliances with Hitler, or distorting the truth in your press, or consigning dissidents to labor camps and mental hospitals, or giving arms and instruction to world terrorists, or singing international agreements on human rights or biological weapons you intend to violate contemptuously. Indeed, if you convince yourself these acts further the revolution, far from being prohibited by morality, they are commanded by a morality. In an earlier phase of the revolution, Pavlik Morozov turned his father in for hoarding grain, and was killed by neighbors. Today you can find his statue in Moscow, a moral hero of Communist society.

Whether human society can be organized on any basis so far removed from the day-to-day best instincts of mankind remains very much in question; the authorities must be startled by the persistence of religion in the face of atheist instruction, and indeed some evidence of a religious reawakening. The Communist view of morality is no mere curiosity, though, so long as the Soviet Union is armed with modern weapons. We cannot afford to assume, even subconsciously, that some residual moral code puts some outer limit on Communist behavior.

For the last few years Alexander Solzhenitsyn has been telling us that the ultimate challenge the West faces from the Soviet Union is not military but moral. He says "the entire 20th century is sucked into the vortex of atheism and self-destruction." And if a Western visitor is not yet ready for Mr. Solzhenitsyn's prescriptions for religious rebirth, he comes away with new respect for the author's diagnosis. Sophisticates wince at the words "atheistic communism," but the vulgar phrase captures the heart of the matter after all. ●

RECOGNIZING "FREE THE FATHERS" CAMPAIGN TO RELEASE FOUR CHINESE CATHOLIC PRIESTS

HON. DON SUNDQUIST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Tennessee Conservative Union has begun a campaign to free four elderly Chinese Catholic priests who have been imprisoned by the Communist government of the People's Republic of China since 1981. They are being held on religion-related charges. I would like to commend the efforts of the TCU on this matter.

The Chinese Catholic Church broke ties with the Vatican in 1957. It is now controlled by the state-approved Catholic Patriotic Association which has accused the Vatican of interfering in China's internal affairs. However, a number of Catholics have remained loyal to the Pope and have formed a loose "underground church." The priests are thought to be associated with this organization. The underlying reason for the priests' imprisonment was their refusal to accept the authority of the state-approved Catholic Patriotic Association and to sever ties with the Vatican.

The elderly priests, ranging in age from 66 to 80, received prison sentences of up to 15 years. After learning the plight of these men, the TCU began its Free the Fathers campaign. They hope to achieve their goal by bringing national attention to the problem. I would like to express my support of the TCU in their mission to free these men and hope that we are all inspired by their actions.

I would like to insert the article by Christopher S. Wren of the New York Times News Service that brought this matter to the attention of the TCU in the hope that my colleagues will give it the serious thought that it deserves.

FOUR CHINESE PRIESTS BACK IN PRISON FOR MAINTAINING TIES WITH VATICAN

(By Christopher S. Wren)

PEKING.—Four elderly Catholic priests in Shanghai have been sent back to prison for up to 15 years for offenses that included maintaining ties with the Vatican and sending abroad information about Catholics in China.

The priests were first arrested in November 1981 in a police crackdown on underground religious activity. They were put on trial after spending as much as 16 months in detention, according to reports from Catholic sources in Shanghai.

The Rev. Zhu Hongshen, who is known in the West as Vincent Chu, received a 15-year prison sentence. The Rev. Zhen Yuntang, who is known abroad as Joseph Chen was sentenced to 11 years.

The formal charges against Zhu and Zhen accused them of colluding with foreign countries, collecting intelligence reports,

fabricating rumors, carrying out subversive activities and endangering the sovereignty and safety of the state.

But the Catholic sources said the underlying issue was their refusal to sever links with the Vatican and submit to the authority of the state-approved Catholic Patriotic Association, which oversees Chinese Catholics.

The Chinese Catholic Church broke with the Vatican in 1957 at the government's behest and now ordains its own bishops and priests and still celebrates Mass in Latin.

The Administration of Religious Affairs, a government watchdog body, has estimated that there are up to 3 million Catholics and 700,000 Protestants in China.

Zhu is now 67 years old and Zhen is 75, the sources said. The two Jesuits have spent nearly 24 years in prison. They were freed in late 1979 and warned to avoid unsanctioned religious activity.

Earlier, the Rev. Stanislas Chen, 80, was sentenced to 10 years and the Rev. Stephen Chen, 66, was given two and a half years, according to the sources, who did not give further details of their trial. Both priests were also Jesuits who had been in prison.

After persecution by Maoist radicals in the Cultural Revolution, Chinese Christians have been allowed to worship openly again, but within explicit guidelines that require the rejection of Western connections and support of state policies.

An unknown number of Chinese Catholics have refused to attend the recently reopened cathedrals and still profess loyalty to the Pope. They have formed a loose "underground church" that meets secretly for Mass in private homes. The four priests are believed to have been associated with them.

The officially sponsored Catholic Patriotic Association has attacked the Vatican publicly for purported interference in China's internal affairs and has criticized Pope John Paul II for his "slandering remarks" last year that Chinese Catholics were being persecuted like the early Christians. ●

STANDING SILENTLY BY

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Soviets invaded Afghanistan on December 27, 1979, I have been asking where are the protests against this aggressive action?

The Soviets are now in their fourth year of occupation in Afghanistan, and yet the mass demonstrations in the United States and Europe center on our Nation's efforts to preserve world peace and to fight Communist expansion. These protests ignore the slaughter of innocent men, women, and children in Afghanistan by the Soviet military which has stooped so low as to use chemical weapons on these defenseless people. The American people are virtually unaware of the gross human rights violations being committed by the Soviets in Afghanistan because the news media have only superficially covered the ongoing war there.

I was encouraged last month to read an editorial by U.S. News & World Report editor Marvin Stone asking the questions I have been raising since 1979. Where, he asks, are the mass demonstrations in the United States and Europe against the Soviet atrocities in Afghanistan? Where, he asks, are the screaming headlines and angry editorials?

He also asks if the American news media should stand silently by, or should they tell the story of Soviet aggression in Afghanistan "in all its ghastly details?" "Perhaps," he concludes, "if the American people were better informed about what is going on in Afghanistan, the Soviet Union might not feel that the world is either unaware of or no longer cares what it is doing."

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is blessed with a free press guaranteed by the first amendment not to be censored as the press is in Communist nations, such as the Soviet Union. With the most active and free press in the world, the American people have access to a wealth of information, such as Mr. Stone's editorial, which proves without a doubt that it is the Soviet Union—not the United States—that poses the greatest threat today to world peace. Following my remarks is a copy of Mr. Stone's editorial entitled "Getting Away With Murder."

GETTING AWAY WITH MURDER

(By Marvin Stone)

In Afghanistan, the invading armies of the Soviet Union are committing one of the most massive campaigns of savagery in recent history. Towns are bombed into rubble. Civilians are massacred by the thousands. Women and children, as well as men, are summarily shot. Homes are looted, females raped. People suspected of sympathizing with the Afghan resistance fighters are tortured.

The U.S. State Department describes the Soviet actions in Afghanistan as "intolerable by any standard of civilized behavior."

But where—in the United States or Europe—are the mass demonstrations against such atrocities? Where are all those people who marched in protest against the American campaign in Vietnam? And where are the screaming headlines or the angry editorials that appeared in the newspapers of the Vietnam era?

Americans read in their newspapers and see on their television screens far more about the relatively few killings in El Salvador than they do about the massive massacres in Afghanistan.

"It would appear," said the State Department, "that the Soviet Union believes that the world is either unaware of or no longer cares what it is doing in Afghanistan and . . . is willing to employ any means, no matter how brutal."

Said the State Department: "We cannot stand silently by and witness this slaughter."

Now, what about the American news media? Should they "stand silently by"?

Or should they tell this story in all its ghastly details—just as they did about Vietnam, and as they do now about El Salvador?

Perhaps if the American people were better informed about what is going on in Afghanistan—and if they would react as strongly as they did during the Vietnam War—the Soviet Union might not feel that "the world is either unaware of or no longer cares" what it is doing.

Another example: How much have Americans been told about the genocide practiced by the Communists who have taken over Kampuchea, formerly Cambodia, at the cost of an estimated 2 million lives?

Charles Z. Wick, director of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA), recently charged that the American news media—particularly the television networks—bear a "great responsibility" for failing to draw the world's attention to that mass atrocity.

Why the seeming reluctance of U.S. news media to tell the story of such Communist cruelties? It is admittedly very difficult—and often impossible—for American reporters to observe events in Afghanistan and Kampuchea. The Communists see to that. But we suspect there are other reasons, too.

Apparently, many editors—and TV news-show producers—feel that Americans do not like to be reminded of Vietnam, or how the domino theory they once scorned is now being proved by the Communist inroads across South and Southeast Asia.

Ever since World War II, when the United States became allied with the Soviet Union to fight Nazism, Americans—and some of this nation's news media—have been prone to knee-jerk reactions against any sins by right-wing regimes while reacting less strongly, or not at all, against excesses of the left.

It is time for a readjustment. ●

FIGHTING INSURGENCY WITH NO REAL STRATEGY

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, last month Charles Maechling, Jr., a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and a counterinsurgency adviser in the State Department from 1961 to 1966, published an article in the Los Angeles Times which demonstrates how seriously the administration seems to misunderstand the nature of the crisis facing us in Central America. Mr. Maechling explains the strategy of the Sandinistas in Nicaragua and of the Salvadoran and Guatemalan guerrillas, and shows how inappropriate and ineffective administration policy has been in countering this threat.

Mr. Maechling proposes two alternative strategies: To disengage gradually and turn the problem over to the Contadora group; or to intervene with an effective counterinsurgency program aimed at expropriating the revolution from the Marxists. Unlike Mr. Maechling, I do not believe that these are alternatives. I do not think we have the option of disengaging from an area of such vital interest to us, but it is possible for us to intervene in consultation with—and in ways that would com-

mand the support of—our Contadora friends. Congressman JACK KEMP and I have introduced a resolution calling on the President to appoint a bipartisan Commission on Central America whose mandate would be precisely to recommend policies that would respond to the region's real needs and that would be supported by our friends in the region. I am hopeful that the President will shortly announce his support for such a Commission.

I hope my colleagues will read Mr. Maechling's analysis carefully. His bottom line is surely right: the present course leads to a dead end.

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 10, 1983]

FIGHTING INSURGENCY WITH NO REAL STRATEGY

(By Charles Maechling, Jr.)

The transfers of Assistant Secretary of State Thomas O. Enders and Ambassador Deane R. Hinton, and the establishment of a U.S. training base in Honduras with more than 300 advisers, obviously signal a shift toward militarization of the Reagan Administration's program for Central America. They also highlight its abysmal ignorance of the nature of Marxist "wars of national liberation."

El Salvador and Guatemala contain all the ingredients for a successful strategy along classic Maoist lines—ridiculous disparity in wealth between rich and poor, greedy landowners (many absentee in Miami), security forces paid off by the landowners to kill and sow terror, and a dispossessed peasantry or Indian population. These are lands that, as international labor expert George Cabot Lodge wrote recently in the New York Times, "have always been characterized by oppression—oppression which has generally been nourished by the United States. Their transition to democracy is a tortuous process probably requiring revolution. If we oppose that revolution, we will lose and push the winners into the hands of the Russians and Cubans."

In El Salvador, and to a lesser extent in Guatemala, which is in an earlier stage of insurgency, the rebels are following the classic model to overthrow the government and win popular allegiance: Erode the government base in the countryside; destroy bridges, vehicles and communication facilities to cripple the economy; treat the peasantry humanely; release enlisted-men prisoners, and provoke government repression. Tactically, the rule is to retreat when the enemy advances, regroup when he stands still and attack when he exposes himself or retreats. A cardinal principle is to capture weapons and ammunition; this creates uniformity of armament and obviates the need for an outside supply line.

The response of the security forces in both countries has been classic also, with Latin refinements. Lump everyone in opposition—violent or non-violent, moderately reformist or extreme Marxist—into one category called subversivos; declare open season to abduct, torture, and kill subversivos and anyone suspected of opposition sympathies; conduct military sweeps through the countryside, indiscriminately slaughtering the peasantry, women, children, and refugees included, in areas considered sympathetic to the insurgents.

In Nicaragua the beleaguered Sandinistas also are resorting to classic revolutionary doctrine, but in a defensive mode. The combined army and militia exactly replicates the pattern of the French Revolution's levée en masse, Leon Trotsky's Red Army of 1918-19 and Fidel Castro's Cuban national militia, each of which successfully repelled counterinsurgency invasion. The Sandinista strategy probably will be to draw the U.S.-supported counterrevolutionary forces deep into the country, then surround them.

The Reagan reaction to these situations is equally typical, intervention without intervening. That is, conducting guerrilla and counter guerrilla warfare by proxy, and with the crucial sociopolitical elements of counterinsurgency strategy conspicuously missing. For El Salvador the United States has no program of full-scale economic and societal reform to counter the insurgents' total strategy. For Nicaragua there is no government-in-exile of respected democratic figures (as there was in the Bay of Pigs). In both countries the Administration is fixated on military solutions; its only political prescription is "free elections," regardless of how premature, fraudulent or risky.

The Administration's human-rights stance is even worse, a blot on the American escutcheon. It seems unable or unwilling to force its unsavory clients to abjure the most bestial practices of torture and mass murder. It also seems terrified of interfering with their internal structures, naively believing that these societies will eventually reform themselves—as if entrenched interests steeped in blood have ever done this in history. Refugees from El Salvador and Guatemala are pouring northward, fleeing government massacres, not the guerrillas.

In El Salvador the Administration is promoting a land-reform program—but applicable only to peasants not yet forced off the land. It keeps promoting free elections—but without safeguards for participation by opposition candidates.

The Administration strategy—if one can so dignify it—touches none of the root causes of left-wing insurgencies, and will only spread the conflict and provoke an anti-American backlash. Already Honduras is being turned into a base for organized attacks on its neighbor.

Unless the President wants another Vietnam on his hands, he has only two choices left. The first is to disengage gradually and turn the problem over to the Latins themselves, under the aegis of the Contadora group of Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and Panama. The second is to intervene with an effective counterinsurgency program aimed at expropriating the revolution from the Marxists. This would mean negotiating power-sharing arrangements preliminary to elections held under outside supervision; placing local security forces under complete civilian control and requiring that war criminals be turned over to justice; and insisting on genuine land-distribution and rural-cooperative programs. Either solution might be effective; the present course leads to a dead end. ●

TEACHERS: MAKE IT TOUGHER TO BE ONE

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George Antonelli is the former president of the Association of Teacher Educators for the State of North Carolina.

He teaches at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, one of this Nation's outstanding educational institutions which I have had the privilege to visit.

Recently, the publisher of the Charlotte Observer, Rolfe Neill, ran a column about his comments on teacher education and how we can attract and keep better teachers.

This House soon will be considering a resolution I have introduced calling on each State to set up a temporary commission to look at this whole question of how we attract and keep better teachers.

If we assume we build the future of this Nation to a great extent through education—and I do not know of anyone who disagrees with that assumption—and if the most important ingredient in that educational process is the teacher—and again I do not know of anyone who disputes that—then we are going to have to pay much more attention to the increasing problem of not attracting our brighter, abler young people into the teaching profession and the problem of many of our best teachers leaving the profession.

Fortunately there still are a great many dedicated teachers staying in the profession. Fortunately we still are attracting some of the finest young minds into the teaching profession.

But we have problems and we had better face up to those problems.

I urge my colleagues to read the item from the Charlotte Observer.

THE TEACHER RIDDLE: FIRST MAKE IT TOUGHER TO BE ONE

(By Rolfe Neill)

How can we attract better school teachers and prevent good ones from changing careers?

Money, important as it is, is only one answer. Additional suggestions come from UNCC's associate professor George Antonelli, a man whose life is devoted to producing tomorrow's classroom teachers. He would:

Make it more difficult to become a teacher by tougher screening of prospects.

Stress teacher training more and theory less.

Require greater knowledge of the subject content to be taught by the teacher.

Have stricter evaluations of performance.

Then, pay higher salaries to the survivors. Whether you agree or disagree with Dr. Antonelli's solutions, the teacher shortage demands society's attention. Something

must be done. You are paying for the consequences of neglect.

Dr. Antonelli just completed his presidency of the Association of Teacher Educators-North Carolina. His organization surveyed educators statewide—from kindergarten teachers to superintendents, from deans in private and public schools to those in colleges and universities—to determine their thoughts about teaching and teachers.

SURVEY'S FINDINGS

The core of the findings, minus the points already made by Dr. Antonelli:

Beginning teachers need to know more about school law in terms of student rights, teacher responsibilities and parental duties.

Colleges of education should include courses in instructional technology.

Elementary student teachers should be required to take more content courses in math, science and language.

Realistic courses should be offered in computer-assisted instruction and programmed learning.

Student teachers should be required to have experience in elementary and in secondary education before graduation.

"Not everybody can be a teacher," says Dr. Antonelli. "That's why prospective teachers must be tested not only on college entrance but on exit, as well, to determine their ability to teach."

But if we're only attracting half as many teachers now as needed, won't stricter entrance requirements increase the deficit?

"At first it might, but that will be made up. The only way to up-grade the image of teaching is to make it tougher to get in. The Marines work that way. So do the Green Berets."

In the rush to be liked, many young teachers do their students a disservice by avoiding confrontations about why students are not doing well, Dr. Antonelli believes.

"The enemy is ignorance. They are there to teach. We must have standards, we must set goals. All students can't have the same level of achievement because we don't all have the same abilities."

Dr. Antonelli thinks teachers who don't dress professionally make a mistake. Ties are in and jeans are out, with him. "Look the part. Students respect that."

"When superintendents tell me 'I wish my teachers dressed better,' I tell the superintendents it's their job as leaders to make it happen. They can if they want to."

Discipline is a handmaiden of teaching success, according to Antonelli. As a man with two liberal arts degrees and a PhD in education, he achieved academic discipline. He has also found it in his personal life.

George Antonelli gave up a three-pack-a-day cigarette intake and shed 100 pounds after Dr. Robert Corley convinced him he would soon be sleeping in Sharon Memorial Gardens around the corner from his Ardberly Place home if he continued those health habits.

Jogging several miles daily is one of his fitness formulas and he's organized numerous runs for the American Lung Association.

The Lung Association honored him as volunteer of the year and the ATE gave him leadership recognition when he stepped down this spring. The lung award meant more, Dr. Antonelli says.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools are seeking legislative permission to experiment with lengthening from three to six years the period before tenure is granted new teachers in a program to upgrade competency and salary. Superintendent Jay Robinson

says the program will help slow the drain of good teachers. The legislature has not yet acted on the bill, which classroom teacher groups oppose as written because they say the bill does not carefully define the limits of the experiment.

LET'S HAVE HEROES

Dr. Antonelli believes in heroes and laments the decline of them in American life. He thinks excellence should be encouraged, rewarded and publicly recognized. That's why he has established an award for the top academic achiever among students in the UNCC College of Human Development and Learning. The plaque bears the name of Mary Cizauskas-Antonelli.

She was his mother, a first-generation Lithuanian-American who married a first-generation Italian-American in Illinois. She was a top student and was admitted to Columbia University.

She never attended. No money. But she was proud of that recognition. Until the day she died, Mary Antonelli carried her letter of admission to Columbia University in her purse. ●

JAN ERNST MATZELIGER

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, today, it is well known that recorded history has traditionally overlooked the contributions of millions of individuals because of their race, sex, or religious beliefs. I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues another little-known black inventor whose ingenuity changed the course of our history. Jan Ernst Matzeliger, inventor of the automatic lasting machine, created a revolution in shoe production in the late 19th century. Below is the story of this courageous young man who overcame the most foreboding social barriers and accomplished a rare technological feat.

The material follows:

THE AUTOMATIC LASTER, ONE OF THE THREE GREATEST SHOE MACHINES

According to shoe industry historians, the three greatest shoe machines ever invented and most responsible for the technological revolution in shoe manufacturing, were the sewing machine by Elias Howe, Jr., the Goodyear stitcher by Charles Goodyear, Jr., and the automatic lasting machine by Jan Ernst Matzeliger, a young black born in 1852 in Dutch Guiana.

The lasting machine may be the most ingenious of all because it had to duplicate the complex, finger-like motions of the hand-laster. Almost overnight it increased the output of the lasting operations more than tenfold. The principles of this machine are still used in modern lasting machines.

At age 25, young Matzeliger, son of a Dutch engineer, came to Lynn, Mass., having just finished serving two years as a seaman on a Dutch ship. The year was 1877. Lynn was the U.S. center for shoe manufacturing, with 175 factories producing shoes and supplies, and its 35,000 employees were producing half of America's footwear.

Matzeliger, without shoemaking experience and further handicapped by his color,

was turned away by factory after factory. He finally was given a job as an apprentice. He already had an aptitude for mechanics, and at the age of ten had been an apprentice in a machine shop in his home country. Because of his curiosity and interest in mechanics, while working at his shoe factory job in Lynn he constantly observed the operations of shoemaking.

At that time, shoemaking was still largely a series of hand operations, though the assembly line system was used, each employee was assigned to one operation. For the many like Matzeliger who couldn't speak English, sign language primers were used to describe each operator's particular operation. This was the "training" program common in most factories.

Matzeliger rapidly learned to speak English, and his natural mechanical abilities soon made him an asset to the factory. Meanwhile he avidly read and studied books on physics and mechanical science, and also acquired a set of drawing instruments. He experimented with a variety of small inventions, a couple of which involved shoemaking.

One challenge, perhaps because of its complications, fascinated him—the lasting operation, up to then entirely a skilled, time-consuming hand operation. He patiently studied the hands and motions of the hand lasters, the rhythm, timing and coordination. Could he recreate all these movements with gears, levels, cams and pin-cers?

At night, in his small room he devised his first crude model out of cardboard. Word leaked out about it and he was offered \$50 for his idea. He refused, but the offer gave him encouragement that he was onto something worthwhile. He finished a second model, much improved. This time he was offered \$1,500, and again he refused.

When the third model, further improved, was completed, he applied for a patent. His machine was so ingenious that Washington didn't grant him the usual patents but instead sent a personal representative to see it, for they found it hard to believe. On March 20, 1883, six years after he got this first job in the shoe factory, his patent was granted.

This significance of the lasting machine? Production leaped from 60 pairs a day per operator, to over 700 pairs. Substantial capital immediately became available and a company was formed, the Consolidated Hand Method Lasting Machine Co. (later to become one of the cornerstones of the United Shoe Machinery Corp.)

But Matzeliger's years of long, intense hours of day-and-night toil took its toll. He acquired tuberculosis and died in August, 1889, at 37 years of age. But his lasting machine still stands as a monument to shoemaking technology—a machine still called the most "human-like" of all shoe machines. ●

TRIBUTE TO THREE SCHOOLS

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, three schools located in the Fourth Congressional District of Missouri were chosen to be part of a national program recognizing successful junior and senior

high schools. The purpose of this program is to call attention to the many good public and secondary schools in the United States, and to begin to establish a network of schools that can serve as models for other schools and school districts that are seeking ways to become better. These schools are:

Blue Springs High School, Dr. Gale Bartow, superintendent; Dr. Robert Blaine, principal.

Camdenton Junior High School, Dr. John Bearden, superintendent; Mr. Ron Burks, principal.

Knob Noster Middle School, Dr. Earl Finley, superintendent; Mr. Wayne C. Miller, principal.

In addition Blue Springs High School was selected as 1 of 144 outstanding schools across the Nation. I would like to extend my congratulations to the superintendents, principals, teachers, and students of these schools. The hard work and dedication of all the people involved with these schools has made excellence in education a reality in Missouri. ●

UNIVERSAL TELEPHONE SERVICE

HON. ROBIN TALLON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my support to H.R. 3440, the "Universal Telephone Service and Ratepayer Protection Act of 1983." This bill would amend the 1934 Communications Act to insure that telephone service will remain available nationwide. It will guarantee basic phone service at affordable prices to all Americans and correct many of the problems with the Federal Communications Commission's policy toward telephone service—a policy which handles the reorganization of the telephone industry by allowing an explosion in the price for local telephone rates and diminished service to customers.

In the United States, we have developed a phone system second to none. We have successfully implemented a policy of "universal telephone service", a phrase that is used to mean that everyone has access to basic telephone service at reasonable rates. Now as a result of the reorganization of the telephone system and the decisions of the Federal Communications Commission, we are moving toward a policy that will eliminate universal telephone service. Americans are being asked to accept a program that could more than double the price of local telephone service.

This could hardly be coming at a worse time for the American people. We are just beginning to come out of the most severe economic downturn

since the 1930's. The Consumer Price Index has been reduced to the lowest level in years, but millions of Americans are still experiencing extreme economic difficulties. Now the Federal Communications Commission is asking our citizens who have struggled during the prolonged recession to again make a sacrifice.

In this case, it involves an item that has become critical for Americans in today's society. The telephone is not only important because it enriches our social lives; it has also become a vital instrument for providing us with access to information that is crucial for our basic needs. The telephone gives the consumer quick access to his or her doctor or pharmacist and dozen of other essential services. Without the telephone, the businessman cannot properly fulfill such important business functions as inventory replacement. The farmer does not have immediate access to essential information such as climate conditions and crop prices.

The FCC has proposed rules for the telephone industry that may lead to this essential item being removed from homes and places of work all over America. The FCC proposal calls for a "cost based" pricing method for access charges which favors users in highly populated, urban areas. In such areas, high concentrations of telephone users make the cost of phone service cheaper. Under this pricing method, low density medium-sized and small towns and agricultural communities would be hit with potentially disastrous increases in rates.

H.R. 3440 would prevent this from occurring by establishing a more reasonable method of distributing the costs for telephone service. Areas with high cost for local telephone service would have a greater part of their costs offset than under the FCC proposal. Companies which benefit from their business in lucrative parts of the communication field will be expected to bear part of the costs for the operation of the entire system. This bill also provides for a strong role for the States in assuring the availability of affordable local rates. It is a fair and balanced method for insuring that the over 90 percent of American households that currently have telephones will be able to retain this service.

In areas such as the Sixth District of South Carolina which I represent, the growth in telephone usage was facilitated by government programs. For continuing this widespread use of the telephone in small towns and rural areas, it is necessary to maintain and strengthen the role of the Rural Electrification Administration telephone program, the backbone of rural telephone service. With the Rural Electrification Act Amendments of 1949, Congress affirmed its support of a policy of universal telephone service

by authorizing Federal financing for rural telecommunications. In the 1949 House Agriculture Committee Report which included the REA amendments, it was stated that the REA was to provide "area coverage" to rural areas which meant: planning, financing and constructing a rural telephone system so that service will be available to all subscribers within the company's area who want it, whether the installation and operation of their particular telephone will be profitable or not.

This policy has been a total success. In 1950, only 38.7 percent of farms had telephones. Today the figure is 94 percent. In the process, the phone was transformed from the party line system to the modern system of today that we take for granted. It would be outrageous if we now walk away from this policy of mandated universal public service.

In closing, let me reiterate that it is crucial that Congress act to insure the continuation of the universal telephone system. It has been said that congressional inaction will allow phone rates to rise out of the price range for millions of Americans. Let not this statement be truthfully uttered against this Congress of today. With a technology capable of telephone service for everyone at reasonable rates; and with a lifestyle that increasingly leads to a nation of families and friends living hundreds and even thousands of miles apart; Congress must act to maintain one of the major communication links of our time. The telephone has provided the means for Americans from all parts of the Nation to stay in contact with one another, and has helped to bring all of the American people, rural and urban, together as one Nation.●

TRIBUTE TO COL. FRANCIS A. MACHINA

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 16, in Albany, N.Y., a dinner will be held honoring Col. Francis A. Machina, who will be retiring after a long and distinguished career in the New York National Guard. Among those honoring Colonel Machina at the dinner will be Maj. Gen. Vincent F. Lanna, Commanding Officer Troop Command, and Maj. Gen. Vito J. Castellano, Chief of Staff to the Governor of New York. I am pleased to join with Colonel Machina's many friends and associates in paying tribute to his fine years of service to New York State and know he must take considerable satisfaction in all he has accomplished.

COL. FRANCIS A. MACHINA

Col. Francis A. Machina, a native of Lackawanna, N.Y., entered the New York National Guard in June of 1948 as a Private in the 152d Engineer Battalion, where he served as an enlisted man until 1952. During this period he rose to the rank of Master Sergeant.

Colonel Machina was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the Engineers on September 14, 1952 and assigned as Platoon Leader for A Company, 152d Engr. Bn. He was reassigned to HHC company as Executive Officer and on February 2, 1957 took over as Company Commander.

Upon being promoted to Captain in 1958, Col. Machina became the S-3 of the Battalion. He was promoted to Major in 1962 and shortly thereafter transferred to the 127th Armor. At this point in his career he proceeded to branch transfer to Armor. He remained as an Armor Officer until 1968, when he became the S-3 of the 152d Engineer Battalion. In 1969 he became the Executive Officer of the Battalion, holding that position until the fall of 1970, when he became the S-3 of the 221st Engineer Group. He was promoted to Lt. Colonel in February 1972 upon being assigned to the 27th Brigade as their Executive Officer.

In July of 1978, he was promoted to the rank of Colonel and subsequently became Task Force Commander for the Command and Control Headquarters. This organization was subsequently reorganized into the Troop Command.

Colonel Machina has also served the New York State National Guard in a second capacity. As a member of the Federal Technician Program, for many years, he assisted all the Units throughout the Troop Command. In his present position as Administrative Officer assigned to Troop Command, Colonel Machina is providing advice and guidance to Technician personnel and the Units they support throughout the Command.

Throughout his long and faithful service, Colonel Machina has received numerous awards and decorations, recognizing him for his dedicated service to the Army, the New York National Guard and his fellow man. These include: Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Armed Forces Reserve (30 years), Armed Forces Reserve Component Achievement Medal, NYS Military Commendation Medal, NYS (35 year) Long and Faithful Service Medal, NYS Recruiting Medal, NYS Aid to Civil Authorities Medal, and NYS Humane Services Medal.

Colonel Machina is a graduate of the Engineer School, Fort Belvoir, Va., the Armor School, Fort Knox, Ky., the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces Institute. In addition to these he has attended numerous other schools including military and civilian institutions. This education has resulted in his obtaining many specialties. These include Engineer, Armor, Air Operations, Nuclear Weapons Employment and Operations and Training as well as a proficiency in the Federal Technician Program, which is unparalleled.

Colonel Machina and wife Catherine reside in Clifton Park, N.Y. with their children, Nancy, Cheryl, Francis, and Gary.●

**A NATIONAL HOLIDAY FOR
MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.**

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it has been 15 years since Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was martyred as he led a courageous, nonviolent struggle for racial and economic justice in America. As the years pass by, the failure of Congress to properly honor Dr. King's momentous achievements is deeply disappointing to me, and, I believe, to millions of Americans.

I rise today to urge the House to correct this glaring omission by supporting H.R. 800, a bill that designates January 15, Dr. King's birthday, a national holiday.

A century ago, Mr. Speaker, Thomas Carlyle lamented the lack of reverence for the great men of his day. He observed, "No sadder proof can be given by a man of his own littleness than disbelief in great men."

And we belittle ourselves if we fail to recognize Dr. King for his breadth of vision, his courage, and his ability to inspire us to create a better society. Today his eloquent words—the impassioned oratory that awakened a nation's conscience—ring as true and as full of moral force and clarity as when he first spoke them.

And Dr. King's words measure for us the distance that we still must travel before we reach fulfillment of his dream of human rights and human dignity for all.

It was under Dr. King's brilliant leadership that the civil rights movement was infused with moral purpose and grew strong. He helped dramatize the evils of segregation in ways that made its downfall inevitable. Dr. King enlisted an entire generation of Americans in the fight for equality and social justice, and won Congress and Presidents to his side. His message of hope and peace crossed national boundaries and touched ordinary people throughout the world.

In 1964, Dr. King became the youngest recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize. Four years later, still young at 39, he was struck down by an assassin's bullet, a victim of the same unreasoning prejudice he had sought to overcome.

Mr. Speaker, it is particularly important, in this troubled and turbulent world, that we acclaim Dr. King's devotion to the gospel of "unarmed truth and unconditional love." He appealed always to what Lincoln called "the better angels of our nature." Not once did Dr. King succumb to the temptation to repay scorn with scorn, hatred with hatred, or violence with violence.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Public holidays should be established only for persons or events of rare significance in our Nation's history. Martin Luther King, Jr., who taught us to recognize and despise oppression, is indeed one of those rare figures who merits such a distinction. By bestowing this high honor on Dr. King, Congress can demonstrate our country's commitment to the principles he fought for: freedom, brotherhood, and equal justice under the law.

And we can thus honor a great American leader who called his fellow citizens to their moral and constitutional duty. Unlike many of his foes, Dr. King took seriously the covenants and principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. He asked not for special favors or privileges, but only that we live up to the high ideals of liberty and equality on which this country was founded.

Thus, Martin Luther King, Jr., is not only a hero for millions of black Americans, for whom he sought freedom and dignity, but for all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting a public holiday in honor of Dr. King. Let January 15 be a day to reflect on the devotion, skill, and bravery with which he sought to make his famous dream a reality. ●

PROCESS PATENT REFORM

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a bill I am introducing today that, if enacted, will be of considerable benefit to our country because it will close a damaging loophole in U.S. patent law.

Under existing conditions, a patent is infringed only if the patented product or process is used, made, or sold in the United States. This is sufficient in the case of a product patent because any item produced overseas and sold in the United States effectively infringes on the patent holder's rights. However, in the case of a process patent there is no effective way by which a patentee can prevent a firm from duplicating and using the protected process overseas and then selling the product of that process in the United States.

You can understand how such a circumvention of normal patent rights can be extremely damaging to the American firm which has invested, researched, and invented a new process that makes new products. If a firm's investment is undercut in such a manner, it has two unreliable options available to protect its patented process from abuse overseas. First, it can

seek to obtain a patent in as many foreign countries as possible and then sue for infringement of its foreign patents in foreign courts when that process is used to make products which are then sold in the United States. This option is very inadequate because it is expensive and it is impossible to obtain effective protection in all of the countries in which the process might be used. The other option open to the patentee is to seek relief from the International Trade Commission. While damages are not available to a patentee under the relevant section of the United States Code, a patentee can seek a cease and desist order against a particular firm. Such an order may be issued by the Commission if it finds that the firm is violating or believed to be violating the pertinent section of the Code. The patentee can also seek an exclusion order that would bar the importation of products made by his patented process if the Commission finds violation, again, of the relevant Code provisions.

However, these options are virtually worthless in providing the patent holder with adequate and fair protection because to obtain a cease and desist order or an exclusion order, a patentee must show not only the importation of a product made by his patented process, but also that the effect or tendency of such importation is to destroy or substantially injure a U.S. industry. Moreover, cease and desist orders against particular firms may not be effective where importation of offending products can easily find alternative channels. Finally, enforcement of exclusion orders by customs officials is complicated by the difficulty of identifying which products were made by patented processes and which were not. Thus, it is very difficult for a process patentee to obtain effective protection under current law where his patented invention is practiced overseas and the resulting product sold in the United States.

My intentions are simply to amend relevant patent law to allow holders of U.S. process patents to realize the full benefits of their inventions. The creation of new and more efficient methods of production is becoming increasingly important as successful innovation depends on adequate protection of the intellectual property rights flowing from research investment. Importation and sale in the United States of products produced by patented processes severely undercuts the value of such patents, and should be prevented.

My bill will accomplish this desirable end by giving the injured company a fair and reasonable opportunity to protect the local market from unfair foreign competition. The people of the United States deserve the right to

profit fairly from their own inventions and creations. The bill follows:

H.R. 3577

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 154 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "invention" the second time it appears the words "and if the invention is a process of the right to exclude others from using or selling products produced thereby."

SEC. 2. Section 271 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(a) by redesignating subsection (a) as paragraph (a)(1); and

(b) by inserting the following new paragraph (a)(2):

"(a)(2) If the patented invention is a process, whoever without authority uses or sells in the United States during the term of the patent therefor a product produced by such process infringes the patent."

SEC. 3. Title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new section 295:

"§ 295. Presumption: Product produced by patented process

In actions alleging infringement of a process patent based on use or sale of a product produced by the patented process, if the court finds (1) that a substantial likelihood exists that the product was produced by the patented process and (2) that the claimant has exhausted all reasonably available means through discovery or otherwise to determine the process actually used in the production of the product and was unable so to determine, the product shall be presumed to have been so produced, and the burden of establishing that the product was not produced by the process shall be on the party asserting that it was not so produced."

CONGRESSIONAL FAST AND PRAYER VIGIL FOR SOVIET JEWRY, JULY 14

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that so many of my colleagues believe, as I do, that the mistreatment of Jews in the Soviet Union is an issue of national concern in the United States.

We have just celebrated our Independence Day, a time of special meaning for all Americans and for people around the world who hope, some day, to be able to live with the same freedoms Americans have fought and died for.

While we stand here and pray and fast in honor of the fifth anniversary of the trial and sentence of Anatoly Shcharansky, let us not forget the hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews who are being denied the most basic rights of mankind.

Let us think about the recent sentence of a Jewish scientist who was convicted on charges of slandering the Soviet system. After being denied permission to emigrate to Israel with his

wife and daughter, Yuri Tarnopolsky staged a 40-day hunger strike to bring attention to the plight of all the refuseniks.

During the course of his protest, the 46-year-old chemist circulated a note to Western reporters which said in part:

I am unable to forget that in modern history only the Nazi barbarians refused to allow Jews to emigrate, persecuting them at the same time.

Let us bring to mind the recent words of Rabbi Jeffrey Salkin, who, in a sermon following his return from a trip to the Soviet Union, said:

I have been asked "Is it really as bad as they say it is for the Soviet Jews?" It is worse than they say. And there is not a single Jew with whom I spoke—and we met with perhaps 30 refuseniks—who did not emphasize their dark fear that the situation is going to continue getting more desperate.

An editorial in the Tampa, Fla., Tribune summed up the situation in the Soviet Union with a tragic comparison:

The growing wave of anti-semitism which preceded the Holocaust in Nazi Germany prior to World War II went largely ignored during those agonizing times. Now, it seems, history is repeating itself. . . .

Sadly, the spirit of the Holocaust did not die in that Berlin bunker with Adolf Hitler. It thrives within the communist system where . . . the principal industry is the repression of the human spirit.

We cannot allow ourselves to be blinded to what is going on around the world. We cannot stick our heads in the sand and say: "It's not my concern." If we care about mankind, about the preservation of freedom for ourselves and others, then we cannot close our eyes.

We must speak out . . . we must be heard.●

TRIBUTE TO HENRY A. STASIUK

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to honor a good friend from New Jersey, Mr. Henry A. Stasiuk, who is known to all of us as Andy. Andy was recently awarded the 1983 Ukrainian Achievement Award in Irvington, N.J.

Currently the managing editor of the Newark Star-Ledger, Andy has held this position since 1965, having joined the Ledger in 1952. During his career at the Star-Ledger, the newspaper has grown into a leading voice in journalism in New Jersey and throughout the country. The Star-Ledger is the 17th largest daily newspaper and the 12th largest Sunday paper in the United States.

Born in New York City to parents who immigrated to the United States

from the Ukraine, Andy was raised by his widowed mother and he attended school in Hawthorne, N.J. During World War II, Andy entered the Naval Air Corps, where he served in the Pacific theater. He distinguished himself in action and was awarded the Silver Star, six Air Medals, and Navy commendation for battle service above and beyond the call of duty in Iwo Jima, Tokyo, and Okinawa.

A newspaperman since 1945, Andy has devoted his considerable talents to maintaining a standard of excellence and dedication to journalism.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Ukrainian Americans of New Jersey for their outstanding selection this year and also send my best wishes to Andy and his lovely wife, Mary, for continued success and happiness in the future.●

MELANIE MACKLIN AND GREGORY BILLINGS, 1983 LEAD PARTICIPANTS

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, today it is my great pleasure to pay tribute to two high school students from my district, Melanie Macklin of Sewell, N.J., and Gregory Billings of Camden, N.J. Melanie, a senior at the Washington Township School, and Gregory, a senior at the Moorestown Friends School, were chosen from among many qualified students to participate in the leadership educational and development program in business (LEAD).

The LEAD program was instituted to encourage highly motivated minority students to pursue careers in business by making them aware of the opportunities that exist in this field. This week, the LEAD students are participating in a Washington business seminar, sponsored by the University of Maryland, Howard University, and several major corporations. The 210 LEAD participants have attended briefings conducted at the White House and the Supreme Court, and have been given the opportunity to speak with many Government officials.

These LEAD students are the business leaders of tomorrow, and I am certain my colleagues will be proud to join me in commending Melanie, Gregory, and all the fine young men and women of the leadership educational and development program in business.●

FAST AND PRAYER VIGIL FOR
SOVIET JEWRY**HON. BEN ERDREICH**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my distinguished colleagues, The Honorable ROBERT MRAZEK from New York and the Honorable JOHN PORTER from Illinois, for cosponsoring the Congressional Fast and Prayer Vigil for Soviet Jewry. I am happy to participate in the prayer vigil, to show the Soviet Union that we in the United States will not tolerate the injustices suffered by millions of Soviet Jews and others behind the Iron Curtain.

The denial of religious liberty is a blot on the human conscience wherever it occurs. The continued denial of basic rights and liberties to the nearly 500,000 Soviet Jews is surely a stain on the conscience of mankind so deep that it will never be forgotten.

The National Congressional Fast and Prayer Vigil being held today marks the fifth anniversary of the trial and sentencing of Anatoly Shcharansky, a man who continues to endure the most brutal and inhumane conditions merely because of his desire to enjoy freedom of religious and cultural expression.

Through this prayer vigil, I hope to draw attention to all refuseniks who have been unable to emigrate from the Soviet Union. But I would like to focus especially on two families that I am sponsoring.

Boris and Irene Ghinis and their two daughters have been trying to emigrate since 1977. Mr. Ghinis was dismissed from his job at the Research Institute of the Ministry of the Radio Industry in Moscow shortly after his first application for an exit visa. Since that day, Mr. Ghinis and his family have submitted their applications for emigration on six separate occasions. Each time their request has been denied on the grounds of "states secrets," despite the fact that it has been 5 years since Mr. Ghinis left his job and his knowledge is no longer current.

Ten years have passed since Mikhail and Natalia Kazanevich and their daughter Janna first expressed their desire to leave the Soviet Union. During that time he has been subjected to continual threats and KGB harassment. He has been threatened with "parasitism" and was interrogated in February 1977 in connection with the case of dissident leader Anatoly Shcharansky.

I have written letters concerning these two families to President Reagan, requesting any assistance he might lend that would provoke a turn-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

around and approval of exit visas for these families.

I have also written letters to Soviet President Yuriy Andropov, personally requesting the release of the Kazanevichs and the Ghinis as a signal to the world that human freedom and dignity have a place in the policy of the Soviet Union.

While this vigil sends a clear message to the Soviet leadership that we will not tolerate such persecution and will continue to work for the safe passage of Soviet Jews seeking to emigrate, it should also serve to encourage those of us in the United States to emulate the persistence and dogged perseverance that Anatoly Shcharansky, the Kazanevichs and the Ghinis have exhibited throughout their ordeal.

Despite the unbearable conditions under which they live, they have steadfastly continued to stand by their beliefs and convictions, the beliefs and convictions held by countless Soviet Jews whose only wish is to live in accordance with their traditions.

It is my hope that we in the United States can draw upon their strength and willpower to bolster our efforts to help the thousands of refuseniks, and others behind the Iron Curtain, who are being denied the basic rights and freedoms that we in this country take for granted.●

UMW's TRUMKA RECEIVES
KREHEL DEPICTION**HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of presenting to Richard Trumka, president of the United Mine Workers of America, a full-color, full-size photo of an oil painting which depicts the cycle of anthracite (hard) coal mining in northeastern Pennsylvania.

The original painting was done in January 1939, by Peter Krehel, a Kulpmont, Pa., high school senior, who now serves the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as the president judge of the Northumberland County courts, in Sunbury, Pa. Judge Krehel worked as a teenager in independent (bootleg) mines with his immigrant father and others.

Judge Krehel's original painting was presented to John L. Lewis, the first president of the United Mine Workers of America, as a symbolic reminder of the historic role of anthracite miners in the founding of the UMW, and as a tribute to the immigrant labor force.●

July 14, 1983

LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH
WILDERNESS AREAS**HON. TOBY ROTH**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from my neighboring district, Mr. OBEY, is today introducing legislation to establish several wilderness areas in Wisconsin. Three of the areas to be designated as wilderness lie within the Nicolet National Forest in my district. Specifically, they are Kimball Creek, Headwaters of the Pine, and Shelp Lake. Altogether, over 20,000 acres of northeastern Wisconsin forest land is involved. Therefore, I am very interested in this bill.

The whole issue of setting aside forest land as wilderness has become intensely controversial, as we have seen in a number of debates here in Congress. Now the courts have also become involved, complicating matters even further. I can therefore appreciate the efforts of everyone involved in working toward a solution for the State of Wisconsin.

However, I am not joining today as a cosponsor of this bill. I feel that I must reserve judgment until more comprehensive studies can be completed on the effects wilderness designation may have on my district, particularly upon the commercial, recreational, environmental, and energy-related interests involved. All factors must be carefully considered, because this proposal, if passed, will set a very important precedent for the treatment of our national lands. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

SOVIET INTERFERENCE WITH
JEWISH EMIGRATION**HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today, on the Capitol steps, I am joining several of my colleagues in a prayer vigil for Soviet Jews. July 14 is the fifth anniversary of the trial of Anatoly Shcharansky who has been serving a 13 year sentence for espionage though his only real crime is a desire to leave the Soviet Union. It is appropriate that we choose July 14 as a day to demonstrate our opposition to Soviet interference in Jewish emigration.

As one who has spoken out often on the issue of respect for human rights, I applaud the gentleman from Colorado for chairing this vigil and the gentlemen from New York and Illinois for organizing it. I would also like to com-

mend the efforts of the Jewish Federation of Orange County and its leaders, including Michael Pinto, Gerald Lasensky, and Chelle Friedman for their work on behalf of Soviet Jews.

Restriction of emigration is not the only problem faced by Jews in the Soviet Union. In general, the position of Jews in Soviet society is deteriorating. The Soviet Government has repressed cultural and religious expression, in what some observers feel is an attempt to destroy the collective memory of the Jewish people. Iosif Begun, a Soviet mathematician, was arrested because his attempts to teach Hebrew were considered anti-Soviet behavior. Antisemitic statements are becoming more prevalent in Soviet publications, including materials that are printed for the young. It is not uncommon for Jews who apply for emigration to be put in administrative limbo and dismissed from their jobs, yet not permitted to leave the Soviet Union.

The rate of emigration by Soviet Jews has reached an alltime low, declining by 97 percent in just 4 years. Jewish emigration reached 51,320 in 1979 but dropped to 2,686 in 1982. If this trend continues, less than 1,200 Soviet Jews will be allowed to emigrate in 1983. The State Department has concluded that the Soviet Government's claim that most Jews who want to leave have already left is false. Interference in Jewish emigration is just one example of human rights violations by the Soviet Union. By demonstrating our support for Anatoly Shcharansky and the right of Soviet Jews to emigrate, we send a proper message to the Soviet Union that the United States stands for justice and decency. ●

SIMON DISCLOSES FINANCES FOR 28TH CONSECUTIVE YEAR AS A PUBLIC OFFICIAL

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I have each year made public my income, assets, and liabilities in detail.

I am inserting in the RECORD those details once again.

REPRESENTATIVE PAUL SIMON DISCLOSES FINANCES FOR 28TH CONSECUTIVE YEAR AS A PUBLIC OFFICIAL

WASHINGTON.—For the 28th consecutive year that he has held public office, Representative Paul Simon, D-Ill., has released a detailed description of his and his family's income, assets and liabilities.

Simon's top personal staff members also released financial statements.

The Illinois congressman's statement lists income for 1982 for himself and his wife, Jeanne, totaling \$102,757.67. The figure includes his House salary, reimbursement for travel and other expenses, rental income, in-

terest and dividend income, honoraria for appearances, and other items.

The Simons had assets of \$493,343.76 and liabilities of \$380,203.13 for a net worth of \$113,140.63.

Simon has been making voluntary financial statements since he became a State representative in 1955. He followed the practice during eight years in the Illinois House, six years in the Illinois Senate, four years as lieutenant governor, and eight years in Congress.

Income for 1982

Income of Paul and Jeanne Simon:	
Salary, U.S. House of Representatives.....	\$60,662.50
Rental income and utilities reimbursement.....	13,630.15
Book royalties.....	1,869.53
Newspaper article.....	100.00
U.S. House of Representatives, expense reimbursement.....	2,888.55
Paul Simon for Congress Committee, expense reimbursement.....	2,282.86

1982 Honoraria and Travel Reimbursement for Appearances:	
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.....	500.00
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.....	49.10
American Council on Education.....	1,000.00
American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.....	500.00
American University.....	300.00
Association of Community College Trustees.....	1,000.00
Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.....	556.15
Brigham Young University.....	511.05
California Association for Bilingual Education.....	500.00
Chabot College.....	1,177.91
Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.....	300.00
City of Louisville.....	252.00
Detroit Educational TV Foundation.....	321.37
Educational Testing Service.....	750.00
First National Bank, Chicago, Illinois.....	779.01
Illinois Association of School Boards.....	142.52
Illinois Council of Community College Administrators.....	1,383.00
Illinois Foreign Language Teachers Association.....	204.00
Interamerican Association of Businessmen.....	500.00
Middlebury College.....	4.38
Mississippi State University.....	1,041.40
National Council of Educational Opportunity Association.....	1,000.00
New York University.....	1,033.45
North Carolina University.....	2,000.00
Northern Colorado University.....	1,205.66
Purdue University.....	547.00
Texas Lutheran College.....	1,009.05
Vanderbilt University.....	260.40
Washington University.....	1,533.65

Dividends:	
American Telephone & Telegraph.....	8.00
Bethlehem Steel.....	6.50
Borg-Warner.....	57.20
Chock Pull of Nuts.....	4.00
Crown-Zellerbach.....	11.85
Fairchild Industries.....	16.00
Fruehauf.....	4.60
Gulf & Western.....	.75
Harper & Row.....	8.00

Lear Ziegler.....	18.00
Massachusetts Investor's Growth.....	23.75
National Steel.....	3.00
Norton Simon.....	6.48
Norton Simon, Preferred.....	1.60
Pepisco.....	36.32
Pacific Gas & Electric.....	143.00
Ralston-Purina.....	9.36
Scott Paper.....	4.00
Texaco.....	42.00
Warner Lambert.....	5.60
Westinghouse.....	7.20
Mutual Real Estate.....	3.75
Interest:	
Bank of Maryland.....	3.64
Dreyfus Fund.....	204.25
Ellis First National Bank.....	6.81
Mid-American Bank, Carbondale.....	21.72
Mobil Corp.....	8.50
General American Life Insurance.....	37.44
University Bank of Carbondale.....	3.34
Franklin Money Fund.....	225.52
Polish National Insurance Co.....	30.80
Total 1982 Income.....	102,757.67

NOTE.—Stock Sale During 1982: Sale of one share of Brunswick Corp. stock, \$30.00, May 2, 1982. Paid \$24.68 for it July 25, 1982. Gain, \$5.32.

Gifts received of more than \$25 value outside of immediate family members: One set Ulysses S. Grant books from the Southern Illinois University Press, precise value not known; one 1822 map of Illinois from Stan Glass, precise value not known; and two Luther medals and one plate from the Martin Luther 500th Anniversary Commission, precise value not known.

Income of Children: Shelia: Total, \$460.94—Interest, Security National Bank, \$24.20; Dividends, AT&T, \$10.80; General Motors, \$24.00; Pacific Gas and Electric, \$11.44; Ralston-Purina, \$39.00; Mutual Real Estate Trust, \$1.50; Honoraria, Wittenberg University, Student Body President, \$350.00. Martin: Total, \$61.10—Dividends, AT&T, \$10.80; General Motors, \$24.00; Illinois Power Company, \$24.80; Mutual Real Estate Trust, \$1.50.

STAFF DISCLOSURES

David Carle, Press Secretary: 1982 income other than government: Wright Patman Congressional Credit Union, interest on shares, \$116.96. Sources and amounts of indebtedness over \$500: Sears, \$682.56. Stocks and Bonds owned: Wright Patman Congressional Federal Credit Union, shares, \$1,247.44; New York Life Insurance policy, \$1,500, face value; Pilgrim Congregational United Church of Christ bearer bond, \$250, 1977 face value. Other property owned: 1976 Chevy Vega, purchased in 1979 for \$1,600; household furnishings, \$1,800.

Ray Johnsen, Office Manager: 1982 income other than government: Rental income, \$13,855; Metropolitan Life, interest, \$56.94; General American Life, interest, \$230.53; Mo. Portland Cement, interest, \$507; Wright Patman Congressional Federal Credit Union, interest, \$.45; General Motors, Inc., dividends, \$75.31; Roodhouse Record, dividends, \$144.00. Sources and amounts of indebtedness over \$500: Washington and Lee Savings & Loan, \$12,853; Illini Federal Savings & Loan, \$24,805; Mary Fairchild, \$16,884. Stocks and Bonds owned: Wright Patman Congressional Federal Credit Union, shares, \$7.31; Cottonwood Junction, 175 shares, \$17,775; U.S. Bonds, Series E, \$1,856.25; Mo. Portland Cement, bonds, \$5,000; Alpha Portland Cement, 24 shares,

\$348; General Motors, 21 shares, \$1,281. Other property owned: State of Illinois Employees Retirement System, \$1,772.01; residence, Arlington, Virginia, \$95,000; home and apartment, Troy, Illinois, \$30,000; duplex, Troy, Illinois, \$37,000; triplex, Springfield, Illinois, \$26,000; household furnishings, \$15,000; 1978 Chevrolet, \$2,000; 1975 Volkswagen, \$1,000.

Vicki Otten, Legislative Director: 1982 income other than government: Commonwealth Edison Stock, dividends, \$130; (Spouse, William H. Barringer, is an attorney with Arter, Hadden and Hemminger, practicing international law. The firm is a registered foreign agent for Japan Iron and Steel Exporters Association, Japan Wire Products Exporters Association, Japan Stainless Steel Exporters Association, Japan Galvanized Iron Exporters Association, Fuji Heavy Industries Limited and El Banco de Brazil.) Sources and amounts of indebtedness over \$500: First Federal Savings & Loan, mortgage, \$119,000; National Bank of Washington, car loan, \$8,000. Stocks and Bonds owned: Commonwealth Edison, 50 shares, \$1,190; Wright Patman Congressional Federal Credit Union, shares \$225. Other property owned: Home in Washington, purchased in 1980 for \$195,000; 1983 Peugeot 505, purchased in 1983 for \$13,000.

Joe Pierce, District Assistant: 1982 income other than government: Jo A. Pierce (wife), salary from the Southern Illinoisian, plus oil royalties and stock dividends, \$14,504; Local Correspondent for Illinois Media Credit Union, \$806; Joe B. Pierce, honoraria for Pastoral supply, \$523. Sources and amounts of indebtedness over \$500: Illinois Media Credit Union, auto, \$2,000; First Bank and Trust, Mt. Vernon, Illinois, personal note, \$2,400; Carterville State & Savings, Carterville, Illinois, real estate, \$44,900. Stocks and Bonds owned: Jo A. Pierce (wife), First Bank & Trust, Mt. Vernon, Illinois, 16 shares, \$256; Lee Enterprises, 24 shares, \$624. Other property owned: Home, 31 Meadowlark, Carterville, Illinois, \$75,000; Property, 700 Meadowbrook, Mt. Vernon, Illinois, (one-half interest), \$20,000; three automobiles, \$6,500.

Net worth statement—Paul and Jeanne Simon, as of January 1, 1983

Assets:	
Security National Bank, checking account	\$206.06
U.S. House of Representatives, checking account	175.54
Ellis First National Bank, savings account..	134.40
U.S. Savings Bonds	1,931.25
University Bank of Carbondale, savings account	87.61
Christian Church of Salem, bond	250.00
General American Life Insurance, cash value...	3,272.11
Polish National Alliance Insurance, cash value...	1,375.10
Congressional Retirement System, cash value	34,836.93
Illinois General Assembly Retirement System, cash value.....	16,233.00
Condominium, Tarpon Springs, Florida, 1979 purchase price	81,000.00
Improvements to Condominium	214.25

Residence, 11421 Falls Road, Potomac, Md., 1974 purchase price	126,000.00
1976-81 Improvements to Potomac home	19,579.20
11.8 acres near Makanda, Illinois, purchase 1978	21,500.00
Home at Makanda property, constructed 1981-82	142,265.00
Improvements to Makanda property	6,683.78
Furniture and Presidential Autograph Collection	18,000.00
1965 Ford Mustang	100.00
1980 Chevrolet	4,000.00

NOTE.—Signed agreement to sell residence in Potomac, Md., December 1983, for \$259,000, but party to whom the title was assigned died. The house is for sale again.

Stock and bond holdings with number of shares:	
AT&T, Preferred, 2	124.50
Bethlehem Steel, 5	96.25
Borg-Warner, 59	2,234.63
Borman's, 8	70.98
Chock Full O'Nuts, 10	140.00
Chrysler, 2	35.50
Crown Zellerbach, 6	176.25
Dreyfus Fund	2,850.00
Fairchild Industries, 20	290.00
Franklin Money Fund	651.05
Fruehauf, 4	113.00
Gulf & Western, 1	16.75
Harper & Row, 10	123.70
Lear Siegler, 8	660.00
International Harvester, 60	255.00
Massachusetts Inv. Growth, 49	876.80
Mutual Real Estate, 25	218.75
National Steel, 2	35.00
Norton Simon, 6	144.00
Norton Simon, Preferred, 1	54.25
Pepsico, 24	858.00
Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 50	1,406.25
Ralston-Purina, 12	210.00
Rohr Industries, 3	42.75
Scott Paper, 4	81.00
Texaco, 14	435.75
United M&M, 8	61.88
Warner Lambert, 4	113.00
Westinghouse, 4	155.49
Jet-Lite, 120 (Approx. value)	300.00
Mobil debenture bond, \$100, 8½%	100.00
IRA Account, 1982	2,569.00

Total assets	493,343.76
Liabilities:	
University Bank, Carbondale, notes	28,500.00
National Bank of Washington, notes	2,200.00
First National Bank of Collinsville, notes	44,762.43
National Savings & Trust, mortgage	84,269.59
Franklin Federal Savings & Loan Assoc., mortgage	59,512.70
Polish National Insurance, loan	1,202.42
General American Insurance, loan	3,021.15
First Federal Savings & Loan, mortgage	136,734.84

Salem National Bank, note	20,000.00
Total liabilities	380,203.13
Assets	493,343.76
Liabilities	380,203.13
Net worth	113,140.63

Assets of children, Sheila and Martin

Sheila:	
AT&T, 2 shares	\$119.75
Ford Motor, 1 share	38.00
General Motors, 10 shares	610.00
Pacific Gas & Electric, 4 shares	112.50
Ralston-Purina, 50 shares	875.00
Mutual Real Estate Trust, 10 shares	87.50
Security National Bank & Trust, checking	781.93
Security National Bank & Trust, savings	356.20
1967 Mustang	300.00
Total	3,280.88
Martin:	
AT&T, 2 shares	119.75
Chrysler Corp., 35 shares	555.62
Ford Motor, 1 share	38.00
General Motors, 10 shares	610.00
Illinois Power Co., 10 shares	236.50
Mutual Real Estate Trust, 10 shares	87.50
Ellis National Bank, checking	145.00
1975 MGB	2,100.00
Total	3,892.37

SPEAKING OUT FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, today many of my colleagues and I took part in a congressional prayer and fast vigil for Soviet Jewry. This day of events dramatized the U.S. continued commitment to defending the rights of Soviet Jews to emigrate from their country and live their lives free from personal and religious persecution. Recent statements from the Soviet Government have indicated that the situation for Jews is deteriorating: allegations that Jews abetted the Nazi's Holocaust and that all the Jews who wish to have left clearly point out the extremity of the Soviet's anti-Semitism.

I call to my colleagues' attention the following article by Seymour Lachman from the New York Times. I encourage every one of my colleagues to consider taking part in the attempts to let these people know they are not forgotten.

SOVIET JEWS NEED HELP

(By Seymour P. Lachman)

The position of the Jews of the Soviet Union is deteriorating rapidly. There is growing harassment and muzzling of cultural and religious expression that is harsh

even by Soviet standards. Yosef Begun, the mathematician, has been arrested and faces a third trial because of his attempt to teach the Hebrew language, which has been interpreted as anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda. Aleksandr Paritsky, an engineer, was arrested, tried and found guilty for the crime of defaming the Soviet state because he organized Jewish cultural and educational activities in the Ukraine.

Many now believe that this oppression is part of a campaign by the Soviet authorities to blot out the collective memory of the Jewish people. Anti-Semitic statements have also become more prevalent in officially authorized newspapers, magazines, books, military publications and even scientific journals.

Recently, "Invasion Without Arms," an officially sponsored anti-Semitic book, was published and republished in 150,000 copies in Moscow. It characterizes the Old Testament of the Bible as, among other things, "an unsurpassed textbook of hypocrisy, treachery, perfidy and moral degeneracy—all the basest human qualities." Even the young have not been spared. In a recent issue of *Pionerskaya Pravda*—an official publication for children under the age of 14—the authorities repeat these anti-Semitic slanders.

As in czarist days, Jews are prevented from entering Soviet universities. Two social scientists, Boris Kanevsky and Valery Sanderov, are in prison for undertaking a study that revealed that Moscow State University practiced anti-Semitism in its admissions policy. Compounding the situation is the fact that Soviet Jewish emigration has practically ceased. Emigration, which had risen to 51,320 in 1979, dropped to 2,688 last year and is down to approximately 100 a month this year. This decline of Soviet Jewish emigration of over 97 percent bears witness to the fact that, more than ever, Russia is still the "prisonhouse of peoples" and in flagrant violation of international agreements, such as the 1975 Helsinki Final Act. The State Department has branded as "patently false" the statement by the newly formed Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee that most Jews who wanted to leave have already left. Our State Department also criticized the Soviet Union for "enlisting people of Jewish ancestry to participate in their anti-Semitic diatribes."

In fact, Soviet policy is even more restrictive than that of czarist Russia, which practiced anti-Semitism but permitted, and at times even encouraged, large-scale emigration. This safety valve no longer exists, even though more than 300,000 Jews have begun the administrative process they hope will lead to departure from the Soviet Union. Some 10,000 of these Jews are now in limbo because, after completing the process, they discovered that their request to leave had been turned down. Many of them are professionals—distinguished scientists, scholars, artists and writers—who have been dismissed from their positions because of their desire to leave. We know them as refuseniks, and they are considered pariahs in Soviet society. The more fortunate have found jobs as building custodians or sweepers in movie theaters. Their creative talents have gone to waste since they are denied access to laboratories, libraries, universities, scientific institutes, scholarly journals and recital halls.

And yet they still have a lifeline to the outside world because the American Government has asked members of its diplomatic corps in the Soviet Union to establish reg-

ular and sustained contact with these refuseniks. This on-going expression of concern and solidarity has helped give the refuseniks a sense of dignity and an awareness that they are not alone. Recently a letter of protest was submitted to the United States Embassy in Moscow because of weekly visits by an American diplomat to Saturday evening gatherings outside the Moscow synagogue. The protest drew a strong response from Ambassador Arthur A. Hartman, who observed that the diplomat was acting on his instructions to gather information that would broaden the embassy's understanding of Soviet and Jewish affairs.

The refuseniks' isolation could be further broken and spirits raised if diplomats from other nations, such as our NATO allies and other democracies in the world, were to establish similar contacts with them.

Until the Soviet Union agrees to halt the persecution of its Jewish minority, it is imperative that free nations raise the issue in all forums. Furthermore, diplomats of all democratic countries stationed in the Soviet Union should be encouraged to meet with refuseniks, thus focusing on their condition and decreasing their isolation.●

A TRIBUTE TO BILL HOBOKAN

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to say a few words in tribute to Bill Hobokan, the former mayor of Hackettstown, N.J.

After his election in 1969, he quickly established a reputation as a tireless worker, devoted to the betterment of the local community. Under his vigorous leadership, the local police department was restructured and a new firehouse was commissioned.

As mayor, Bill Hobokan was both a man of vision and a man of action. He foresaw the long-range benefits of many worthwhile projects, and then devoted himself completely to their fulfillment. He played a vital role in the creation and the establishment of Hackettstown Community Hospital. The zoning change that he authorized enabled the construction of the hospital in a residential area, which otherwise would not have been permitted. This year, Hackettstown Community Hospital will be celebrating its 10th anniversary.

Bill Hobokan was a very popular mayor. His top priority was always the welfare of the community. His constituents had enormous confidence in him. This was shown at the polls, where he was reelected twice. Since that time, he worked at Ashland Chemical, but he has since retired.

Individuals such as my neighbor, Bill Hobokan, are this Nation's greatest resource—the kind of person who sees a job that needs to be done and does it. Indeed, he deserves our recognition and appreciation for his many years of

public service. I know his family and friends would like to join us here today to extend our deepest thanks to Bill and to wish him many years of health and happiness.●

H.R. 2668, CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY AMENDMENTS OF 1983

HON. BUTLER DERRICK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, Congressional reaction to the recent Supreme Court decisions invalidating the legislative veto has been varied. The various committees of the House are beginning to consider a number of options to regain oversight of the rules and regulations promulgated by executive branch agencies to implement the laws passed in this Chamber. Indeed, as you know, the two subcommittees of the Committee on Rules, on which I am privileged to serve, will be holding hearings on this very topic soon after the August recess.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to comment on language added to H.R. 2668, Consumer Product Safety Amendments of 1983, which represents the first attempt to reassert congressional prerogatives and oversight of regulations promulgated by executive agencies, in this case, the Consumer Product Safety Commission. Specifically, I refer to the Levitas amendment which has incorporated into the Shelby/Broyhill amendment in the nature of a substitute, which was subsequently adopted by the House. While I did support the Shelby-Broyhill substitute as policy, I do wish to express my regret that the Levitas amendment was a part of the substitute.

Without question, the Congress is presently burdened with great numbers of minor measures which frustrate the legislative process, and frustrate our ability to deal effectively and expeditiously with more complex and pressing issues. To the extent that the Levitas amendment will require an affirmative act of Congress on every rule promulgated by the Consumer Product Commission, I fear that one of two unfortunate consequences will follow: either the administrative agency will become an advisory panel recommending legislation to the Congress which will not be enacted, or the Congress will become increasingly and overly involved in the formulation of regulations—a responsibility which appropriately rests with the executive branch.

Quite simply, we cannot go about the business of this country if we are to review every rule the Consumer Product Safety Commission issues. Nor will the agency be able to move forward with its mandate to represent

and protect the safety of the public, a mandate which was granted by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I commend both of my friends and colleagues, Mr. LEVITAS and Mr. WAXMAN, for their attempts to deal with this issue. On balance, I believe Mr. WAXMAN's approach is more workable. Moreover, it is my hope that this legislation will return from conference without the Levitas amendment, and that this amendment will not serve as precedent for further authorization measures brought before the House of Representatives.

The importance of the legislative veto, and congressional oversight generally, requires the in-depth and deliberate consideration of the House of Representatives, and not hastily drawn proposals which may well have the effect of emasculating the very executive agencies which we have charged with significant responsibility to safeguard public health and safety.●

CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of the Child Care Assistance Act of 1983, I was particularly gratified to note that H.R. 1, which we passed yesterday, includes an authorization to set up a public housing child care demonstration program. It is past time that we started dealing with this problem at a national level, for there is no question that it has a national impact.

The number of working families faced with a lack of adequate child-care facilities is rapidly growing. Single parents and working mothers, especially those with low incomes, are finding it increasingly difficult to insure that their children are properly supervised. Rather than take risks with their children's well-being, many parents are choosing to stay home themselves. Thus, they are being denied the opportunity to raise themselves out of poverty, and instead have become a part of our vast welfare system, draining billions of tax dollars from our economy each year.

Those who do work—the estimated numbers of working mothers of children under age 18 have increased by about 20 percent since 1977—must, in many cases, leave very young children unsupervised or inadequately supervised for hours at a time. Is it any wonder that there has been, in recent years, an alarming increase in school vandalism, juvenile alcoholism, and a variety of other disruptive and criminal activities?

All this constitutes a terrible cost to our society, both in personal and eco-

nomic terms. Instead of continually bemoaning the fact that so many Americans must depend on public assistance, or that our enshrined concept of the typical American family is being eroded, it is about time we started facing up to the realities of the situation. Economic conditions have changed, traditional family roles have changed, society itself has changed. There are millions struggling to cope with problems a lot of us continue to deny. One of the most serious of these, and one of the most easily corrected, is the lack of adequate child care. There is no question that this is a tremendous factor in the institutionalization and the feminization of poverty. The provisions we have adopted in H.R. 1 constitute both an acknowledgement of this fact and the first steps toward positive action to alleviate the situation.

If we are really concerned about the future of this Nation, we will take action to guard our most precious natural resource—our children. I urge all of you to continue your support for measures which will promote the availability and diversity of quality child-care services for all Americans.●

FAST AND PRAYER VIGIL FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as we pray and fast today on the fifth anniversary of the trial of Anatoly Shcharansky, we should all take the opportunity to reflect on the courage and patience of the Soviet Jews who, year after year, have been denied permission to emigrate. Soviet emigration has slowed to a trickle, just one-twentieth of its 1979 peak.

As worrisome as the signs that the Soviet Government is now attempting to permanently snuff out the religious and cultural life of its Jewish population, whom it would not let go free from the Soviet Union. Soviet Jews are being deliberately isolated. Increasingly, their mail is being intercepted, their telephones disconnected—even radio jamming has increased. The recent formation by the Soviet Government of the so-called Anti-Zionist Committee indicates that the U.S.S.R. is attempting to institutionalize this isolation and the recent crackdown on Jewish culture.

The so-called Anti-Zionist Committee has dismissed the emigration problem as a "juggling of figures by Zionist propaganda." One committee member went so far as to state that Israel executed Nazi war criminal Adolf Eichman "to make sure he would not be seized by another nation and make

public the sacred secrets of cooperation between Zionism and Nazism." Such outrageous propaganda is clearly designed to justify to the Soviet people and to the West a Stalin-like campaign of defamation and terror against Soviet Jews.

I would like to include a special dedication of today's fast and vigil to the Prutkov family. Ludmila, Alexander, and their 10-year-old daughter, Ilona, have sought permission for 9 years to emigrate from the Soviet Union. Alexander Prutkov's parents left the Soviet Union and settled in Michigan 4 years ago in an effort to help their son and his family obtain exit visas.

The Prutkovs apply every 6 months to leave, and every 6 months the Soviet authorities turn them down.

Thousands of Soviet Jews like the Prutkovs wait, enduring uncertainty, harassment, and loss of their jobs. If they speak out, they undergo worse punishment. Today's fast cannot help but remind us of the particular bravery of Anatoly Shcharansky. Shcharansky, a would-be emigre jailed on charges of spying for the United States, spend weeks on a hunger strike in protest of the prison conditions which destroyed his health. Even in prison, even at the risk of his own life, Shcharansky has refused to give up fighting for all those detained and imprisoned in the Soviet Union. His acts stand as a call to us to continue our own efforts on behalf of all those who live in countries where freedom is not a right but a never-ending struggle.●

REASONABLE SETTLEMENT FOR SWAIN COUNTY

HON. JAMES McCLURE CLARKE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the State of North Carolina, and the county of Swain entered into an agreement on July 30, 1943. Now known as the "1943 agreement," it provided that the U.S. Department of the Interior would construct a park standard road, if funds were made available from Congress, from Fontana Dam to the eastern boundary of the 44,000-acre addition to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. Only a small part of this road was ever constructed.

In an effort to resolve the longstanding controversy of the 1943 agreement for the construction of the North Shore Road, the National Park Service and the Swain County Commissioners have negotiated a settlement which could provide appropriate relief to Swain County and could be supported by the U.S. Department of the Interior and Congress. The negotiations led

to the development of the following formula in determining the amount of a cash settlement: The value of the old road now flooded by Fontana Lake (\$1,300,000) compounded annually from 1940 through 1980 at a rate of 5 percent for a total of \$9,609,582. Interior Secretary Cecil D. Andrus endorsed this settlement on November 28, 1980 and signed a document to this effect.

I have introduced a bill today that will resolve the 1943 agreement controversy between the U.S. Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the State of North Carolina, and Swain County. This legislation directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$9.5 million to Swain County and further relieves the county of any further liability to make payments on the principal and interest on a Farmers Home Administration loan secured as a direct result of the 1943 agreement. This legislation implements the fair and reasonable solution which has been reached after years of negotiation.

Tremendous costs have been incurred over the last 40 years trying to resolve this conflict. The man-years and hours of travel have been countless. If no solution is achieved, additional, and unnecessary costs will result.

Based on 1980 dollars, the estimated cost of completing the North Shore Road would be \$91 million. The cost savings of the proposed settlement to the taxpayers we represent would be approximately \$80 million—\$9 for every \$1 spent. A construction-related solution is out of the question in view of our Nation's budgetary situation, but the moral obligation of the U.S. Government to resolve this matter remains.

The legislation I have introduced implements the negotiated settlement and fully resolves the 1943 agreement controversy. Interior Secretary Andrus' decision of the settlement is binding on all parties and should be acted upon in good faith. The people of my district in Swain County acted in good faith in 1943. Now, it is the Government's turn to reciprocate.

The terms of the settlement are fair and reasonable. Congress should move in an expeditious manner to resolve this longstanding conflict. ●

A TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES OLESKE

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, the spread of the tragic disease Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS)

is of serious concern to the medical field and the population in general. This illness suppresses the body's natural immune defense, leaving victims prey to lethal infections, rare cancer, or both. The death toll continues to climb as 50 percent of all AIDS victims die within 1 year of diagnosis. Since 1981, 1,361 Americans have developed AIDS with 520 of the cases resulting in fatality.

I feel it is timely to honor an American who has made a great contribution to the advancement of the research of AIDS.

Dr. James Oleske, a pediatric immunologist at St. Michael's Center in Newark, N.J., has, through his research with infants, made fundamental breakthroughs in the discovery of how AIDS is transmitted. Dr. Oleske encountered immune deficiencies in infants which bore a remarkable resemblance to the AIDS syndrome claiming the lives of certain adult social groups, namely homosexual men, intravenous drug users, Haitian refugees, and hemophiliacs. Through his investigative work, Dr. Oleske discovered that in each of eight cases, the children he was treating lived in households with a family member belonging to one of the AIDS risk groups. This observation sparked his brilliant deduction that AIDS may be transmitted through personal contact: From mother to child during pregnancy or at birth, from transfusions of blood donated by an AIDS victim, or to quote the doctor, by the "kind of loving contacts we all have in a family."

All who come in contact with the doctor are moved by his abounding humanitarianism and dedication. He treats these children and their families with sensitivity and concern. Dr. Oleske ardently fights for increased governmental funding for AIDS research. He and his colleagues were also instrumental in establishing a help line, a call-forwarding system at St. Michael's for suspected AIDS victims.

Dr. Oleske has an impressive record of medical practice. He received his B.S. degree from the University of Detroit, his M.D. from the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry, and a masters degree in Public Health from Columbia University. In addition to his medical practice and laboratory work, Dr. Oleske is an associate professor of pediatrics and director of the Allergy, Immunology, and Infectious Diseases Division at the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey. The doctor so loves children that he finds the time out of his demanding schedule to coach Little League baseball in his hometown of Parsippany, N.J., and to serve as the medical director of "Project Haven," an organization which places adolescent refugee males in foster homes.

Dr. Oleske has won international acclaim for his enormous contributions to the field of medicine. I am particularly proud to represent this renowned physician and great humanitarian. His fervent concern for the good of humanity merits special recognition by this body.

On behalf of my colleagues, I would like to express our unfailing support for Dr. Oleske in his search for an answer to this mysterious disease. He has our admiration and our gratitude. ●

SOVIET JEWS—THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM HAS NOT ENDED

HON. BOBBI FIEDLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege today to fast in support of the congressional vigil for Soviet Jewry. The plight of the Soviet Jewish community has not improved. Immigration has ground to a near-standstill. Repression still remains at the worst level since Stalin. Indeed, portents for the future are even more sinister.

An "Anti-Zionist Committee" has appeared in the Soviet Union, gaining instant notoriety by its pronouncement that all the Jews wishing to leave the Soviet Union had been allowed to leave. This is totally and completely false. This statement tries to deny the very real human tragedy of the thousands of Soviet Jews who have suffered the hardships of becoming refuseniks so that they can live in freedom. "Anti-Zionist Committees" and their ilk are part of the trappings of antisemitism and persecution the world over. I have joined in writing the Soviet Government to express my strong opposition to such a group and all that it stands for.

It was 5 years ago today that Anatoly Shcharansky became a prisoner of conscience. He is still behind barbed wire. But no one in the Soviet Union is free. Ida Nudel is still suffering in domestic exile, far from friends and family, a survivor of years of Siberian imprisonment that resulted from asking for an exit visa. Lev and Elizaveta Shapiro are luckier—they have still been allowed to live in their Leningrad apartment, but are under constant fear of arrest for "parasitism"—the crime, unique to Soviet law, of not having a job—there is no unemployment, of course, in the worker's paradise, so anyone without a job is obviously a parasite. As refuseniks almost automatically lose their jobs upon applying for an exit visa, they are always at risk of being arrested and imprisoned. But all Soviet Jews are continuing to suffer. Not only is religious edu-

cation restricted, religious observances limited, but the threat of even worse repression is always present. Soviet citizens must carry internal passports. Only Jews have their religion officially entered in their passports—unlike Moslems, Baptists, Ukrainian Catholics or any of the other religious groups that have also suffered at the hands of the Soviet regime. In this nightmare world of internal passports, secret police informers, imaginary crimes that come with very real sentences, and a state that does not at times seem to fear anything as much as a few people who want to be free.

The world of the 19th century, with its belief in peace and progress and its contempt for anti-Semitism as the relic of less enlightened days, an evil that, if still existing, could be stamped out by knowledge, would have never even imagined the Soviet Union of today. Nineteenth century society was outraged by the injustice done to one man—Capt. Alfred Dreyfuss. Until justice was finally done, the Dreyfuss affair made front page news throughout the world. Today, in the Soviet Union, we see not one but thousands of people like Dreyfuss, persecuted for any number of crimes under any number of statutes, but for only one reason—for being a Jew. Do we care less than the people of the earlier age who protested injustice done to Dreyfuss? Are we so dehumanized by a century of genocide, autogenocide, and constant, total, warfare that mere humans being simply no longer count? Unless we can truthfully answer "no," we have made for ourselves a future even more perilous than that of Anatoly Shcharansky, Ida Nudel, or Lev Shapiro. We must never cease to care about Soviet Jewry. We must never cease to work for their freedom. People's lives and freedom are at stake, but so is the continuation of our own belief in humanity.

That is why I am fasting today. That is why I have introduced House Resolution 260, calling for freedom for Lev and Elizaveta Shapiro. That is why I will continue to fight for Soviet Jewry.●

STOP SUBSIDIZING SODBUSTING

HON. HANK BROWN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, "Stop Subsidizing Sodbusting" is the title of an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post of July 13.

"Sodbusting" is the plowing up and farming of marginal lands. Erosion on such lands is so excessive that the soil disappears faster than it can be replaced by natural processes.

Current Federal farm programs implicitly encourage the cultivation of marginal lands and, thus, the degradation of our soil resources. The Post editorial makes a strong case for the passage of legislation Senator BILL ARMSTRONG and I have introduced (S. 669/H.R. 1077) that proposes to reduce Federal incentives to farm these highly erodible lands.

I would like to have the editorial reprinted here in the RECORD. I hope my House colleagues will agree with it and become cosponsors of H.R. 1077.

STOP SUBSIDIZING SODBUSTING

In recent years, record surpluses have sent farm prices plummeting and forced the federal government into increasingly expensive subsidies to support farm income. Meanwhile, precious topsoil is eroding at a faster rate than in the Dust Bowl days of the 1930s. Should the government be encouraging farmers to bring new, fragile cropland into production?

Sen. Bill Armstrong (R-Colo.) has drawn the obviously correct conclusion that such encouragement makes no sense at all. Together with 28 cosponsors, he is pushing a bill that would stop all government subsidies to persons who cultivate previously unplowed land determined by the Agriculture Department to be highly susceptible to erosion.

After 45 years of government soil conservation programs, erosion is a more serious problem than ever before. The Agriculture Department estimates that every year more than 5 billion tons of topsoil are lost through erosion, a loss that can ultimately turn current farm surpluses into future deficits. The reasons for this loss are not technical—soil conservation techniques are highly developed—but economic. They arise primarily from the incentives that farm subsidies provide for ever more intensive and extensive cultivation of farmland.

Sodbusting, the plowing up of marginal grazing land for wheat farming, is one of the most pernicious practices encouraged by current policies. Enticed by the prospect of subsidies that can immediately double the value of grazing land, speculators have been plowing millions of acres. Farmers who buy the land can claim subsidies for their contribution to the nation's wheat surpluses or they can take their land out of production and get paid by the government for their forbearance. Once plowed, the fragile topsoil blows or washes away.

Farm groups have traditionally opposed linking subsidies to their methods of cultivation. But grasslands destruction has become such a threat that almost every major farm organization has joined with conservation groups in supporting Sen. Armstrong's measure and a companion bill introduced by Rep. Hank Brown in the House. The measure is also supported by the administration, which is trying to focus soil programs—long a favorite source of congressional pork barrel—more closely on areas that need help and on practices that foster conservation rather than increased production.

Last year, a similar measure was killed on technical grounds in an appropriations bill conference. This year, Sen. Armstrong hopes that prompt action by the Senate Agriculture Committee, which is scheduled to take up the matter today, and a strong supporting vote in the Senate will encourage the House to move quickly as well. Time is important. There are 250 million acres of

unplowed land at risk, and farmers will soon be making their planting decisions for next year.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to official business, I was unable to be present during part of the proceedings Tuesday, July 12. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall 238, the Walker amendment to H.R. 10.●

INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING THROUGH SPORTS EXCHANGE

HON. GUY V. MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, the path to understanding and cooperation among nations is not an easy one, but I am pleased to report that some very special young people are doing their best to help.

During the last 2 weeks of July, young people from the Tokyo Nanshiki baseball team will be touring the New York area, along with the New York Friendship team, as part of the New York-Tokyo Sister City program.

This is the 20th year of the sister city program, and the third year that such an exchange has taken place. Last year, young people from the New York area visited Tokyo, and surely that experience will be remembered fondly all their lives.

The goal of the program, Mr. Speaker, is to foster understanding and cooperation, not only between New York and Tokyo, but among all nations and peoples. And what better way to do so than through the sportsmanship and spirit of athletics? And what better people to be ambassadors of good will than young people, the leaders of tomorrow?

I am proud to say that the Tokyo team and the New York Friendship team will be playing against All Star teams representing part of my district, Staten Island, on July 21, at the Snug Harbor Little League fields.

I hope their stay on Staten Island is memorable, and I am pleased that Staten Island has had a role to play in furthering the cause of understanding, cooperation and peace.●

July 14, 1983

CONGRESSIONAL FAST AND
PRAYER VIGIL FOR SOVIET
JEWRY

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I join with many of my colleagues in the national congressional fast and prayer vigil for Soviet Jewry. Today's vigil, which coincides with the fifth anniversary of the trial of Anatoly Shcharansky, is designed to let the Soviet authorities know that we will not be silent as long as they continue to violate international agreements by refusing to permit the thousands of Soviet Jews the right to emigrate.

The situation for Soviet Jewry is becoming increasingly grave. Emigration has come to a virtual standstill as official Soviet antisemitic campaigns have increased in scope and intensity. The Soviet authorities are employing harsher measures than ever before to deny the Jews of the Soviet Union the right to emigrate and the right to openly maintain their Jewish identity and culture without fear of punishment.

The rate of Jewish emigration is at an all-time low. In 1982, only 2,692 Jews emigrated, a 95-percent decline from 1979, when 51,329 Jews emigrated. Even more ominously, only 639 Jews have been permitted to leave the Soviet Union during the first 6 months of this year. The 102 Jews permitted to emigrate during the entire month of June 1983 were significantly fewer than the average number of Jews who left per day in 1979, the peak year for emigration. If the present trend continues, fewer than 1,300 Jews will be permitted to emigrate this year—a decline of more than 50 percent over the rate of emigration in 1982.

As I mentioned, today marks the fifth anniversary of the trial and conviction on trumped-up espionage charges of Anatoly Shcharansky, the man who for so many of us has come to symbolize the Soviet emigration movement.

Despite the ceaseless efforts of his wife Avital and thousands of concerned people around the world, Anatoly Shcharansky remains in Chistopol prison, where his health continues to deteriorate as a result of the harsh treatment he has received. Shcharansky endured a lengthy hunger strike last year to protest his persecution and treatment. Shcharansky's crime is his desire to live as a Jew in Israel with his wife. He has said many times that he would gladly trade his activist's life if only he were permitted to emigrate and be reunited with Avital, from whom he was forcibly separated the day after their 1974 wedding. De-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

spite the pleas of so many, though, Shcharansky's treatment in prison remains harsh.

Viktor Brailovsky has long been persecuted for daring to live openly as a Jew and for trying to exercise his right to emigrate to Israel. He is currently serving the third year of a 5-year sentence of internal exile following a conviction of charges of defaming the Soviet state. His crime was his involvement as a Jewish scientist with other Jews who have been harassed and isolated from the mainstream of their professions because they dared to express their Jewish identity and applied to emigrate. A prominent computer scientist, Dr. Brailovsky organized the Moscow Seminar for Jewish Scientists, a group of eminent Soviet refuseniks and Western scientists who met each Sunday to discuss recent advances in their respective fields. Dr. Brailovsky's publication of a cultural journal entitled "Jews in the Soviet Union" and his signing, with 200 other refuseniks, a written appeal to the late President Brezhnev requesting free emigration for Soviet Jews, were the activities that led to his latest conviction and 5-year exile. He has repeatedly been denied application to emigrate to Israel. His declining health concerns his friends and family, but they were informed that his sentence will not be reduced. I would urge my colleagues who have not already done so to join 82 other Members of Congress in cosponsoring House Resolution 118, which I have introduced, which urges the Soviet authorities to allow Dr. Brailovsky and his family to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel.

The persecution of Shcharansky and Brailovsky and the thousands of refuseniks violates international obligations the Soviets agreed to in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki Final Act. It is imperative for our Government to do everything in its power to secure the release of Shcharansky, Brailovsky, Yosef Begun, and the other prisoners of conscience, and to guarantee the right of all Jews to emigrate from the Soviet Union.

Countless refuseniks have stressed that their greatest hope has come from knowing that so many people around the world, and particularly in the United States, continue to be vigilant and to express their outrage at Soviet human rights violations. Through our solidarity with Soviet Jews, through our prayers and fasting today, and by continuing to speak out forcefully on their behalf, I believe that we will hasten the day when Shcharansky, Brailovsky, Begun, and so many others will be free, and that all Jews who wish to emigrate and to live freely as Jews will finally be able to do so. ●

19381

SOVIET JEWRY

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in the observance of the congressional prayer vigil for Soviet Jewry. As the leader of the free world, it is incumbent upon the United States to speak out on behalf of this persecuted people so that they may one day enjoy those freedoms which we treasure so highly. It would be tragic to sit by and watch these flagrant violations of human rights without voicing our strong objections.

The atrocities perpetrated against Jews living in the U.S.S.R. are too numerous to mention in one brief statement. But, by way of illustration, I would like to relate one case which is representative of this tragic situation, the case of Mark Nashpitz.

Mark was only 8 years old when his father defected from the Soviet Union in 1956. He grew up with his mother in Moscow, studied, qualified and worked as a dentist. In 1971, Mark and his mother, Ita, submitted their first applications for exit visas, but were turned down immediately with the excuse that they must be punished for his father's betrayal of the motherland.

In March of 1972, Nashpitz was called up for military reserve duty. He refused to serve because it would be against his conscience to serve in the Soviet Army after he had already renounced his Soviet citizenship in anticipation of emigrating to Israel. As punishment, he was sentenced to 1 year of physical labor to rectify his "perverted ways."

Upon his return to Moscow, Nashpitz was continually harassed and constantly followed by the KGB. In the summer of 1974, Mark's mother was finally permitted to leave for Israel. Several months later, the KGB promised Nashpitz an exit visa if he would agree to collaborate and spy on Jewish activists who had applied for exit visas. Even though he was warned that his refusal would lead to his arrest on a fabricated charge, he refused.

On February 24, 1975, Nashpitz was one of nine Jews who staged a peaceful demonstration outside the Lenin Library in Moscow carrying banners in support of freedom for Soviet Jews. Within 30 seconds the KGB forcibly broke up the demonstration and arrested Mark. He was sentenced to 5 years of internal exile in a remote Siberian village over 6,000 miles from Moscow for "disturbing the public order."

When he returned to Moscow in June 1979, Nashpitz sought emigration visas and was again refused. On March

23, 1980, Mark and his pregnant wife, Ludmilla, were expelled from Moscow for the third time.

He settled in Strunino but has been denied the opportunity to practice dentistry. The only job he has been given is a paper shuffling position in a mortuary. The harassment by the KGB continues to this day.

Mr. Speaker, Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union has reached its lowest point since 1971. Throughout the 1970's we observed a steady increase in Jewish emigration, reaching a high point in 1979 of 51,320. Yet, now emigration has been almost completely cut off. It is estimated that there are over 500,000 Soviet Jews, like Mark, who desperately want to emigrate if only the Soviet authorities would consent.

It is important for us to keep the pressure on the Soviet Union to honor the commitments it made under the Helsinki accords 8 years ago. This agreement compels all signatory nations to "respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion, or belief."

The accord also states that each nation will "work in a positive and humanitarian spirit with the applications of persons who wish to reunite with members of their family," and that signatory nations would "process applications in this field as expeditiously as possible." On every count, the Soviet Union has flagrantly violated this agreement. Even worse, the Soviet Union has apparently embraced anti-Semitism as a cornerstone of national policy.

For these reasons, it is imperative that we continue to remind the Soviet Union of our concern about the plight of the Soviet Jews. This issue must be stressed at every opportunity, and we should encourage our allies to do the same. This is the only way to send the correct message to the Soviet Government of our commitment to human rights. I urge my colleagues to continue to lend their voices to the cause of Soviet Jewry.●

RELIEF FROM MIDYEAR IMPOSITION OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS ON PUBLIC HOSPITALS

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to relieve a serious problem faced by public hospitals and the governments which operate them.

Earlier this year, Congress adopted the Social Security Amendments of 1983. As part of this legislation, we enacted a new prospective method of re-

imbursing hospitals and other providers for medicare services. In general, the prospective reimbursement system becomes effective at the beginning of a hospital's fiscal year. However, the requirements addressed by the legislation I am introducing were made effective October 1, 1983. In the case of hospitals with July to June fiscal years, these requirements become effective in mid-fiscal year. Midyear compliance will produce no measurable benefit to the Federal Government. But it will impose very real burdens on affected local and State governments.

In the past, a number of hospitals have contracted out for the performance of certain services, such as laboratory services. In these cases, the contractor was allowed to bill part B of medicare directly, and the contractor's charges then were not reflected in the hospital's budget.

The social security amendments continue to permit such contracting relationships. To achieve uniformity in billing procedures, however, the new law generally requires services provided under contract to be billed to the hospital and through the hospital to part A of medicare. The costs of these services thereby become part of the hospital's budget. This new requirement is made effective on October 1, 1983, even though the compliance date may fall within the middle of a hospital's fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen firsthand the impact this is having on Hunt Memorial Hospital, the municipal hospital in the town of Danvers in my own congressional district, which for 4 years has contracted for the operation of its hospital laboratory. The hospital is the largest component of the Danvers town budget, and like the town has a July fiscal year. Compliance with the law as it stands now would require the town to go through an extraordinary and difficult procedure for amending its budget which would certainly include a special town meeting. It will be very hard to explain to the citizens of Danvers why this is necessary. Moreover, constraints on increases in local spending and revenues imposed by Massachusetts law could mean that reductions will be required in other municipal services to offset increases in the hospital's budget. I must add that it is not at all clear, at this point, that medicare will be willing to reimburse all the added costs. There difficulties are compounded in my own State by the need to adjust the State's own cost containment program for the substantial federally mandated increase in the hospital's budget.

The social security amendments do authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to grant a hardship waiver extending the compliance date. But to date no procedures to grant

these waivers have been established by the Department, and despite my repeated urging, the Department has not assured communities like Danvers that mid-fiscal year compliance will not be required.

Sound local budgeting requires assurances that sufficient time will be allowed for orderly local budget procedures to be followed. I am at a loss to understand the Department's reluctance to grant these assurances. If the Department will not act, the Congress should.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which I am introducing does not ask permanent or lengthy relief from the new law for public hospitals. All it asks is that the changes in reimbursement policy which I have described be imposed at the end of the municipality's fiscal year rather than in the middle of it. This legislation will have no effect on the medicare budget. All it will do is show decent respect by the Federal Government for the budget procedures of governments.

I urge the support of my colleagues for this needed legislation. And I urge the Department to act now so as to make this legislation unnecessary.●

A SPECIAL ELECTION IN CALIFORNIA COSTING \$17 MILLION IS "A BAD SCENE"

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, California Assemblyman Don Sebastiani has used his vast personal resources to draw up, and get qualified, yet another reapportionment plan for California State and Federal elected officials. His plan would do all possible to get rid of the Democratic plan. Common Cause has labeled this Republican version as no improvement at all.

Now Assemblyman Sebastiani and others are lobbying Governor George Deukmejian to call a \$17 million special election a few days before Christmas!

What a spectacle of waste. As the Los Angeles Times said in its editorial on July 14th:

...the Democrats are right about one thing. As Common Cause sees it, the Sebastiani mischief is just another gerrymandering that would be approved or rejected by only a handful of Californians.

Common Cause estimates that as few as 10 percent of the state's voters would go to the polls two weeks before Christmas. As the citizens' group points out, even turning out that many voters would cost millions of dollars; politicians who are already in hock to contributors would be in absolute bondage by December.

Deukmejian did not start the fight, either, but he can stop it. Going ahead with a spe-

cial election on Dec. 13 would be a partisan power play without equal in recent gubernatorial history.

Governor Deukmejian owes all Californians (60 percent of whom are Democrats) better government service than this, especially in a State with severe budget problems and where education should be the No. 1 priority. No wonder the L.A. Times calls this "A Bad Scene".

CONGRESSIONAL FAST AND PRAYER VIGIL FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● **Mr. GILMAN.** Mr. Speaker, it is a sad commentary that Members of this body must continually remind ourselves and others of the inequities being perpetuated by the Soviet Union against its Jewish citizens. We participate today in the Congressional Fast and Prayer Vigil for Soviet Jewry as an example of our alliance with the thousands of innocent men and women who have been harassed, arrested, or convicted of the simple "crime" of wishing to emigrate.

What these individuals desire is no more than liberty, an ephemeral concept that we in the United States are privileged to enjoy. Today is also Bastille Day, when the cry, "Liberté, égalité, fraternité!" became the banner that the French citizenry raised so many years ago. Their desire for freedom is being celebrated today. It is ironic that only those Soviet Jews who have emigrated can speak these words, since their compatriots and coreligionists behind the Iron Curtain cannot.

This fast and prayer vigil is meant to highlight the sorry state of affairs thousands of Soviet Jews find themselves in daily. Each of us has been asked to fast on behalf of a particular prisoner of conscience, and today I fast for Mark Nashpitz. Mark has been a refusenik for well over a decade, and was in exile for several years after having been convicted for demonstrating with placards in front of the Lenin Library in Moscow. He married while in Siberia, and after serving his sentence, tried to return to Moscow, yet was denied a residency permit. To make matters even worse, Ludmilla, Mark's wife, was refused hospital care during her term of pregnancy, because they were not registered as residents of any locality. Since his release, Mark has still not been allowed to emigrate, and has been the target of continued KGB harassment.

Mr. Speaker, Mark Nashpitz is, however, still a prisoner—in the prison of the Soviet Union. We must make sure that Americans know about Mark's plight, and that of other Soviet Jews

who continue to cry out for justice and liberty. This congressional vigil is only one part of our efforts in their behalf.

I recently learned that Anatoly Shcharansky has finally been allowed a visit by his mother and brother. His health is still uncertain, as he has not yet regained the substantial weight lost during his hunger strike. I recently wrote to Soviet Premier Yuriy Andropov, but have received no reply regarding Anatoly's condition. I hope that in the spirit of the Helsinki Accords the Soviet authorities will allow both Mark and Anatoly to emigrate, having endured so much suffering.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to work for the emigration of all who so desire, mindful of Thomas Jefferson's words: "My God! How little do my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of, and which no other people on earth enjoy." Freedom of thought and deed are certainly the most prized of blessings. Let us renew our dedication today, and every day, until they are all free.

SECRETARY-GENERAL'S MESSAGE ON INTERNATIONAL DAY OF SOLIDARITY WITH STRUGGLING PEOPLE OF SOUTH AFRICA

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● **Mr. WOLPE.** Mr. Speaker, on June 16 the international community commemorated the International Day of Solidarity with the Struggling People of South Africa. On that occasion U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar issued a statement calling for the peaceful eradication of apartheid and the end of the consequent suffering of the people of South Africa. I commend the statement of the Secretary General to the attention of my colleagues.

SECRETARY-GENERAL'S MESSAGE ON INTERNATIONAL DAY OF SOLIDARITY WITH STRUGGLING PEOPLE OF SOUTH AFRICA

Following is the text of a message by Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Struggling People of South Africa (16 June):

The observance of the International Day of Solidarity with the Struggling People of South Africa demonstrates the commitment of the United Nations to a basic principle of its Charter: namely, the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race or gender, language or religion. Through the institution of apartheid and the repressive practices which follow from it, this principle is most pointedly challenged in South Africa. The International Day is, therefore, an expression of the unwavering resolve of the international community to answer the challenge.

This year the Day carries a special and most poignant meaning. It is being observed in the tragic shadow of the carrying out of death sentences against three members of the African National Congress of South Africa despite the calls of the Security Council that the sentences be commuted and my own urgent appeal to this effect. The continued tensions and turmoil in the whole southern African region and the escalation of violence bear witness to the urgency of breaking a vicious circle which not only causes widespread suffering and bitterness but also has ominous implications for international peace and security.

Precisely because the situation is fraught with grave dangers, I believe it is most important to preserve international solidarity in support of the just struggle of the people of South Africa to reclaim what is their birthright. This solidarity derives strength from the abhorrence of racial discrimination felt world-wide and from the shared conviction that, without racial harmony and justice, there can be no assurance of peace. The international community cannot afford to break ranks over the issue and thus unwittingly offer encouragement to those who, against all ultimate odds, would still maintain the iniquitous institutions of racism. Besides symbolizing our dedication to the principles enshrined in the Charter, the International Day should also remind us of the special responsibility of the United Nations to devise peaceful means for bringing about the abandonment of apartheid and ending the consequent suffering of the people of South Africa.

I wish to commend the Special Committee against Apartheid for the sincerity and determination with which it continues to carry out its mandate.

AFDC BENEFITS FOR NEEDY PREGNANT WOMEN

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● **Mrs. KENNELLY.** Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would amend the changes made in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 affecting needy pregnant women. Before fiscal year 1982, women pregnant for the first time in over half the States could receive AFDC assistance, and medicaid coverage, as soon as pregnancy was medically confirmed. OBRA eliminated the option of States to provide AFDC benefits to these women, except in the third trimester. I am firmly convinced that it is critical to take into account the needs of pregnant women earlier than the last trimester in order to safeguard the eventual well-being of the children involved. My bill would provide AFDC from the time the pregnancy was medically confirmed. For the benefit of my colleagues interested in this issue, I am inserting in the Record the text of my bill:

H.R. 3574

To amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to eliminate the present restrictions (added in 1981) on the payment of aid to families with dependent children in cases involving pregnant women

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 406(b) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "payments with respect to a dependent child" and all that follows down through "families with dependent children", in the matter preceding clause (1), and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "payments with respect to a dependent child or dependent children (including payments to meet the needs of a pregnant woman in any case where a child born as a result of such pregnancy, if he or she had been born and was living with his or her mother in the month of payment, would be eligible for aid to families with dependent children)".

(b) Section 406(g) of such Act is repealed. Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to months after the month in which this Act is enacted.●

GOP LEADERSHIP FINDS RISE IN INTEREST RATES UNWARRANTED

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of speculation recently in the press as to whether the Federal Reserve should deliberately raise interest rates by tightening its monetary policy.

The House Republican leadership has considered the arguments put forward in favor of such a policy, and does not find them convincing. As the Nation—and the world—learned from painful experience in 1979-82, the magnitude of the M1 definition of the domestic money supply is not a reliable indicator, by itself, of proper monetary policy. And no other major indicator indicates an imminent resurgence of inflation. Under these circumstances, significant tightening of monetary policy does not appear to be warranted. The leadership has said so in a letter to Federal Reserve Board Chairman Paul Volcker. I would like to submit the letter to the attention of my colleagues.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1983.

HON. PAUL VOLCKER,
Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are deeply concerned about published reports that the Federal Open Market Committee is seriously considering a tightening of monetary policy and a raising of interest rates. We believe it would be ill-advised for the following reasons.

Concern has focused on the growth of M1 or on the strength of the economic recovery as supposed harbingers of renewed infla-

tion. But we must reject the notion that too much economic growth is the cause of inflation; and in fact the current recovery remains below the post-war norm. Moreover, as you know from the Federal Reserve's recent experience with money supply targets, the M1 definition of the money supply, taken by itself, has been quite misleading as an indicator of monetary policy. Because changes in the demand for money were not adequately anticipated, the kind of upward "nudges" in interest rates and "modest" restrictions of the money supply which are now contemplated became unintentionally contractionary.

Almost every other indicator besides M1 fails to support the wisdom of a rise in interest rates. The dollar has risen and remains quite strong against the strongest foreign currencies. The prices of gold and other sensitive commodities have remained stable if not soft—indicating the absence of speculation on future inflation. The growth of M3 has slowed over the past eight months, at the same time as M1 accelerated. And even M1 shows recent signs of slowing without a rise in the discount rate.

We pledge our best efforts to bring about reductions in the growth of federal spending which, unlike substantial tax increases, would reduce the total burden of government on the economy. And the economic recovery itself will diminish fiscal pressure by expanding the tax base and diminishing unemployment-related spending.

The jobs and hopes of Americans must not be dashed out of abstract concern for one arbitrary measure of the money supply. The current recovery has barely returned the economy in real terms to its 1979 level, and industrial production remains far below it. The recovery must not be needlessly jeopardized by an unnecessary rise in interest rates.

We, and a great many of our colleagues, would look with extreme disfavor upon any increase in the discount or federal funds rates at this time.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. MICHEL,
TRENT LOTT,
JAMES G. MARTIN,
PHILIP M. CRANE,
JACK KEMP,
DICK CHENEY,
GUY VANDER JAGT,
Members of Congress.●

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY'S NORMAN THAGARD MEMBER OF CHALLENGER CREW

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the five members of the crew that flew the seventh American space shuttle mission will be in Washington next week for well-deserved tributes.

Challenger's second flight included a number of firsts. It was the largest crew of astronauts, one more than any previous flight. The first American woman in space was a member of the crew.

Commanded by Bob Crippen, making his second shuttle flight, the first person to do so, the 100-ton craft

performed flawlessly. Pilot of the mission was a talented newcomer to space, Rick Hauck.

Great attention was focused on Sally Ride as she worked with John Fabian in perfectly operating their assigned experiments.

And, last, but not least, Floridians are proud that another of its own, Dr. Norman Thagard, rounded out the crew. I think you will pardon the justifiable pride I have in having a crew member who was born in Marianna, Fla., only a short distance from the family farm on which I grew up. Another point of special pride is that Dr. Thagard attended Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla., in my district.

We were disappointed that plans to land at Cape Canaveral had to be scrubbed. This would have been the first landing in Florida. However, Florida continues to be the spaceport to the stars and the professional manner in which NASA handled this problem only accentuates the high regard I have for all of those connected with our space program.

We have only begun.

Space shots will become more and more routine. Another link in the chain has been forged. My congratulations to each member of the crew, as well as my commendation to those who controlled the flight from the ground. It was a tremendous accomplishment.

Since I am proud of Florida State University, I felt it would be appropriate to reprint a column by Mary Ann Lindley which appeared in the Tallahassee Democrat just prior to the flight.

It is a tremendous tribute to a very outstanding Seminole.

SEMINOLE IS ABOARD STARSHIP CHALLENGER

When someone we know or once knew soars to fame, the urge to examine common bonds is irresistible. We try to piece together the combination of luck, pluck and ingenuity that worked its magic, hoping to discover what caprice caused the ascent starward.

So it is with Dr. Norman Thagard, who at dawn Saturday will begin a million-mile journey aboard the spaceship Challenger. He'll be joining an elite group of history-making spaceblazers, but in some ways Thagard's extraordinary climb to the ranks of the nation's astronaut corps began here in his native North Florida.

Thagard, who will be 40 on July 3, was born in Marianna, grew up in Jacksonville and spent most of the '60s at Florida State University working on degrees in engineering science. He also spent a good bit of time trying to convince his future mother-in-law that a special-education major named Kirby Johnson would not do badly to marry him.

That was 18 years ago. Tuesday, Kirby's unusual-named mother, Rex Johnson of Dallas, said with a laugh that "it seems to have worked out beautifully."

Her only fears, she said, had been that her daughter, then a sophomore, might "get pregnant and quit school." (Two degrees

later, she did, and today the Thagards have Gordon, 15, Jimmy, 12, and Daniel, 3.)

Speaking from the Betton Hills home where she is visiting her mother, Rex Withers, the astronaut's mother-in-law described Thagard as "a really nice guy and terribly, terribly bright."

How bright? Two close friends from FSU days describe Norm Thagard's brainpower with unstinting admiration. "Norm typifies the Renaissance man," says Gerald Lopez, who roomed with Thagard at Florida State's Southern Scholarship and Research Foundation House while the two were undergraduates.

Lopez went on to become general counsel to the Nevada Legislature and is one of the select guests invited to liftoff and touchdown festivities. He says Thagard has "had an interest in math and science, but also in world affairs and politics. He played the cello and had been in his high-school orchestra. He has built three computers, from scratch, as a hobby."

"I once asked him the purpose for those computers, and he said it was simply to learn how to build them," said Lopez. He recalls Thagard had come close to earning his Ph.D. in engineering at Florida State when the engineering program closed. "Undaunted, Norm decided to begin studies to be a doctor. He went to the University of Texas Southwestern Medical School in Dallas, and while he was establishing residency in Texas, he worked as a nuclear engineer."

"Norm had been flying Phantom jets for the Navy during the Vietnam War," says Lopez's brother Cecil, another college friend who now works with Florida's Department of Transportation. "I recall being extremely opinionated about the war, very anti-war, but Norm was very tolerant. He was not gung ho military."

Gerald Lopez, who spoke with Thagard a few days ago before the astronauts became incommunicado, said Thagard seemed to have "no trepidation whatsoever" about riding the 100-ton spaceplane on the seventh space-shuttle mission.

"He had a number of close calls, probably more dangerous than this, while flying jets during the war. Once he flew an aircraft to Okinawa on 'dead reckoning'—that means all the instruments went dead. But Norm had the mathematical senses and the ability to fly the plane on in. These people are unbelievably calm in the face of what could be impending disaster."

As a physician, Thagard will be an on-the-spot investigator of the space sickness that has plagued seven of the 16 shuttle astronauts. Performing most of the experiments on himself, Thagard will attempt to understand more about the body's system of balance, visual stimulations and pressure inside the skull.

"The mind tells you that you're in a particular situation, but the senses disagree," says Lopez. "Norm told me he hopes to see what in the world is causing that."

Or beyond the world, as the case may be. Thagard will take a symbol of his North Florida roots with him into space. The Challenger's official flight kit will include a Florida State pennant, according to FSU spokesman Mike Beaudoin.

In a hand-written note thanking FSU for the items, Thagard told Beaudoin that he felt his "professional career really started at FSU" and that he is "more of an FSU sports fan now than when I attended."

"I am proud to carry aloft the pennant of the Florida State University," Thagard wrote, adding that "although it will fly

more than a million miles, we'll try to bring it back in good shape." ●

CONGRESSIONAL FAST AND PRAYER VIGIL FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. Au COIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to express my support for the Congressional Fast and Prayer Vigil for Soviet Jewry. I commend my colleagues, Mr. PORTER and Mr. MRAZEK for organizing this display of concern for the victims of Soviet oppression.

This event marks the fifth anniversary of Anatoly Shcharansky's trial, in which he was found guilty of "treason" and "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" and sentenced to 13 years in labor camp for crimes he did not commit. Indeed, his only crime is his desire to see his family and emigrate to Israel to join his wife, Avital.

Despite the protests of human rights activists and his wife, the Soviet authorities show no signs of releasing Mr. Shcharansky in the near future. The Soviet authorities may be able to imprison Shcharansky, but they cannot imprison his cause and what he stands for. His plight represents the struggle of thousands of Soviet Jews and refuseniks who seek to assert their fundamental human rights and emigrate from the U.S.S.R.

We in the United States are watching with alarm a startling decline in Soviet Jewish emigration. Last month, fewer than 116 Jews were allowed to leave the Soviet Union—this is less than the number of Jews permitted to leave on an average day during the peak year of 1979. Last year, only 2,700 Jews left compared to the departure of more than 50,000 in 1979.

The National Conference on Soviet Jewry estimates that by the late 1970's, at least 300,000 Jews had asked relatives abroad to send invitations to emigrate. Of those 300,000, only about 33,000 have been permitted to leave the country in the last 2 years.

Unfortunately, these figures do not even tell the whole story. All too often, Soviet authorities hold up the critical invitation from a relative abroad without which the arduous process of applying for exist visas cannot begin. And so, Soviet Jews are caught in a vicious circle. No mail, no letter. No letter, no application. No application, no chance to leave.

We are also watching with distress a fundamental qualitative change in the lives of Soviet Jews. Jewish cultural activity and religious observances are being attacked with frightening vengeance. What is worse is that the Soviet Government appears to be intensify-

ing its efforts to discredit Soviet Jewry and stir up anti-Semitism through its new government-sanctioned "Anti-Zionist Committee." The committee alleges that virtually all Jews who have wished to emigrate from the Soviet Union have done so. This is clearly not what we hear from those like Anatoly Shcharansky and others seeking freedom and emigration from the Soviet Union.

In February, I sponsored House Concurrent Resolution 63 with my colleague from Connecticut, BARBARA KENNELLY, to promote the cause of Soviet Jewry. I am encouraged by the strong bipartisan support my resolution has received from nearly one-half of the House and am more determined than ever to pursue this resolution to successful passage. Just a few weeks ago, the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Human Rights favorably reported out the resolution. The more Members of Congress who join me in this pursuit, the more likely the Soviet Union will sit up and take notice.

We know that despite grave risk, there are many within the Soviet Union who continue to speak out, to protest and virtually put their lives on the line for human rights and freedom. As they maintain their vigil, we in the West must maintain ours. So, as we mark with sadness yet another year of the imprisonment of Anatoly Shcharansky, it is only fitting that we demonstrate the U.S. commitment to Soviet Jewry and human justice by expressing our support and solidarity with Soviet Jews. ●

NATIONAL FAST AND VIGIL ON BEHALF OF SOVIET JEWRY

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to join with many of my colleagues in the national fast and prayer vigil. I feel very strongly that gatherings of this nature demonstrate to the world that our Nation will not condone the Soviet leadership's non-adherence to basic human rights agreements.

In 1975, the Soviet Union, along with the United States and 16 other nations, signed the Helsinki agreement which sought to promote a more global recognition of human rights. While the United States has consistently lived up to its part of the agreement, this cannot be said of the Soviet Union. In the past few years, the Soviets have stepped up their war of internal repression, and as a result, the number of Jews allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union has dropped off to a mere handful. This is both shocking and deliberate.

Under the Soviet regime the Jewish population has declined steadily. The terms programs, concentration camps and gulags have come to symbolize a century of suffering by the Jewish people in the Soviet Union. Today, a Jewish person in the Soviet Union is regarded as a second-class citizen. They are harassed, they have few privileges, and their activities are closely monitored. For many the only hope was emigrating to a better life in either Israel or the United States. The 1975 Helsinki agreements brought this hope nearer to reality as it supposedly ushered in a new period of understanding and progress. However, as each year passed the number of Jews allowed to emigrate has dropped off steadily.

Today's demonstration of prayers and fasting symbolizes our Nation's continuing commitment to furthering human rights for all oppressed peoples. It is my strong hope that the actions taken today by this body of people will be a significant step in reversing the trend of Jewish emigration. I, therefore, join with many people in the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania who are also praying for the day when Soviet Jews will be allowed to emigrate and when families long since separated will be reunited. My thoughts and prayers are with these brave people on this important day. ●

SOVIET VIGIL

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be able to participate in this year's Soviet vigil which is being sponsored by my good friend and colleague TIM WIRTH. As you are aware, this event shines light on the predicament that thousands of Soviet Jews who seek religious freedom and desire to emigrate find themselves in. I would like to take this occasion to commend Mr. WIRTH for his effort on behalf of this noble cause.

It is a well-known fact that Soviet Jews face extreme difficulties in attempting to emigrate from their homeland. In many instances, once an application is submitted, retaliation for such an "unpatriotic" act is swift and brutal. Today, I wish to share with my colleagues the story of Adele Khassin, her son Genadiy, her daughter-in-law Natasha and her grandchildren. Many years ago, Adele had to singlehandedly raise her son because her husband had fallen victim to Stalin's purges. Genadiy started to work at the age of 14. Later he received a doctorate in mathematics and rose to the position of associate professor at a prestigious university.

Although, at this point in their lives, life had improved somewhat for them, they could never forget their tragic past and were constantly reminded that those belonging to their faith were subject to discrimination, suppression, and unwarranted harassment. They wished to emigrate to Israel where they could reap the fruits of religious freedom. However, Adele alone was given permission to emigrate with the promise that her family would be allowed to follow her soon afterward. When she resisted, she was threatened saying that if she did not leave at that time, they would cancel her exit permit forever. It has been over 6 years since that time and the Khassins are still separated.

Shortly thereafter, Genadiy was demoted and had to teach on the high school level. Subsequently, he lost his right to work after his next application. He now teaches Hebrew in order to support his family. However, because teaching Hebrew in the Soviet Union is not considered a registered profession, Genadiy has been threatened with arrest for parasitism on several occasions.

Natasha, his wife, a trained computer operator, was severely beaten by the Soviet authorities after attempting to participate in a Mother's Day demonstration. The list of instances of harassment goes on and on.

Adele, who moved to Israel, had written, "The only thing that gives me the strength to live is the hope of being reunited with my son, his wife, and my grandchildren." Sadly, Adele Khassin died a short time ago without realizing her dream, to be reunited with her loved ones.

I believe that it would be a great step toward humanity if the Soviet authorities allowed the Khassins to join Adele at her gravesite to mourn her death and be able to worship in peace. ●

CONGRESSIONAL FAST AND PRAYER VIGIL

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, today Members of this Congress have pledged tangible support to the plight of Soviet Jews. Of course, I am referring to the congressional fast and prayer vigil for Soviet Jewry.

Imprisoned Soviet Jews—those in work camps and confinement, and those imprisoned by fear and desperation—have seen their hopes for fulfilling lives mocked because they seek to live in a free society. They have always needed our help, however, our support is even more urgent now in light of the severe reduction in emigration.

Soviet authorities claim the emigration of its Jewish citizens has slowed to a trickle because the majority of those who wished to leave have already done so. Do they also expect us to believe that the formation of a Soviet anti-Zionist organization is a genuine expression of the Soviet citizenry? That its platform which links Zionism to Nazism is in no way motivated by the Government's desire to promote anti-Semitism while simultaneously suppressing the desires of individuals who seek to emigrate to Israel?

Mr. Speaker, our Government, our Nation, and the worldwide community are expected to accept these flagrant falsehoods. Participation in today's congressional call to conscience vigil is a dramatic way of telling the Soviets the time has come to end the lies. We are only too well aware of the thousands of cases like Isaak Shkolnik's.

Following the 6-day war in 1967, Isaak Shkolnik decided to pursue his lifelong dream to emigrate to Israel with his family. The required invitations from relatives in Israel never reached Isaak until they were presented as evidence against him at his trial on the charges of hooliganism and disloyalty to the Soviet Union. The documents were used again later as the basis for the charge that Isaak was an Israeli spy. When Isaak refused to abandon his request to emigrate to Israel, he was sentenced to 10 years in prison. After a worldwide outcry the sentence was reduced to 7 years. While serving that time, Isaak's wife and daughter were granted exit visas and left for Israel. Following his release, Isaak once again applied for his exit visa. He is still waiting. As recently as March, immigration authorities told Isaak that he had no chance of receiving the visa anytime soon. He has not seen his family in 10 years.

It is cases such as the Shkolnik family's that remind us of the importance of our work. We cannot be deterred, just as the courageous in the Soviet Union have not been dissuaded in their struggle for freedom. Let the Soviet Union heed this warning in the form of our united protest. ●

CYNDY LITTLEFIELD LEAVES FOUNDATION TO ESTABLISH NEW FIRM HERE

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to inform my colleagues that my good friend and constituent, Cyndy Littlefield, recently left her position as director of the congressional seminar of the Washington Workshops Foundation. Many of us have had the great

pleasure of working with Cyndy since she first came to Washington in 1968, the year the Washington Workshops got started.

Cyndy is moving on to establish her own political consulting firm. I want to extend to her my best wishes in her new endeavor.

Since her high school days at Nolan High School in Fort Worth, Cyndy has been active in political organizing. She organized the high school's first Government Week, inviting me to participate in 1968. As president of the Nolan student government, Cyndy spearheaded a fundraising drive for a new student center. Her efforts brought in \$17,000 for the new center that was constructed in 1969.

Before receiving her bachelor of arts degree in political science from Loyola University in New Orleans in 1973, Cyndy was elected student government vice president. After graduation, she served on the staff of our colleague, LINDY BOGGS. In 1974 and 1975, Cyndy worked in the U.S. Office of Education.

Since 1977, Cyndy has been director of the congressional seminar of the Washington Workshops Foundation. In her spare time, Cyndy was able to earn her master in arts degree in 1978 from George Washington University and to perform a variety of freelance consulting tasks.

As director of the congressional seminar, Cyndy Littlefield presided over a period of tremendous growth in the program. My colleagues are already well aware of the positive work this foundation does in bringing our young constituents to Washington to learn about how our Government works.

This "hands on" learning experience helps our Nation's students to understand the value of democracy and the responsibilities of citizenship. Talented, idealistic people, such as Cyndy Littlefield, help to give life and meaning to our ideal of democracy.

My colleagues, I am sure, join me in wishing Cyndy Littlefield success in her new venture.●

**NATIONAL CONGRESSIONAL
FAST AND PRAYER VIGIL FOR
SOVIET JEWRY**

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in joining my distinguished colleagues to speak out against something which is of concern, not only to the Jewish community, but also to each and every person who believes in preserving the rights and dignity of his fellow brethren. As elected Representatives to the people of the United States, we must fight for the

ideals upon which our great country was founded. By supporting the national congressional fast and prayer vigil for Soviet Jewry, I feel I am speaking out against the violations of the principles of human rights which, we in the United States, hold so dear.

Held on the anniversary of the trial and sentencing of Anatoly Shcharansky, the vigil draws attention to the millions of Soviet Jews who have undergone similar persecution in a country which has the third largest Jewish community in the world. In the last few years, the Soviet Union has drastically restricted the emigration of her people to the point of a virtual standstill. Moreover, the refuseniks have experienced intensified harassment in every sphere of their lives simply because they wished to emigrate to a country where they could express their faith without fear of persecution. This mistreatment of Jews by the Soviet Union blatantly violates both the Helsinki accords and the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, two documents signed by the U.S.S.R.

On July 14, the national congressional fast and prayer vigil for Soviet Jewry will draw support from people of all faiths. We, like Anatoly Shcharansky, will fast not only to express our outrage at the manifest antisemitism in the Soviet Union but also to symbolize the suffering born from a blatant denial of human dignity. We will also continue our prayers that, in the near future, Soviet Jews, as well as all people of the world, can live in freedom and justice and have the opportunity to participate in the religious and cultural activities of their faith. We must continue our efforts, despite any discouragement we may feel at times, to reach our goal as citizens of a free country to protest the violations of human rights and defend the ideals of our democracy.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the floor of the House during Rollcall Vote 250 on House Resolution 208. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."●

**SOUTH ABERDEEN/COSMOPOLIS
DIKING PROJECT AUTHORIZATION
DESERVES TIMELY APPROVAL**

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to solve a longstanding problem in my congressional district. This bill would authorize flood control improvements along the Chehalis River at South Aberdeen and Cosmopolis in Washington. I am grateful for the past support the Committee on Public Works, and this body, have given to the South Aberdeen/Cosmopolis project and I trust that this will be the year the measure is finally enacted into law.

Since 1944, the South Aberdeen/Cosmopolis project has received favorable congressional action, but, for one reason or another, the several attempts to begin construction or regain the necessary authorization have failed. In the meantime, residents of South Aberdeen and Cosmopolis have been flooded out on several occasions. In addition, the estimated cost of the project has risen from some \$1.2 million in 1946 to approximately \$20 million at the present.

This project deserves immediate approval for several reasons—the risk of flooding at South Aberdeen and Cosmopolis is unacceptably high; the project is cost-effective; it is noncontroversial and enjoys broad support from the community; the necessary studies for authorization have been completed; and the local government is prepared to pay its fair share of the costs. I therefore strongly urge the committee to again act favorably upon this project and include it in the upcoming omnibus water resources development bill.

In a nutshell, the project would protect two communities at the mouth of the Chehalis River as it enters the port of Grays Harbor, Wash. The recommended project consists of 4 miles of levee embankment and approximately one-half mile of floodwalls. This diking would protect some 5,000 people residing on 1,288 acres of low-lying development in South Aberdeen and Cosmopolis. In 1976, the Army Corps of Engineers recommended that the height of the levee be increased by an additional foot to provide protection against the 500-year flood—up from the 200-year flood protection under the original proposal. In addition, the corps recommended that the local sponsor assume responsibility for controlling future increases in interior runoff. Both of these recommendations were agreed to by the local government.

As evidenced by periodic flooding and a recent disaster declaration, the risk of future damage is unacceptably high for area residents. It is foreseeable that a combination of high river levels, tides and winds could devastate hundreds or perhaps thousands of homes and businesses in Aberdeen and Cosmopolis. Given the generally depressed state of the local economy and the fact the Federal flood insurance rates here increased dramatically, many residents will be without adequate protection in the event of future disasters. For many Aberdeen and Cosmopolis residents, flooding under such circumstances would be the last straw.

The project has been studied and restudied. The feasibility report and environmental impact statements have been completed and accepted. There is broad local support for the project and even some early reservations raised by environmental groups have been withdrawn. All parts of the community are in agreement that the project must go forward.

The Aberdeen/Cosmopolis project is of great importance to the area and it has been promised the financial support that will be necessary from the State and local governments.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that this project must be completed. I am convinced that it will eventually be approved and constructed. It is my hope that this project will be completed before additional flooding and devastation occurs, and before inflation further increases the cost of the project. I urge the committee, and this body, to give this legislation the timely attention it deserves.●

SOVIET JEWRY

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the U.S. Helsinki Commission I am pleased to take part in the congressional fast and prayer vigil for Soviet Jewry, which also marks the fifth anniversary of the trial of Moscow Helsinki Monitor and Jewish rights advocate Anatoly Shcharansky.

We have witnessed a deterioration of conditions for Soviet Jews. The plummet in emigration, the continuing suppression of Jewish culture, the increase in harassment of Jewish activists, and, most disquieting, the formation of the notorious Anti-Zionist Committee, illustrate the ominous character of Mr. Andropov's policy toward Soviet Jewry.

The Helsinki Commission shall continue its efforts on behalf of Soviet Jewry and do its part to insure that Anatoly Shcharansky and the many courageous individuals in the Soviet

Union like him, who are punished for defending human dignity, are not forgotten.

I commend the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews and the National Conference on Soviet Jewry for their abiding dedication to the humanitarian cause of Soviet Jewry and pray that our efforts will hasten the day of Anatoly Shcharansky's deliverance to freedom in Israel.●

SOVIET JEWRY FAST AND PRAYER DAY, JULY 14, 1983

HON. DAN SCHAEFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to realize, in a land where we can travel across a continent with ease, that there are people confined to their homes, degraded in their workplaces, and serving in gulags because of their faith. These people are not revolutionaries—they insist only that their Government uphold the clause of their constitution granting them freedom of religion.

They have no desire to overthrow the Government, nor are they a burden on society. Soviet Jews wish only to emigrate to Israel, where they will be granted the freedom to practice the religion and live in the manner they choose. We should certainly appreciate the ease with which we travel, not only within our own country, but to other countries. Any restrictions made can be resolved through obtaining a visa—and the visa is granted without consideration of race, creed, or color.

We who gather here today, on behalf of all Soviet Jews who have been refused exit visas from the Soviet Union, should concentrate on extending to them the hope for the future that our Nation embodies; the belief that all people should be given the chance to live in the manner they choose. Freedom is for those who seek it—our responsibility is to assure the seekers of the support we extend them as a nation.●

FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, along with my colleagues, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. OLIN, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. HANCE, Mr. GORE, Mr.

EMERSON, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. ROSE, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SHARP, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. EVANS of Illinois, a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the 1984 feed grain program by September 16 of this year.

The timely announcement of the 1984 feed grain program is essential if farmers are to have sufficient time to weigh various program options, make a decision about program participation, and plan accordingly. Similarly, the farm supply businesses which serve producers must know program details well in advance so that they can estimate farmers' needs and prudently determine their required inventory.

The early announcement of the 1984 program is particularly important in view of the hardships created for producers and farm suppliers alike by the late implementation of this year's rather drastic payment-in-kind (PIK) program.

The PIK program was not announced until January 11 of this year, and it took several days for the details of the program to reach farmers and rural businesses. Because farmers had to make a final decision on program participation by March 11, many had a difficult time establishing their eligibility for program benefits, and those that had applied fertilizer the previous fall or otherwise made planting decisions found the program less attractive. In 1983, as in some previous years, the late announcement of the farm program led to lower program participation than might have been expected with an early announcement.

The delayed PIK announcement also put agribusinesses in a severe bind. Although these rural businesses generally recognized that the PIK program was necessary to lay the groundwork for recovery in the agricultural economy, most nevertheless suddenly found themselves burdened by costly inventories of fertilizer, farm chemicals, machinery, and other supplies. Many of these businesses were forced to curtail their operations and reduce their number of employees just as businesses elsewhere were beginning to feel the impact of an improving economy.

Mr. Speaker, the disappointment of a late farm program announcement is not an infrequent experience for farmers. Despite promises to the contrary, farmers regularly over recent years have been forced to accept an announcement issued just before the statutory deadline for such announcements.

In 1980, I authored legislation moving up the announcement date on the feed grains program from November 15 to October 15. Unfortunately, even that modest legislation, as approved by the Committee on Agriculture with the amendment setting the date at November 1, did not become a part of permanent law.

Mr. Speaker, we are quite certain, even at this early date, of the need for an acreage reduction program for feed grains next year. We know that our surplus of feed grains after this year's harvest will, despite the PIK program, be excessive, and the administration has already outlined the parameters of the program it is likely to announce for 1984. And the current controversy over the administration's request for a freeze on target prices—which has led to an unfortunate delay in the announcement of the specifics of the 1984 wheat program—is likely to be resolved in one way or another by the Congress this month, leaving no legitimate reason for a delay in announcing the 1984 feed grains program in a timely manner.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the early announcement of the 1984 farm program is not only responsible agriculture policy, it is also sound fiscal policy. An early announcement contributes to higher program participation, and higher program participation means a program more effective at reducing our surplus and decreasing the likelihood of Government outlays for price support costs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of my colleagues for this needed measure, and I express hope for its prompt adoption.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 3564

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 105B(e)(1) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding the foregoing sentence, the Secretary shall announce any such feed grain

acreage limitation program or set-aside program for the 1984 crop not later than September 16, 1983.".

TITLE II OF H.R. 10 APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1983

• Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that the attitude of the administration makes it impossible for us to do more for Appalachia than title II of H.R. 10 would do.

The people of Appalachia deserve more, and the record of the Appalachian Regional Commission justifies more.

For most of a century, Appalachia was a neglected region. The Commission appointed by President Kennedy called it a region apart. Back in early 1960's:

One-third of the Appalachian people were living in poverty.

Per capita income was almost one-fourth below the national average—far lower than that in east Tennessee and the rest of central Appalachia.

Only one-third of the Appalachian adults had completed high school.

Health care was generally poor and was nonexistent in many of our more rural counties; substandard housing was commonplace; and millions of Appalachians were forced to leave the region in search of better opportunities.

From 1965 through 1980, ARC helped change all that. Poverty was reduced by more than 50 percent. Per capita income rose to 85 percent of the national average. Hospitals and clinics brought decent health care to most of the region. A network of vocational schools was built and is bringing training to more than half of the young people of the region. Almost 2 million new jobs were created, and outmigration was reversed.

ARC did not achieve all that alone, but it played a major part in this change.

And even then, Appalachia was not getting its fair share of Federal expenditures. On the contrary, its per capita share was below 60 percent of the national figure in the early 1960's, rose to only slightly above 80 percent in 1980, and is now heading back down again.

Everyone—except David Stockman—agreed ARC was working. And even he vacillated between saying we could not prove it was working and deciding that it had worked so well we did not need it any longer.

But, since 1981, we have been losing much of the ground we gained in Appalachia.

Appalachia has been hit far harder by the recession than the rest of the country. Unemployment is 30 percent higher than the national average. The oil glut and the recession have sharply curtailed the market for coal. Administration budget cuts have cut ARC funds in half and severely reduced other economic development efforts so important to Tennessee and the rest of Appalachia.

In these circumstances, it is tragic that we cannot do more than title II of H.R. 10 would do, but I am realistic enough to agree that circumstances force us to battle even for half a loaf.

At least H.R. 10 will:

Bring some special assistance to the 67 poorest counties in the region, 13 of them in Tennessee;

Extend basic health care to the 57 counties which now lack it, including three in Tennessee, and reduce infant mortality in another two counties in Tennessee and the 23 in the rest of the region where it is at least 50 percent above the national average.

For these reasons, I strongly support title II of H.R. 10 to authorize an ARC finish-up program as an alternative to abrupt discontinuation of a program that has worked so well. •