

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

APPROACHING THE SUMMIT
SOBERLY

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, as the two following articles indicate, America must sober up and approach the first Reagan-Gorbachev meeting with the kind of clear-eyed skepticism that such an occasion warrants. Specifically, the President must "go to the summit, complain as he intends about Soviet aggressions and abuses of human rights and make no promises." On the matter of the ABM Treaty, the President should follow the lead set by my colleagues JACK KEMP and MALCOLM WALLOP; that is, to stop viewing the ABM Treaty as sacred icon, the Old Testament, or the Magna Carta—characterizations made by prominent U.S. statesmen and senior allied officials, and to press on with the achievement of the noble objective of rendering nuclear weapons useless and, ultimately, nonexistent. The President has the opportunity to make this the only United States-Soviet summit ever to achieve enduring, positive results, but only if he follows his instincts and does not succumb to Soviet propaganda, and Congressional hand-wringing. It's a tall order, but the President has faced tougher challenges in his time and emerged unbowed and unscathed.

TIME TO SOBER UP

Let's hope President Reagan's presummit TV address tonight will sober up the Washington community, which is suffering from a terminal case of silliness over its hopes about what Mr. Reagan's sitdown with Mikhail Gorbachev is likely to accomplish.

Contributing to the air of unreality are tales of White House gnomes delivering tons of briefing papers to the Oval Office and setting up projectors to show the president the Gorbachev-Mitterand game films. Newspaper Style sections this Sunday will describe in infinite detail what Nancy will wear when she has tea in Geneva with the lovely Raisa. Tip O'Neill is taking time out from the budgetary chaos he presides over on Capitol Hill to make the outrageous claim that Congress has given the president the support he needs for a summit "success."

On a more serious level, George Shultz has been treating with the Soviets since his meeting with Andrei Gromyko last January, laying the summit groundwork. Without knowing the game plan, it's impossible to assess how well Mr. Shultz is doing. But we mostly have been hearing about gifts the State Department might like to lay before Mr. Gorbachev. Surrender of the U.S. claim to Wrangell Island (discussed in this space yesterday) is one possibility. An offer to pool fusion energy research with the Rus-

sians is another. And the U.S. is prepared to go on pretending SALT II is a real agreement, however much abuse it gets from the Russian side.

In short, the Washington community, by merely following its own instincts, is once again setting the president up to have his pockets picked. Mr. Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative is being negotiated and renegotiated on Mr. Gorbachev's behalf. The president is being urged to rush back, as Richard Nixon once did, to dramatically present some "breakthrough" to a joint session of Congress. Word is going around, as it always does, that the Soviet leader is in deep trouble and will be eager to make deals.

Mr. Reagan has tried to discourage such nonsense. He has wisely rejected the idea of a post-summit communique, for example, saying that you don't promise a communique when all you are doing is having a little get-acquainted session. He has discouraged the notion that there will be any "agreements." But even for a president with Mr. Reagan's keen understanding of what the U.S.-Soviet relationship is and must be, there are dangers of being trapped. Arms control is, as always, the biggest area of danger.

The policy of abiding by SALT II, which Mr. Shultz seems prepared to continue, hasn't made much sense. Consider the just-published "Military Balance" report of London's well-respected International Institute for Strategic Studies. It says the Soviets have increased their supply of long-range nuclear warheads by 37 percent in just three years. They now enjoy a 2.4-to-one advantage over the U.S. in land submarine-based megatonnage. That's mutual restraint?

U.S. soft-liners want the president to promise that the U.S. will not over the next five years exercise its option to withdraw, on one year's notice, from the 1972 anti-ballistic missile treaty. That treaty also has not placed much restraint on the Soviets. The IISS says the Soviets are actively pursuing their own space-based nuclear defense research even while they attack the U.S. effort. A Pentagon report sent to the White House Tuesday cites a series of serious Soviet ABM treaty violations. So while Mr. Reagan temporizes and generously offers to make future U.S. defense technology available to all comers, the Russians are actually putting a defense in place. The danger in this is clearly outlined in the open letter to the president from Rep. Kemp and Sen. Wallop excerpted nearby.

People often ask why the Russians have invested so much in weapons of mass destruction while living standards in the Soviet Union are, on the whole, only slightly above Third World levels. The summit ballyhoo in the U.S. provides the obvious answer. They want to be feared. They surround themselves in mystery so that American congressmen, permitted an audience with the Great Gorbachev, will come away awed by having been spoken to in English or fixed with his steely gaze. Showmanship of this skill level wins concessions.

Richard Nixon, who has had some experience with summits, wrote in the latest For-

eign Affairs some cautionary words: "This is a long struggle with no end in sight. Whatever their faults, the Soviets will be firm, patient and consistent in pursuing their foreign policy goals. We must match them in that respect."

A good way to match them will be for Mr. Reagan to go to the summit, complain as he intends about Soviet aggressions and abuses of human rights and make no promises. And tonight will not be too soon to start damping down the mindless euphoria that has overtaken pre-summit Washington.

CLEAR UP ABM TREATY CONFUSION

Excerpts from a letter to the president by Sen. Malcolm Wallop (R., Wyo.) and Rep. Jack Kemp (R., N.Y.):

Dear Mr. President: Soon you will be traveling to Geneva to meet with Mr. Gorbachev. We join with all Americans in sending our best wishes to you as you prepare for that meeting. At the same time, the confusion surrounding the U.S. government's attitude toward the ABM Treaty particularly demands public clarification.

On Oct. 14, Secretary Shultz explained an approach to the ABM Treaty that raises more questions than it answers. Whereas your administration had said previously that the treaty prevents us from doing a variety of things to protect ourselves against ballistic missiles, Secretary Shultz now made clear that we refrain from doing those things not because the treaty forbids us, but because we choose not to do them.

ONE NEED ONLY LOOK

This peculiar self-denial, as Secretary Shultz pointed out, is not required by the ABM Treaty. Nor does technology impose such excessive restraint. To see this, one need only look at the things the Soviets are doing. Five out of the six Pechora-class large phased array battle management radars are perfectly legal, as is the seventh, even more capable radar at Pushkino (yet only the illegal radar at Krasnoyarsk which completes the circle draws our attention). The mass-production of the other components of the ground-based ABM system, the Flat-Twin engagement radar, the SH-4 and SH-8 interceptors, all easily transportable, does not violate any part of the ABM Treaty. The mass-production of the mobile SA-12 system (which is very effective against the mainstay of our retaliatory force, the SLBMs) transcends the ABM Treaty because it performs both anti-aircraft and antimissile functions in the same "mode."

No one has suggested that when the Soviets test their space laser weapon soon we will consider that to be a violation of the ABM Treaty, even though all knowledgeable persons would agree that any of our missiles which flew within 1,000 kilometers of such a weapon would be vulnerable to destruction.

The Defense Department's publication "Soviet Military Power" describes how the Soviet Union is building prototypes of a variety of antimissile devices. The intelligence community tells us about the Soviets' massive building program associated with stra-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member of the Senate on the floor.

Boldface type indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

tegic defense. Since no one in the administration is calling these things treaty violations, we presume they are not. We are not even mentioning the deployment of rapidly reloadable launchers—equipped with who knows how many SH-8s, around Moscow. The actual existence of these weapons is a tiny part of the problem, compared with the open Soviet production lines that keep on disgorging antimissile equipment.

So even without considering the activities that your administration has called violations, the Soviets' approach to strategic defense is diametrically opposed to the self-denying "extra miles" approach your administration is pursuing. But why this disparity? Some may argue that in order to "restore the integrity of the ABM Treaty" we must eschew any capacity for intercepting missiles for the foreseeable future, while we try to draw the Soviet Union into doing the same. But does this make sense? We can only presume that when you labeled your own purpose as "restoring the integrity of the ABM Treaty" you meant to confirm your administration's very effective policy of cleansing the Defense Department of just such a future capacity for intercepting missiles, while we try to draw the Soviets into denying the same. But does this make sense?

We see little reason to believe that the Soviets might reverse their approach to defense and adopt the unilateral U.S. approach of self-denial beyond the terms of the treaty. Moreover, as we see it, this unilateral new approach is wholly incompatible with the strategic direction you have indicated for our country.

Several times since March 23, 1983, you have spoken so eloquently of the need to protect the American people against Soviet missiles. Your secretary of defense and his undersecretary for policy have described defense against ballistic missiles as "the very core" of our strategic policy. We find this not just morally attractive, but strategically indispensable.

Contrary to popular misconceptions, the strategic imbalance to which you pointed when you first sought the presidency has not been eliminated. Indeed, even if every program you proposed to Congress had been fully funded, the Soviet Union's edge over us in counterforce weapons would continue to grow indefinitely. By 1988 our relative strategic position is projected to be worse than it was in 1980. The Soviets are now deploying mobile missile systems unlike anything we ever plan to build. As Soviet strategic forces become mobile, the tasks demanded of our few counterforce weapons, due in the late 1980s and 1990s, will become ever more difficult. In other words, under present plans, defending the U.S. against Soviet missiles is the only opportunity we have of preventing Soviet strategic superiority from becoming permanent. If anyone in your administration has any other suggestion, we have not heard it.

Therefore we find it difficult to understand why the people actually in charge of these matters postponed at least until early 1990s the question of how we are to deal with our strategic predicament. Current SDI planning contains no options for early deployment of antimissile devices. Instead, they have proposed that all of our SDI resources be devoted to research to answer the question of whether defenses against ballistic missiles are possible.

Not surprisingly, the answer to this question is the same today as it was 10 years ago, and as it will be 10 years from now, namely:

Yes, it is possible to do some things to defend against ballistic missiles. But, no, it is not possible to do others. The Pentagon's all-too-familiar tradition is to substitute research for action. Yet, tomorrow, just like today and yesterday, someone must decide what action our predicament requires.

Is that decision really to be postponed any decision on ballistic missile defense until the 1990s even as antimissile devices continue to roll off Soviet production lines?

As two of your staunchest friends and supporters in Congress, we strongly urge you to address publicly certain important questions before you or our negotiators talk seriously with the Soviets about the ABM Treaty.

If our objective, as you have expressed it, is to move to a strategic environment that incorporates stabilizing strategic defenses, why are we imposing unilateral self-restraints required neither by treaty nor technology?

Given that the first megawatt-class Soviet laser weapon will be in orbit in this decade, why is it prudent for us to wait 10 years before even deciding whether or not to build one?

What options will remain to us if in this century an undefended America should face a Soviet Union whose defenses actually provide protection for the capability of a disarming nuclear first strike?

PATH TO A NEW HOPE

As we see it, the noble goal of protecting, rather than avenging, lives is precisely opposite to what has been called "the integrity of the ABM Treaty," when that "integrity" presumes the defenselessness of the American people. We question whether it is reasonable to pursue such wholly contradicting ends at the same time, or whether it is possible to pursue them simultaneously without discrediting both.

Sir, you showed us a path to a new hope which is available in sufficient measure now and in its totality soon. We stand ready to help you to the fullest extent of our abilities to achieve that protection for our nation and our allies. In that spirit, we respectfully address this plea to you: Let the era of MAD come to its logical end. You have shown us the way to ensure our protection through our own resources, rather than through Soviet forbearance. America and the Free World will be safer when you have achieved your goal.

PROSPECTS IN THE PHILIPPINES

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Oklahoma, Representative DAVE MCCURDY, wrote an op-ed last week for the Los Angeles Times. In it, he discusses the need for the United States to be prepared to do more for the Philippines.

Certainly, it is my hope that the people of the Philippines will be able to handle their own difficulties, but it is foolish to believe that we can sit passively and let events unfold. We do have influence that we can and should use. As Representative MCCURDY states in his article, "This is the time and place to take some risks."

I submit his thoughtful essay for my colleagues' perusal.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Nov. 14, 1985]

AMERICA MUST BE PREPARED TO DO MORE IN PHILIPPINES

(By Dave McCurdy)

Two weeks after telling an American television audience that his people had rejected a snap presidential election because there would be nothing to gain, Philippine President Ferdinand E. Marcos said that he is ready to hold such an election in January, well ahead of the scheduled mid-1987 vote.

In another turnabout the presidential palace announced that the vice presidency, which has been vacant for 13 years, also would be contested because the focus of opposition criticism "has changed from Marcos to that of his entire administration and his entire program of government."

It remains to be seen whether the fragmented democratic opposition will be able to mount an effective challenge to the incumbent on such short notice—if, in fact, the election takes place.

But it is clear that pressure from the United States has already succeeded in focusing attention on the crucial issues of succession and institutional change, and that more can be accomplished if U.S. policymakers are not afraid to use our leverage both with the Philippines and with other countries in the region who depend on American aid and trade.

Marcos' corrupt government has made the Philippines the only non-communist country in East Asia with a negative growth rate. The economic mess and the increasing strength of the Marxist insurgent New People's Army, which is now active in nearly all the country's 73 provinces, pose a growing threat to important political, economic and strategic interests that are shared by all free nations.

For several reasons, the burden of defending these interests falls largely on the United States. The Philippines is the only nation that we have ever governed as our colony. Private U.S. banks and international lending institutions to which we are a principal contributor hold a majority of the Philippine external debt. Most important, U.S. bases there have become strong links in a security chain that protects the Western Pacific and supports our policy objectives in Asia and the Middle East. Except for Vietnam, no country in East Asia wants the United States out of these bases.

In 1982 President Reagan warmly welcomed Marcos and his wife on a state visit to Washington. Subsequently Reagan tried using gentle persuasion to coax reforms from Marcos. Now, in view of the rapidly deteriorating economic and political situation in the islands, Reagan is letting his spokesmen hint at the bleak scenarios that have long prevailed in the intelligence community. Assistant secretaries of state and defense are warning of imminent security threats if vigorous reforms are not undertaken; our ambassador in Manila has criticized egregious human-rights violations by the Marcos government, and the International Monetary Fund, with the Reagan Administration's support, is withholding \$453 million in loans because of Marcos' failure to carry out economic reforms.

These are steps in the right direction, but we must be prepared to do even more. Since 1972, when martial law was declared in the Philippines, four U.S. administrations have looked the other way while Marcos dismantled democratic institutions and consolidated his personal rule. It is time for Reagan to

step up direct public pressure on the Philippine president for a return to pre-martial law institutions, including an independent judiciary, and to hold him to his pledge that American observers will be allowed to help monitor the presidential election. We should begin using our considerable influence—independently of the Marcos government, if necessary—to help rebuild democratic institutions that will ensure badly needed military reforms, free elections and basic human rights.

Congress will undoubtedly make funds available to improve security at Clark Air Base and Subic Bay Navy Base, but nothing approaching the \$1.3 billion multiyear figure that has been floating around Capitol Hill. Only about two hours' flight time from the Philippines is the huge Soviet naval base at Cam Ranh Bay, which was built by the United States during the Vietnam War. In exploring alternatives to our present basing arrangements, however, we must not give the impression that we are prepared to abandon the Philippines. We can always relocate our military facilities, but restoring our credibility if we pull out may be impossible.

It is a rare occasion when the intelligence community is out front with virtually no disagreement on an issue of this importance, when members of Congress offer bipartisan support, or when historical and security commitments and a reservoir of good will toward the United States argue so convincingly that we must stand up for the values we believe in. This may well be the test that shows whether democracy has a chance to flourish in the Third World.

This is the time and place to take some risks. A corrupt dictator and Marxist gunmen cannot be allowed to prevent the rebirth of democracy in the Philippines because we were unwilling to help while there was still a chance to do so.

TROUBLES IN BANKING AND INSURANCE INTERACT

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an article from the New York Times indicating that difficulties in banking and insurance are beginning to interact.

The article reports on plans in the banking industry to create an industry-run insurance company to deal with the problem of unavailability and unaffordability of insurance from traditional sources.

The article suggests that some observers attribute the trouble banks are having finding insurance to "the rising tide of bank failures." Testimony in hearings before my subcommittee also indicates that the insurance capacity crunch may be attributable to insurance industry financial weakness.

The possible spread of instability within our financial services industries is ominous and deserves the attention of all Members.

BANKERS WEIGHING OWN INSURANCE UNIT

NEW ORLEANS, Oct. 22.—The banking industry is considering forming its own insurance company to combat the dwindling supply and soaring prices of insurance for directors and officers.

The same "captive" insurance company would also provide banks with blanket bonding coverage to protect them against fraud and other wrongdoing by employees.

The proposal to form the insurance company was made public here today during a risk seminar at the annual convention of the American Bankers Association. Although details must still be worked out, the current plan is for the insurance company to be formed by the association itself, with coverage made available to all 12,000 member banks.

The insurer would have as much as \$30 million in initial capital, said Ronald C. Summerville, a consultant on the project to the association who spoke at today's forum. Where that money will come from remains to be determined, but one possibility being considered is for each association member bank to make annual contributions to the insurer, Mr. Summerville said. Other sources familiar with the project indicated that a formal proposal to create an insurer could go to the association's board of directors early next year.

If the association does form an insurer, an outcome that many bankers think is extremely likely, it will be because, for growing numbers of banks, directors' and officers' liability insurance and bonding insurance have become either unavailable or prohibitively costly. The number of underwriters offering bank bonding coverage, for example, has shrunk to six, from 40 in 1983.

The number of insurers offering the liability coverage has also fallen to about a handful, from 20 two years ago. Premium increases on policy renewals have been as high as 500 percent. And insurance industry experts say that, on certain types of bank policies, insurance losses have been nearly 200 percent of premium income.

The reasons for the problems are many. L. Patton Kline, vice chairman of the insurance brokerage firm of Marsh & McLennan and one of today's speakers, said insurers had become wary of banks in recent years because of the rising tide of bank failures. He also said insurers were deferred by the fact that bank regulatory agencies, such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, had begun suing bank management after failures, creating a new avenue for potential insurer payouts.

SOUR MARKET SEEN

And, most troubling to the insurers, Mr. Kline said, some banks have begun suing their own employees to try to recover insurance. He was apparently referring to recent decisions by the Chase Manhattan Bank and the Continental Illinois Bank and Trust Company to take legal action against some of their employees following losses at the banks.

"The insurance market, especially for financial institutions, has turned very sour in 1985," Mr. Kline said. "Just about gone are the three-year insurance policies that you are accustomed to in the financial industry."

"The directors' and officers' insurance problem will get worse," said Donald T. Brown, a group vice president at the First Atlanta Corporation, an Atlanta-based banking company. Mr. Brown, who moderated the seminar, added, "Some banks see themselves going barer as far as D.&O. insurance is concerned."

Although the idea of forming an insurance company has been bandied about in banking circles for some time, today's events provided the clearest indication that creation of such an entity was nearing. Similar

proposals are being explored by savings and loan industry executives and by some big, money-center banks. According to banking sources, the big banks may decide to form their own insurance company because their potential exposure from lawsuits is well above what the A.B.A.-sponsored insurer could likely handle.

MANUAL ARTS HIGH SCHOOL COMMEMORATES ITS 75TH DIAMOND ANNIVERSARY

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, on December 13 and 14 of this year, Manual Arts High School in Los Angeles will be celebrating its 75th diamond anniversary.

The school has a rich and distinguished history as is evidenced by some of its notable graduates, including Gen. James H. Doolittle; former Governor Goodwin Knight; opera singer and actress Kathryn Grayson; actor Paul Winfield; Congresswoman Yvonne Braithwaite Burke; movie producer Frank Capra; artist Jackson Pollock; and a number of other individuals in various fields.

One of the highlights of this event will be the dedication and naming of one of the school buildings as the Gen. James H. Doolittle Building.

In its 75 years, Manual Arts High School has proudly boasted new buildings, high academic honors, State and national recognition of its programs, and superior athletic achievements. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit a brief summary of the history of Manual Arts High School, which is without question one of the finer schools in Los Angeles, and in our country.

MANUAL ARTS HIGH SCHOOL, 1910-85

The year 1985 is a diamond year for Manual Arts High School as it celebrates and reflects on seventy-five years of tradition and spirit.

In 1909, there were two high schools in the city—Los Angeles High School, the first and the oldest, and the new Polytechnic High School. Both these schools were overcrowded, and so 350 students waited and studied patiently in a shabby abandoned grammar school on Olive Street. It was obvious that a new school had to be built; and by September of 1910, a new school did open on Vermont Avenue—Manual Arts High School. Dr. Albert E. Wilson, the first Principal, moved his faculty and students to the new location and thus began the grand history of the school at its present location.

Pride, excellence in achievement, and a spirit of adventure have marked the endeavor of the Manual Arts "Tollers".

The decade of the thirties is often referred to as the "Golden Era" of Manual Arts High School. The earthquake of 1933 crumpled tradition-filled buildings, but not the spirit of the teachers and students who inaugurated new buildings. It was during this time that the "Manual Arts Daily" was born, the only daily high school newspaper west of the Mississippi. The foreign language classes were acclaimed as the best in the state. The Theatre Arts Department

was widely recognized; and at the same time, the athletic teams swept to many city championships. The crowning glory was the completion of the new school, which was considered one of the most attractive high schools in the entire state.

When World War II came, the students extended their activities beyond the campus: they supported their own Jimmie Doolittle by helping to raise three million dollars for "Bombers for Doolittle"; this carrying Manual's name around the world by naming three planes.

During the Korean War, Manual Arts adopted an orphanage in memory of "Toiler" Kenny Kaiser, first California Gold Star.

The fifties and sixties brought multicultural enrichment to Manual Arts High School as students representing many nationalities, races, and creeds were welcomed and included in school life.

The sixties also witnessed major social changes with the inception of the Civil Rights movement and the charismatic influence of Martin Luther King, Jr. The Air Force Academy accepted its first Black candidate, Maurice Econg, a Manual Arts graduate.

By the mid-seventies, Manual Arts High School and its surrounding community had become predominantly Black; the strength of Martin Luther King's influence was apparent in the school with its increased emphasis on Black pride and success. The "Toilers" won scholarships, awards, and athletic championships.

Thus far the eighties not only have brought recognition to Manual Arts High School, but also have witnessed rapid changes in the ethnic make-up of the school. Immigrants and refugees from several Central American countries have settled in the community. Black and Hispanic "Toilers" have, triumphantly, shared in the glories of a city championship in basketball and two consecutive years as city champion in football. They have also shared in the pride of being named the Ambassador High School for the 1984 Olympics. Academic successes are enthusiastically recognized, as graduates gain admission to prestigious universities, win scholarships, and accept special awards.

CAMPUS-BASED RESEARCH CENTERS VICTIMS OF ADMINISTRATION FRUGALITY

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of furthering the continuing debate on our Nation's budget priorities, I am submitting an article by Daniel S. Greenberg, entitled "A Case of Mega-Bucks and Mega-Science," which was published in the *Journal of Commerce* on October 25, 1985. I recommend it to my colleagues.

This Nation will spend about \$107 billion for research and development this year—more than the combined R&D spending of Great Britain, France, West Germany, and Japan. Almost a third of this amount will be devoted to defense. In the area of advanced technologies alone, 85 percent of Federal R&D funds will be spent for military purposes.

Mr. Greenberg's article clearly brings into focus the effects of this defense bias in our national research budget. We have skewed our research resources toward "mega-science" so much that we have left little for other efforts, especially as he points out, for campus-based engineering research centers tying universities and industry together in research as well as education. These "other efforts" have to scratch for nickels and dimes in our Federal budget, yet they are no less than the first line of defense in our national security as we move into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, one of these days we are going to wake up and discover that our disinvestment in non-defense research, particularly as it applies to advanced engineering technologies, is a national disgrace. I just hope it won't be too late.

[From the *Journal of Commerce*, Oct. 25, 1985]

A CASE OF MEGA-BUCKS AND MEGA-SCIENCE

(By Daniel S. Greenberg)

WASHINGTON.—Last year, as White House budget planners proposed to spend \$26 billion on Star Wars research, they displayed vintage Reaganite frugality by snipping a couple of hundred million dollars from the government's medical research budget.

They also wiped out a mere \$1 million item for university studies of ethical problems in science and technology, and held back on spending over \$50 million available for remedying the decrepit condition of science education in elementary and high schools. All the while, though, planning proceeded for a manned space station, with a price tag loosely calculated at \$8 billion, and an atom smasher—60 miles in circumference—estimated to cost at least \$4 billion.

The pattern that emerges is billions for the scientific mega-project and parsimony for other parts of the research enterprise, particularly for the mom-and-pop segments of scientific research. Referred to in the business as "little science" the latter lives on government grants ranging from a few thousand to a few hundred thousand dollars per year, mostly for campus laboratories, where student scientists learn on the job.

Generally lacking the dramatic photo appeal of mega-science, little science tends to be inconspicuous. Nonetheless, it is the intellectual backbone of the system that produces the majority of the highly trained people who advance basic scientific knowledge, staff industrial research labs, and educate coming generations of scientists and engineers. But, increasingly, this style of science is facing hard times, as anti-deficit politics presses against all federal spending and the proponents of monumental ventures grab for a bigger slice of the federal research and development budget.

The most appalling instance of mega-projects trampling little science is the Space Shuttle, built on politically alluring but false promises of economical operations—and then financed with the help of money stripped from NASA's scientific research programs. The consequences were recently spelled out in congressional testimony by Professor Eugene Levy, director of the Lunar and Planetary Laboratory at the University of Arizona. Mr. Levy noted that because NASA has cut back on sending aloft the scientific satellites that carry small experiments, "There is a startling lack of young scientists—ages 30 to 40—who have

been able to establish space experimental research groups in the past decade."

At a recent meeting between university heads and the chief of the Star Wars program, Lt. Gen. James A. Abrahamson, the issue of Star Wars' fiscal gluttony was gingerly raised by Dale Corson, president emeritus of Cornell University. "There just isn't enough money going around to sustain the health of the research enterprise," Mr. Corson said, adding that "it's inevitable that there will be a decline in the kind of science that's been with us for the last 40 years, the investigator-initiated research project, in which the ideas are coming from the scientists themselves." That's not the general's problem, and he offered no consolation.

The fiscal crush of mega-projects is also evident in the sparse funding available for one of the government's most applauded and promising research innovations—campus-based centers where scientists and engineers and their students' work with industry on basic engineering problems. Last year, 140 schools, with proposals totaling \$2 billion, applied to take part. The government eventually picked six to share in the \$20 million a year available for the program.

The president's science adviser, Dr. George A. Keyworth II, recently described the engineering program as "the single most important initiative in the Reagan administration's science policy," and urged that it be elevated to \$500 million a year.

There's no chance of that. These centers, designed to provide technical underpinnings for improved industrial competitiveness, are small stuff, costing just a few million a year.

The irony is that, in the era of the mega-project, they cost too little to rate high.

TOM BETHELL ON PROPERTY RIGHTS IN UNDERDEVELOPED NATIONS

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, Tom Bethell's recent article in the *National Review*, "How To Start a Revolution Without Really Trying," November 15, 1985, discusses the frequently neglected importance of security of ownership for developing nations. Mr. Bethell cites numerous examples of the way in which the constant threat of expropriation in Third World countries has effectively destroyed the right of property in those nations.

In many of these countries, governments' attempts to use land reform as an excuse to destabilize political rivals or landowners whose wealth is threatening—through the expropriation of lands owned by "absentee landlords"—have actually resulted in the seizing of the plots of middle-class smallholders who for a variety of reasons were unable to till their land and therefore leased it to farmers.

Once seized, the land is typically redistributed to the peasants, although in El Salvador, Mexico, and other underdeveloped nations the new owners are prohibited from selling or renting out the land. Without these basic rights of ownership, the new owners are clearly no more than serfs

and property rights are further weakened. By contrasting these cases with successful land reform in Japan and Taiwan, Tom Bethell demonstrates that the necessary element is an assurance that the land, once redistributed, will not again be subject to arbitrary expropriation or use limitations. Only if this right of property is conveyed with the land, will those who own the property be willing to invest in its improvement. I commend the complete article to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the National Review, Nov. 15, 1985]

HOW TO START A REVOLUTION WITHOUT
REALLY TRYING
(By Tom Bethell)

"If the law itself commits the act that it is supposed to suppress. I say this is still plunder and, as far as society is concerned, plunder of an even graver kind." Frédéric Bastiat, "The Law" (1850)

In a recent article (NR, Aug. 23) I pointed out that the international debt crisis would not soon go away, because the indebted countries have been unable to create property rights, which are indispensable if new wealth is to be created. And without new wealth, debts cannot be repaid. Moreover, I suggested, certain American elites have sometimes worked to obstruct the emergence of property rights abroad, whether or not they knew they were doing so.

Property rights depend on the rule of law: the establishment and acceptance of the idea that the law must apply to all, including (especially) those who administer it; and that there sits human rights of ownership and exchange, the security of which it is the duty of governments to protect. Today, the central problem of economic philosophy is simply this: How is the rule of law to be established in those countries—the great majority—that do not enjoy it? Not only has this not been answered in contemporary economic discourse, it has scarcely been asked. For example, Professor P.T. Bauer of the London School of Economics (now Lord Bauer), perhaps the leading critic of mainstream "development" economics, does not raise the question of property rights and how they are to be established in undeveloped countries.

Let us now embark on a brief excursion, beginning with the Philippines. Citing a Communist threat, Ferdinand Marcos imposed martial law there in September 1972. Political opposition and press freedom were curtailed. And land reform was instituted. This, Marcos said, "would eliminate landlordism in the Philippines and give land to the tillers everywhere in the country." Marcos has simply seized the power to expropriate rural property, with the added provision that the tillers, or renters, of the land were in some cases declared to be its new "owners."

The New York Times reacted to Marcos's martial law with telltale ambivalence. It was predictably concerned about the "repression of civil liberties" and the "suspension of democratic institutions." But it relished the "genuine reform" of expropriation, which deserved "open encouragement." This might take the form of "generous economic assistance for programs to help the majority of Filipinos." (The welfare state should be extended to the Philippines, in short.)

LAND TO THE TILLERS!

The truth was that Marcos deserved condemnation on all counts. But the Times saw partial merit in his version of martial law:

Freedom of speech was a civil liberty; the security of ownership was not. The Times here made explicit what we all know: The claims of property are often suspect to educated elites. Even though we may enjoy the security of property and take it for granted in our own lives, its general advocacy and application are intensely controversial. Explicit support of the security of property by the economics profession would entail a repudiation of the statist ideology by which it has been guided for fifty years, and such a change is too painful to contemplate, no matter what the evidence may be.

A year later, in October 1973, embarrassing details about the Philippine land reform were published by the New York Times. The reform was facing a "major roadblock." Tens of thousands of middle-class smallholders were unexpectedly scheduled for expropriation. Half the plots eligible for plunder were 25 acres or less. They were owned, Tillman Durdin reported, by businessmen, retired military officers, teachers, and other professionals who have put their savings into small rural properties that they have regarded as providing basic security for themselves and their heirs. Tenants cultivate their lands while they live in towns and collect as rent their share of what the tenants make."

The Secretary of Agrarian Reform was quoted as saying: "These are the very people, a part of the middle class, whose support the president needs. They will be very bitter if they have to give up their lands."

Oh dear, somebody had goofed. Marcos had been persuaded that ownership was the great bulwark against Communism. Therefore, if you took land from "absentee landlords" and gave it to the tillers, ownership would increase and Communism would find no foothold. But the absentee landlords turned out to be teachers—Marcos's own bureaucrats—who had bought a little land as a form of pension plan: something literally to live on after retirement. And now Marcos wanted to seize it from them. Adding insult to injury, the New York Times (its editorial writers secure in Scarsdale) had given its blessing.

Much of this planned plunder was forestalled. Nevertheless, Marcos weakened his own country with land reform, which provided him with the rationale for seizing the property of political opponents (including the largest steel mill in the country), thereby contributing to a general insecurity. Furthermore, when the rule of law is subverted, corruption invariably takes its place. If a landowner's property was unexpectedly not taken, then his neighbors would suspect him of buying off the Agrarian Reform surveyors even if he had not.

New owners cannot possibly feel secure in such a climate of mounting despotism. This key defect of land reform has been pointed out by the anthropologist Grace Goodell, now at Johns Hopkins' School for Advanced International Studies. Miss Goodell did her field work in Iran, where in the 1960s the Shah had unwisely taken American and World Bank advice, imposed a draconian land reform, expropriated the mullahs, "rewarded" the peasants with the stolen land, and in the end, as we know, paid the penalty himself.

"If the Shah can take all this land away from the landlords to give to us," Iranian peasants said to Miss Goodell, "how much easier it will be for him to take it away from us some day."

This happened, and it didn't take long. Persuaded that American agribusiness con-

cerns knew more about working the land than his own Iranians, the Shah soon stripped the peasants of their short-lived holdings. Miss Goodell, whose book about Iran, "The Elementary Structure of Political Life," will be published by Oxford University Press next year, regards land reform as "the state's Trojan horse for its own penetration and domination of the countryside." But, as the Shah found, it is a dangerous weapon, creating an embittered and perhaps revolutionary middle class that sees itself, probably correctly, as having been wrongfully dispossessed. In much the same way, Ngo Dinh Diem and Nguyen Van Thieu destabilized South Vietnam with American-backed land reforms in the early and late 1960s.

TILLERS AT THE TILL

The Philippine fiasco was largely financed by the World Bank, which shelled out at least \$50 million to the Marcos government (which of course could use the money to reward political allies). The U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) was also involved in a small way, spending about \$2 million on various studies and surveys. But AID soon withdrew, apparently having recognized its dangerous features. By 1975 the proposed new "owners" were downgraded to "leaseholders" in AID documents, leaving the Philippine middle class, one may guess, more secure and less rebellious.

Roy Prosterman, the land-reform expert from the University of Washington Law School, testified in 1975 before the Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Assistance that he had been "very close to the processes of development of the land reform there [the Philippines], and I have been very disappointed to see the failure of the Philippine land-reform program. It was initiated as a program to transfer land ownership to a million families of tenant farmers, and with respect to that goal they have achieved only 1 percent of what was intended over a thirty-month period."

Prosterman was also an architect of President Thieu's 1969 land reform in South Vietnam ("successful in achieving its immediate objectives," Prosterman wrote in the Summer 1981 issue of International Security), and he also played a major advisory role a decade later in the land-to-the-tiller phase of the Salvadoran land reform that was established (with the close cooperation of U.S. Ambassador Robert White) in the final year of the Carter Administration. Subsequently, President Reagan's political appointees to AID have been surprised to find that the most unpopular and destabilizing feature of the Philippine reform was repeated in El Salvador: Land was eligible for expropriations on the grounds that its owners were absent, but these turned out in many cases to be middle-class professionals in San Salvador, not millionaires in Miami. Many of these people soon found that, instead of a patch of land to retire to, they had worthless bonds stamped by the El Salvador Institute for Agrarian Transformation. Later the State Department (in two separate reports) concluded that there was a connection between this injustice and what came to be called "right-wing death squads."

In some cases, AID and State Department officials were dismayed to find, "absentee landlords" turned out to be widows, orphans, and yes, handicapped persons, whose crippled or aged condition prevented them from tilling the soil themselves, but who had enterprisingly found others to rent the land from them. No matter! Expropriate the

expropriators! In some of the more pathetic cases, apparently, the intended beneficiaries refused to accept the land. (In Sri Lanka this error was also made, and again many tillers refused to accept plundered land.)

It turned out that the new owners could not sell their land for thirty years. This was intended to prevent them from selling it back to those from whom it had been taken. The effect was to weaken property rights considerably, because those who cannot realize the value of what they own cannot really be said to own it, and will certainly be deterred from improving it. (Consider what would happen to the building stock in the United States if no one could sell houses for thirty years.) Moreover, the new owners weren't allowed to rent out "their" land either, because if they did they would become . . . absentee landlords! And subject to expropriation in turn. This destructive and tyrannical provision, also a feature of life in rural Mexico, effectively returns a country to serfdom. Consider the effect on industry if the owners of buildings were not allowed to rent them out.

In Phase I of the Salvadoran land reform, all farms larger than 1,235 acres were expropriated, and those who had worked the fields were told that the collectively owned the land. But each individual could not sell his share nor could the collective as a whole sell the property. Rather than "extending" property rights, such edicts destroy them completely. They also destroy the incentive to work, because the individual who multiplies his effort can only marginally increase his reward, if indeed he can increase it at all. This "reform" repeated in El Salvador the collectivists system imposed by the Cardenas administrations in Mexico in 1934, when a sizable percentage of Mexican farmland was "reformed" into the *ejido* system—one that denied the peasants the right to sell their share of the land (an error that remains uncorrected to this day).

A POLITICAL TOOL

The Aid Administrator, Peter McPherson, has in recent months publicly criticized this provision of the law and has tried to get President Duarte to change it, so far without success. Duarte is far more wedded to socialist principles than is generally realized, and he is most unlikely to comply. In addition, a collectivized farm is a convenient political tool, useful for granting favors or withholding them nor will Duarte feel the economic pinch that might encourage him to change so long as he is cushioned by U.S. dollars—one of P. T. Bacer's favorite arguments against foreign aid.

Fiscal 1986 U.S. aid for El Salvador is \$483 million—including \$46 million in food aid to make up for the sharp agricultural decline that has set in since land reform was implemented in 1980. The foreign-aid request for the Philippines this year is \$279 million, including \$35 million in food aid. Two countries that do not receive U.S. aid, incidentally, even though they are eligible for it, are Mexico and Nigeria. They are, one AID official said, in the "Too Proud to Accept" category. One wishes for the sake of P.T. Bauer that they were doing better economically. Both, alas, are basket cases. At the same time neither enjoys anything remotely resembling the rule of law. So far are we from grasping this issue that when, a month after the earthquake, the Mexican strongman Miguel de la Madrid expropriated seven thousand private buildings on 625 acres of Mexico City land, two Wall Street Journal reporters (Steve Frazier and Mary Williams Walsh) adjudged the expropriation decree

to be among de la Madrid's "short-term successes." Due process at home and socialism abroad—that is the unstated and probably unconscious prescription of so many university-educated Americans.

(The Wall Street Journal assigned nine reporters to its six-part, post-earthquake "Nation in Jeopardy" series, and between them they covered several square yards of newsprint, reporting many interesting facts but not one touching on the underlying cause of the Mexican problem: the insecurity of property, which is continually exposed to the threat of expropriation. This is really what is meant by those who say, usually approvingly, that the Mexican revolution is "still continuing." Indeed it is.)

Foreign eligibility for U.S. aid is determined by GNP-per-capita statistics compiled by the World Bank. When they lose their eligibility, successful countries are said to "graduate." Three countries that graduated years ago are Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan. They are of great interest and importance because they all experienced land reform of a sort and they are repeatedly cited in the land-reform literature as great success stories, proving that land reform really does work. And critics of land reform must concede that economic progress in these countries has been perhaps unrivaled anywhere since World War II. What did this success have to do with land reform?

Again, the great problem with land reform is this: The government that imposes it enlarges its own power over citizens' lives. However well intended, this represents a step away from the rule of law. A ruler who can change the pattern of ownership with the stroke of a pen is more tyrant than lawgiver. If he can do it once, he can do it again. No property is then secure, as we saw in Iran, as we see today in Mexico, and of course in the Communist countries.

Land reform was imposed in Japan by decree of General Douglas MacArthur in December 1945—along with a new constitution and elections. The Japanese were not merely defeated, they were willing to accept "the American way" as the price of defeat. They could surely see that MacArthur was not seizing power for himself. He was not establishing a tyranny for his own benefit, but was intervening under circumstances that would not be repeated. Whereas Marcos, Duarte, and the Shah went some way toward undermining the rule of law in their countries, MacArthur imposed it on Japan. The Japanese accepted it, no doubt because they could see that the new system was designed to obstruct the arbitrary exercise of power, so that the future was likely to be more secure, thus encouraging the people to go about their business in a spirit of hopefulness. Furthermore, the system had evidently served the Americans well enough to defeat the hitherto invincible Japanese!

PEASANTS FOREVER

It was the same in South Korea, formerly a Japanese colony, with about 15 percent of its land owned by Japanese. (And these really were the archetypal absentee landlords.) Again, the Americans arrived, imposed elections and a new constitution, and restored the Japanese-held lands to Koreans. The Koreans for their part had no reason to believe the victorious Americans were seeking personal or political gain, and so they could anticipate that this external intervention would not be repeated.

Likewise in Taiwan. After the Chinese Communist victory in 1949, General Chiang Kai-shek's remnant retreated to Formosa under U.S. auspices and there a Joint (U.S.-

China) Commission on Rural Reconstruction imposed the new property arrangement on the old Formosan aristocracy. This "defeat" was likewise accepted by the Formosans, and the rule of law established.

None of this would have worked if the Americans had attempted to establish collective farms, as in El Salvador. In all three countries property rights were assigned individually, titles were issued, and these titles were fully transferrable. (In Japan there was a ten-year delay before titles could be transferred.) Owners, that is, could sell their land to others who in turn could do what they liked with it. In Taiwan today, land is rapidly being converted from agricultural to more highly valued industrial use. Land-reform zealots are usually opposed to such permissiveness because, they believe, it will "dispossess" the peasants. One can only reply that where there are doctrinaire land-reformers there will always be peasants. Where there are property rights, peasantry will soon disappear.

How odd that the great guru of land reform, Wolf Ladejinsky, a Ukrainian immigrant to the U.S. who worked for ten years at the Department of Agriculture before joining MacArthur's staff in 1945, never understood why land reform had worked in Japan. In later years he traipsed disconsolately about Asia, conducting unsuccessful agrarian experiments in different countries, becoming (it seemed) increasingly disgruntled and radical. Shortly before his death he told a World Bank seminar: "If we are to wait until the peasantry of India—or for that matter a number of other Asian countries—decide to take the law into their own hands and fight for an out-and-out radical agrarian revolution, I think we would have to wait for a long, long time."

But the Japanese peasants didn't take the law into their own hands. The law was given to them.

HUGO MORALES: A GREAT AMERICAN

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to pay tribute to a dear friend of mine, Dr. Hugo Morales. Dr. Morales has been a pillar of New York's Dominican community for almost three decades. This past year, he was given the honor of being elected president of the Bronx County Medical Society for 1984-85. On November 17, he was honored at a dinner in New Rochelle, NY.

I will not try to list the many accomplishments of Dr. Morales. He has done so many things so well. I would like to mention, however, that aspect of his personality that is hidden from the general public—the human side of Hugo Morales. He is a warm, concerned human being who believes in his community. He has given of himself for years without expecting a reward. His reward has been all the good he has done for his community. He has been unfailingly modest and patient, never demanding.

Dr. Hugo Morales deserves to be honored by his peers in the medical profession. He deserves to be recognized by his friends

and his community. I am proud to say that I have had the privilege of working with him over the years, and it is my fondest hope that we will continue our friendship for many years to come.

I am submitting for the RECORD the biography of Dr. Morales, so that my colleagues can read about his many accomplishments.

HUGO M. MORALES, M.D.

On June 1, 1984, Dr. Hugo Morales became the Bronx County Medical Society's 71st President. He is a Diplomate of the American Board of Neurology and Psychiatry, and a member of the American Board of Quality Assurance and Utilization Review Physicians.

Dr. Morales received his M.D. degree from the University of Santo Domingo in 1956. Following postgraduate training at New York Polyclinic Medical School and Hospital, he held a teaching appointment in Psychiatry at Harlem Hospital in New York City. He was also the Director of the Department of Psychiatry at St. Francis Hospital in the Bronx.

He was elected to membership in the Bronx County Medical Society in February, 1965. He served as Chairman of the Public Relations Committee from 1976 to 1982. He was elected Vice President on June 1, 1982, and became President-Elect on June 1, 1983. He is currently a member of the Board of Trustees and the Board of Censors, and continues to serve as a Delegate to the Medical Society of the State of New York, a position which he has held since 1981.

Dr. Morales is on the Psychiatric Staff at the Bronx-Lebanon and Gracie Square Hospitals, and serves as a Consultant to numerous city agencies. In 1978, he was appointed by the Governor to serve on the Council for Mental Health Planning in the State of New York, and he continues in that position. His name has also been submitted by the Governor to the Legislature to become a member of the Medical Advisory Board of the Social Services Department of New York State. He is also a member of the Mental Health Task Force in Albany, whose main responsibility is the development of community rehabilitative programs.

In early October, Mayor Koch appointed him as a member of the Mayor's Commission of Hispanic Affairs. The purpose of the Commission is to identify economic, education and health problems in the Hispanic community and to offer solutions to these conditions. He has been a member of the Shared Health Facility Advisory Board Council of New York since 1983.

He has been the recipient of numerous awards for his services to the community, including the Bronx Community College's "Man of the Year Award" in 1976. Dr. Morales is active in many community and professional organizations, including the Bronx Society of Neurology and Psychiatry, the American Medical Association, the Spanish-American Medical Society, the New York Academy of Science, the Pan American Medical Association, and the Dominican Medical Society. He is a former President of the Bronx District Branch of the American Psychiatric Association.

He is the founder and Medical Director of the Bronx Mental Health Center. This mental health care facility employs approximately fifty people, and provides innovative, comprehensive ambulatory mental health care services to patients which are largely black and Hispanic. Dr. Morales is deeply

committed to providing quality mental health care services to these patients.

Dr. Morales and his wife, Gladys, have a daughter, Nilda Morales Horowitz, and a son, Hugo.

LAST YEAR'S SUPERFUND BILL IS STANDARD FOR EFFORT THIS YEAR

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, last year the House passed, by a vote of 323 to 33, strong and effective Superfund legislation that would have reauthorized the program at a funding level of \$10 billion for 5 more years. Unfortunately, the administration blocked the legislation in the Senate and this year we are compelled once again to consider the extension and expansion of this major environmental program.

In addition to expanding the financial resources available for the Federal toxic waste cleanup effort, last year's Superfund bill established a strict annual schedule for cleanup and uniform national cleanup standards for finished sites. The bill gave citizens the right to sue polluters for cleanup when the Government was not acting at the site and reaffirmed the current law's strong liability for those found responsible for creating these toxic hazards.

This year, we are—quite understandably—being held to the standards established in last year's bill as one definitive measure of our commitment to a strong and effective Superfund Program. A recent editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer is typical of the commentaries that have been written in recent weeks urging us to reaffirm last year's effort. I commend this thoughtful analysis to my colleagues' attention.

GIVING SUPERFUND A CHANCE

Last year the House of Representatives voted to reauthorize a strong Superfund program by an overwhelming margin of 323-33. The enormity of that bipartisan vote was attributed generally to the fact that members faced re-election and knew the voters at home wanted get-tough programs that would clean up hazardous wastes.

Something's changed this year. The legislation that in 1984 whizzed through the House (only to die in the Senate) has been stalled by a few House members who assert that there isn't broad-based public support for a rigorous chemical cleanup program.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

In a recent Time magazine survey, 79 percent of the Americans polled said that "not enough" has been done to clean up toxic-waste sites, and 64 percent said they would be willing to pay higher state and local taxes to fund cleanup programs in their communities. With each new discovery of an abandoned toxic-waste site, contaminated groundwater supply, or polluted river, the constituency for strong cleanup regulations grows. Chemical contamination is so pervasive that the health of millions of Americans already is being endangered.

They hardly would be protected by the bill that emerged from the Energy and Commerce Committee, chaired by Rep. John D. Dingell (D., Mich.). Many of the components vital to making Superfund do the job it was intended to do had been removed, including cleanup schedules and standards. Fortunately, a second bill that contains those provisions and others was approved by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, chaired by Rep. James J. Howard (D., N.J.).

Members of both committees have begun meeting in an attempt to work out an agreement on the two bills. The extent of differences between the bills—and the strong feelings that exist on both sides—make observers less than optimistic that a compromise can be reached. It will then rest with the House Rules Committee to decide which measures goes to a vote.

The Superfund program, which officially expired at the end of September after five years of existence, has not lived up to the expectations of those who enacted it. No one in 1980 understood the magnitude of the problem, or the complexities of cleaning up this witches' brew of chemicals. The EPA grossly mismanaged the program during the first years of its life, and the success stories wrought by Superfund efforts are few.

But those are precisely the reasons that a strong, fully funded Superfund program must be enacted. If House members question whether there is a groundswell of support for a Superfund that will do the job, they ought to talk to their constituents. Better yet, their constituents ought to tell them.

KEEPING SOUTH AFRICA IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in spite of what many in the media and among the liberals of this country would have us believe, the Botha government in South Africa has committed itself to meaningful change of its system of government. But Mr. Botha and his National Party have before them a task that is far from easy—witness the recent successes of the far-right in parliamentary elections as a backlash to the limited reforms introduced so far. But there can be no doubt that the journey along the road to reform has begun, and once begun, it will not end until tremendous changes have been accomplished.

Many have criticized the recent ban on reporting in certain areas of South Africa where violence and unrest have been most prevalent, but the simple fact is that the more presence of television cameras in such areas tends to spark or at the very least aggravate incidents in these areas. Freedom of the press is, of course, very important. But when that freedom is abused or implemented to distort what is actually occurring, or when it is a catalyst of further violence, then it should not be surprising when most governments in the world limit that freedom. No one who has ever been near an angry mob will deny that cer-

tain individuals tend to play to the press, and in a situation as volatile as that in South Africa, this can be dangerous indeed.

Anyone who doubts the sincerity of the South African Government to bring about meaningful change has merely to look at some of its recent actions and listen to what the leaders have been saying. Anyone who believes that the foreign press in South Africa has been a model of objectivity and has done nothing to transgress the basic principles and ethics of journalism is sadly misguided. Along these same lines, I commend to my colleagues' attention a speech given by Mr. D.J. Louis Nel, the Deputy Minister of Information of South Africa, during a recent visit to Washington. I hope my colleagues will take a few moments to really listen to what one of South Africa's leaders thinks and intends, rather than just relying on what the media tells us these leaders intend.

(By Mr. D.J. Louis Nel, Deputy Minister of Information of South Africa)

SOUTH AFRICA: PLAYING IT BY THE RULES

Men and women of the press:

INTRODUCTION

I come from a country that many in the American Press nowadays, sadly enough, love to denounce.

We are only too aware that over the past year an ugly stamp, a seal of disapproval, has been put upon South Africa.

Yet we who live in South Africa, both black and white, not only love our country, but also take pride in it.

We are encouraged by the vast amount of goodwill that exists between all of us—despite the stridency of radical condemnation and the images of violence that have appeared on your screens.

Appalling violence has occurred in our country, violence which we deeply regret. We are saddened by the hurt and injury and the deaths. We are also saddened by the measure of polarisation in our society that the violence has caused.

We ask only that the blame be fairly apportioned.

We ask that our situation be justly appraised.

PERCEPTION CREATED BY THE MEDIA

My Government believes in freedom of speech and the freedom of the press.

Creating a media image, however, which conveys the impression of a country in well-nigh total turmoil, when facts prove that that is most clearly not the case, surely is not fair. Yet this has happened.

Although such an image may be exciting to your readers or to your TV viewers, you ultimately misinform them. Reality and truth would dictate a more balanced picture.

The reality of violence in South Africa is portrayed on your television screens and in newspaper columns as violence and brutal force by the South African Police against Blacks. The false perception thus created is one of violence only by the authorities against those Blacks who oppose the political system.

The truth, in fact, is that most of the violence is perpetrated by radical and revolutionary Blacks against moderate Blacks—and the police, responsible for law and order, of necessity have to move in to prevent the destruction of property, the murdering and maiming of innocent people and the total disruption of the Black communi-

ties—which, unfortunately so, is the stated aim of the ANC, which is a terrorist and Communist backed organization and who, by its own admission, has close links with other terrorist organizations like the P.L.O. And when the police move in, the rioters turn against them.

It is in fact that, in discharging this difficult duty, many people have been killed and wounded through police action.

Between September 1984 and September 1985: 210 Black people were murdered and 884 Black people hurt by Black radical and revolutionary elements, 14 Black policemen were killed and 405 hurt, 615 schools for Black children, 26 churches, 520 factories and shops owned by Black businessmen, 1917 private Black homes, and 3138 delivery vehicles, carrying food and other commodities into Black residential areas, were destroyed or petrol-bombed by rioters.

How many of you are really aware of these atrocities committed by radical, revolutionary elements against moderate Blacks, ostensibly in the interest of freedom?

These facts are freely available and yet not fully reported.

We object to the perception created that these terrorist acts against moderate Blacks are honest attempts at democratic reform, and that only police actions are the cause of violence. That is simply not true!

COMMITMENT TO DEMOCRACY AND ITS REALIZATION

The debate today, however, is really not about violence, not about apartheid either, but about South Africa's advance to a full democracy.

The implementation of full democracy, however firm the commitment, takes time: it does not happen overnight, especially not in a complex multi-ethnic or plural society.

Certainly, when one looks at the sweep of modern history, instant democracy is very rare! Most countries in the world have not reached the ideal of full democracy and still have a long way to go.

The American experience is a case in point:

The American Declaration of Independence of July 4, 1776 stated: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights . . .—of which Liberty is one."

The American Bill of Rights followed in 1791.

In spite of all these strong commitments, slavery in America was abolished only in 1865—74 years after the Independence Declaration.

Remarkably so, only in 1870, nearly 80 years after the Bill of Rights, which certainly is applicable to everyone in the USA, race as a bar to voting rights was abolished in your country.

We all know too well that even those developments did not end racial discrimination in the USA.

As late as 1960, Martin Luther King Jr. had this to say: "I have a dream that one day even the State of Mississippi, a State sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice . . ."

Nobody doubts the successive American governments' and the American peoples' commitment to democratic values and norms.

Yet, the fulfillment of those values took many generations to achieve.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN COMMITMENT

I would now refer you to South Africa's commitment which we would expect to achieve much faster!

Our State President, Mr. P. W. Botha, recently put the South African Government's commitment for the future in these unequivocal terms:

He started off by pledging that there will be no political domination of one group over another; he promised that no community would be excluded from the decision-making process; he pledged equal opportunities to all communities and firmly rejected injustice and inequality; he pledged the removal of any racial discrimination and encroachment upon human dignity.

Surely we can all back the South African President up to the hilt in this.

As regards constitutional reform, President Botha made the following commitment, and I quote:

"The Republic of South Africa forms one state . . ."

And then . . .

"It follows from this point of view that there should be one collective South African citizenship for all who form part of the Republic."

And then again:

" . . . My Government stated clearly that all groups and communities within the geographical area of this state must obtain representation at the highest level without domination of the one over the other."

And furthermore:

"It is the conviction of the South African Government that any eventual constitutional dispensation will have to take into consideration the multi-cultural nature of the composition of our population . . . The protection of minority rights will thus have to be ensured."

He continued:

"In order to meet these realities and views, it is evident that units will have to be recognized on a geographic and group basis . . ."

And further:

"It is the conviction of the Government that the structures in which co-operation will take place, must be the result of negotiation with the leaders of all communities."

President Botha concluded:

"To summarise, I thus finally confirm that my Party and I are committed to the principle of a united South Africa, one citizenship and a universal franchise, but within structures chosen by South Africans, not within structures prescribed from abroad . . ."

On economic reform President Botha expressed himself as follows:

" . . . Further socio-economic reform, based on the principle that discrimination on the basis of race, ethnic character and origin is rejected, is also put on the agenda by the Government."

This firm commitment by the South African Government conforms to Western civilized values. They should be universally acceptable and should be recognized as such.

Now you're all looking forward to the upcoming World Series. Those teams wanting to participate in the World Series can only do so if they conform to the rules of the game. If not, they are barred from the game.

I appeal to you today to recognize and to accept that my Government is committed to playing the democratic, constitutional game according to the rules.

The fact that this commitment has as yet not been fully fulfilled, does however not detract from its validity.

In this respect, the stated South African approach finds some support in the well-known Lusaka Manifesto, agreed upon by 13 Black member states of the Organization for African Unity in 1969.

After stating its ideals, ideals which in broad terms are acceptable to South Africa, the Manifesto continues:

"We recognise that at any one time there will be, within every society, failures in the implementation of these ideals. We recognise that for the sake of order in human affairs, there may be transitional arrangements while a transformation from group inequalities to individual equality is being effected. . . ."

South Africa now has a strong and binding commitment, which I can assure you we will live up to. Its fulfillment is being implemented and we are in a transitional period.

We must however be practical: It cannot be denied that the speed of implementation of our lofty commitments will greatly be influenced by the economic progress and social stability which all South Africans experience and the peace and tranquility which we will be allowed to enjoy.

Now it is true that you Americans have a somewhat different approach to some of these matters, particularly when it comes to recognizing the constitutional rights of groups.

As determined as we are to remove discrimination from the statute books, as committed as we are to institute real democracy in South Africa, so intent is my government as well to safeguarding the minority interests of our different peoples and groups.

The hard fact of South Africa, in fact of Africa as a whole, is the existence of minority or ethnic groups with a cohesiveness that for centuries has been the corner stone of everybody's security.

My fellow Black countrymen belong to nine different ethnic groups, speak different languages, have different lifestyles and to a great extent conform to different cultures. By stating this obvious truth, I do not in any way whatsoever wish to belittle the common interests among all South Africa's Blacks, which I hasten to recognize.

But these groupings can nevertheless not be wished or willed away; they are there; and clearly they must form the building blocks of any new society.

Other countries in Africa who ignored this reality, did so to their everlasting detriment!

Since ethnicity is so strong a factor, not only in South Africa, but on the whole continent of Africa, then obviously recognition of ethnicity is cardinal to reform. Without guaranteeing the security that comes with each group's cohesiveness, reform becomes well-nigh impossible. Fearful of losing their rights, some minority groups will undoubtedly become unwilling to enter into any kind of national negotiation.

And thus we come to the most important issue of the day: What model should South Africa adopt in implementing democracy in its broadest sense.

At this point, no clear-cut answer can be given except that it will be a model negotiated with leaders of all communities on the principles spelled out by the State President, namely:

- (i) A United South Africa;
- (ii) One citizenship for all; and
- (iii) A universal franchise where every person will have a vote.

As far as specific model is concerned, the President said "that the Government will

not prescribe and will not demand. Give and take will be the guiding principle."

In this regard I must now make reference to the so-called "one-man-one-vote-in-a-unitary-state" system which so many in the world demand that South Africa should implement immediately.

The rejection of this specific model, without guarantees of the rights of minorities as it has been applied in Africa, however, does not imply that every person will not have the vote and will not participate fully in the democratic process. There are numerous other models of democracy which can be considered and which are successfully being applied in the world. It will, however, be essential for South Africa to work out its own system in order to satisfy its unique requirements.

The reality and history of our continent demonstrates unmistakably that one-man-one-vote in a unitary state, without guaranteeing the rights of minorities, leads to one of two results: either a dictatorship by whatever ethnic group has the most people, or to military coup and rule by soldiers.

I do not ask you to take my testimony on this point. Instead, I refer you to one of your own colleagues.

The New York Times representative in Africa wrote from Zimbabwe on August 14, 1984:

"In 100 coups or attempted coups, at least 70 African leaders have been deposed in a quarter of a century. Almost half the member nations of the Organization of African Unity are led by soldiers. If there is a political system that has evolved as the norm, it is the one-party state, often based on one-man rule."

Against the background of such testimony and the historical record, it is not only a rationalization but the clearest of truths to state that to simply install one-man-one-vote in a unitary state in South Africa without adequate protections for the cultural and ethnic minorities of which South Africa is composed, would only repeat the deadly struggles that have broken the promise of democracy in so many African states.

SOUTH AFRICA'S CREDIBILITY

South Africa is committed to change.

While I say that this is for real, you might answer that all I have said is mere pie in the sky, and then asks: What about South Africa's apartheid? What about the legislated racism which is the basis of our condemnation of your society?

Let us say that the legislated discrimination of successive South African governments is common cause. Let us also say that that was the case. Let us further say that South Africa is indeed changing, in very much the same way that America changed over many generations.

There are those who claim, regardless of what we say, that no change has taken place in my country. There are others who nullify those changes by professing them to be cosmetic and meaningless.

And yet, for those with open minds, our track record is there to see: what has been achieved, with much political pain and turmoil, corroborates the credibility of the South African Government when it states its commitment to change.

Compare the South Africa of 1975 to that of 1985:

In 1975, the Parliament was for Whites only and the policy was to keep it that way.

In 1975 Whites were entitled under the Job Reservation Law to a monopoly of all skilled jobs in industry. Multi-racial trade

unions were illegal and the labour laws did not recognize Black trade unions.

In 1975, the urban Black population was considered to be temporary migrants only and the policy was to reverse the flow into the cities back to the homelands. South African citizenship was denied to those coming to the cities, and was being taken away from many who were there. Blacks could not own homes whether outright or in the form of leasehold.

In contrast, today, in 1985, the Government has broken the colour-line in Parliament, where elected representatives of the Coloured and Indian communities sit.

Moreover, the entire job reservation law has been abolished. Multi-racial and Black trade unions are by law on the same footing as White unions, and they are large and powerful.

Today, the urban Black population is explicitly recognised as permanent: one collective citizenship for everybody—White, Black and Brown alike—is the policy: those who lost their South African citizenship will have it restored, and the whole system of influx control is being reconsidered.

Today, Blacks can hold 99-year leaseholds of their homes, and freehold rights are imminent. The ban on mixed marriages has been repealed, and the resettlement of Black communities has been discontinued, thereby ending the 'Black Spot' policy.

Taken individually, each of these reforms represents a major change in basic areas of South Africa's life: as a whole, they signify the beginning of a new era in South Africa.

COMMITMENT TO REFORM OR TO REVOLUTION: A CHOICE

The experience of many nations tells us that when you bring about fruitful change, there are often forces that oppose reform—in that it could frustrate their plans for a total overthrow of the society. They present reform as a sign of weakness, and move in to foster civil unrest with the hope of overturning the established order at this crucial juncture. In manner of speaking, they want to win the match by bending the rules!

This is exactly what has happened in South Africa of late. We too have our enemies among the radical forces of the world.

The Soviet bloc manifestly has designs upon South Africa with its strategic position, its mineral wealth and the only industrial complex in Africa.

There is further the African National Congress (ANC), operating from exile and forming an alliance with the South African Communist Party, who endeavour to establish a Marxist-Socialist state in South Africa.

The ANC also openly sides with terrorist movements like the PLO, the Polisario Front, and other Latin American terrorists groups.

This fact is proved by official statements on more than one occasion by various leaders, including its President, Oliver Tambo, who on 9 November 1982 in New York, publicly stated the ANC's support for and solidarity with the PLO and other terrorist organizations.

The ANC is firmly committed to total change through violence and revolution.

On 11 February this year, Radio Freedom, the ANC's radio station, put it quite clearly: "Our future lies in our victory and our victory lies in the attack—militant and vicious attack".

And further:

"Whilst we are continuously making our country ungovernable and ourselves diffi-

cult to control, we must at the same time attack the enemy. We must start here in our residential areas and remove from our way all enemy collaborators—all those who man the apartheid oppressive structures, either councillors, police or agents must be removed"

The reference here is, tragically enough, to Black South Africans.

On January 8, 1983, Oliver Tambo, as reported in Sechaba, the official mouthpiece of the ANC, of March 1983, explicitly stated:

"The ANC . . . upholds a strategy which combines revolutionary mass political action with revolutionary armed struggle".

And on 30 January 1985, Radio Freedom said: "We shall be ungovernable—abiding to the call by the President, Comrade Oliver Tambo, we must be ungovernable"

The events in South Africa during the past year should be understood against the background of these quoted statements.

These organisations contrive incident after incident, muster crowds to go on the rampage and see to it that the eyes of the world via television are fixed upon them.

I have given you details of the murders perpetrated and destruction caused by these revolutionary elements.

The sad fact is that the purpose of these radical organisations in embarking upon their course of violence has essentially been to intimidate their fellow Blacks into toeing their line and to frighten any moderate leadership from taking part in the constitutional negotiations that the government has pledged.

The South African government is severely criticised for not negotiating with the ANC.

We are, however, prepared to compare commitment with commitment, deeds with deeds.

The ANC is committed to violence, to murder and destruction . . . to a revolution which could only result, not in the sharing of power by all South Africans irrespective of race, colour of creed, but by the seizing of power by a militant few. The ANC does not accept the rules of democracy recognised by civilized Western countries.

This is the recipe we have seen so often in Africa.

Columnist Flora Lewis in the New York Times wrote on March 22, 1983:

"To be blunt, the experience of Black Africa since decolonization has been dreadful. Revolution and wars of liberation proved effective only for seizing power, not in any way for improving the miserable condition of the people in whose name they were fought".

Is this what the world wants?

Is the emotional feeling against the South African Government so great that this becomes an acceptable alternative?

I would hope not.

The Big Lie in Africa where most states are run by military dictatorship or on a one-party basis, is that a Black government is a democratic government.

This where well-intentioned South Africans of whatever race or colour draw the line. We want a democracy in which all South Africa's people, irrespective of race, colour or creed, will share power and share responsibility.

We want to play it according to the rules. And if the ANC is willing to change its commitment, is willing to accept the rules and renounce violence to achieve political aims, I say that we will be willing to play the game with them. And who knows, perhaps we might even end up playing in the same team!

SUMMIT HOPES FOR RAOUL WALLENBERG

HON. BILL LOWERY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, the President has properly promised to bring up the issue of human rights while he meets with Soviet Secretary Gorbachev in Geneva this week. The record of human rights violations in the Soviet Union can be described as nothing less than atrocious.

However, we in Congress often seem to view the Soviet human rights record as somehow "ebbing and flowing" as the United States and the U.S.S.R. move back and forth between so-called cooling and warming periods. Mr. Speaker, the Soviets' disregard for basic human rights reflects a consistent policy of subjugating the individual to the needs of the State. At times, the needs of the State allow for less repression, at other times not.

It is not my expectation, Mr. Speaker, that the fundamental nature of the Soviet system—denying freedom for individuals—will be changed by the summit between President Reagan and Secretary Gorbachev. But it is my hope that President Reagan will be able to impress upon Secretary Gorbachev that it is in the interests of the Soviet state to lessen repression and to abide by the Helsinki accords.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I hope that President Reagan will convey to the Soviet leadership the gravity and importance with which we view their actions toward the lost hero of the Holocaust, Raoul Wallenberg. As the author of legislation which will rename 15th Street, SW., in Washington, DC, as Raoul Wallenberg Place, I agree with the editorial entitled "The Wallenberg Coverup" which appeared in the Wall Street Journal yesterday, and I would like to share it with my colleagues.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 18, 1985]

THE WALLENBERG COVER-UP

The weekend announcement that the Soviets may release some Americans' spouses now held behind the Iron Curtain will be good news when it happens. There's rarely been any apparent political reason for the Soviet practice of dividing American and Russian spouses. It's important, however, that some distinction be made between such welcome gestures and human-rights issues that raise more acute questions about the nature of the Soviet system.

One profoundly symbolic human-rights case is especially poignant. In World War II, the Russians took Hungary from the Nazis. They also took political prisoners in order to make the country safe for communism. One of those imprisoned was Raoul Wallenberg, the Swedish diplomat who managed to save 100,000 Hungarian Jews from the Nazis by granting them Swedish passports and otherwise whisking them out of Nazi control. Such a human-rights campaigner would have caused trouble for the totalitarianism being implemented in Hungary.

Mr. Wallenberg was taken prisoner by the Soviets in 1945, but in 1947 they denied any knowledge of his case. In 1957, the Soviets

admitted he had been imprisoned (by a Stalinist, they said) but claimed he had died in 1947. Dozens of citations by gulag survivors have raised hope in the West that Mr. Wallenberg might still be alive. The Research Center for Soviet Concentration Camps, an Israel-based group, contacts all Soviet emigres coming into Israel, and reports citations of Mr. Wallenberg up to 1982. He would be 73 years old if alive.

The Soviets consider the case closed. They refuse to accept inquiries made by Sweden or the U.S., which granted Mr. Wallenberg honorary citizenship in 1981. Out of desperation, Mr. Wallenberg's half brother and legal guardian asked a U.S. court to get the Soviets to account for Mr. Wallenberg. Despite the usual rules about immunity for sovereign nations, U.S. District Judge Barrington Parker recently ruled that "while the U.S.S.R. has continuously represented that Wallenberg died in 1947, those representations are inconsistent with and at odds with credible and uncontroverted evidence."

Judge Parker found that the Soviet Union "has always had knowledge and information about Wallenberg; that it has failed to disclose and has concealed that information; and that otherwise, defendant's representations are suspect and should be given little, if any, credit." The Soviets were told to explain their "gross violation" of international law.

The judge may have to wait a long time for the Soviets to comply with a report on who's languishing where in the gulag. For one thing, unaccounted-for prisoners are an extremely touchy subject for the Soviets' Eastern European "allies." The exact figures are hard to come by, but in 1972 the Senate Judiciary Committee reported there were tens, perhaps hundreds of thousands of Eastern Europeans in Soviet gulags. Poles were sent during World War II, Hungarians after their 1956 revolt, Czechs after theirs in 1968 and Poles during the Solidarity era.

Nonetheless, the Soviets still even deny the 1940 Katyn Forest massacre of 15,000 Polish officers and servicemen. So it's entirely unlikely that the Soviets will ever tell the full story of what happened to Mr. Wallenberg. It would be encouraging to see this week's summit prove otherwise.

RABBI EDGAR GLUCK: MAKING BROOKLYN A BETTER PLACE TO LIVE

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Jewish Week, a well-respected national newspaper, highlighted the important role the American Jewish community plays in law enforcement.

Drawing special attention is the fine work being done by Rabbi Edgar Gluck, a constituent and dear friend of mine, who serves as special assistant for community affairs for the New York State Police.

Rabbi Gluck stands tall among all men who value their community and work hard to make it a better place to live.

[From the Jewish Week, Nov. 18, 1985]

ORTHODOX RABBI WEARS STATE POLICE BADGE

The special assistant for community affairs of the New York State Police carries a badge. He also sports a black satin yarmulka. His *payot* are tucked underneath.

"I'm a trouble-shooter, a red-tape cutter," says Rabbi Edgar Gluck, sitting in his World Trade Center office overlooking Liberty Island, surrounded by photographs of himself with Henry Kissinger, Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter, Daniel Patrick Moynihan and "Tip" O'Neill.

As an aide to Superintendent Donald Chesworth, his formal duties are narrowly defined—teach at the State Police Academy, act as liaison between the superintendent and government agencies, enhance the force's public image. As a self-confessed political activist who began working with public officials as yeshiva student 32 years ago, he has broadened the responsibilities.

He is the division's liaison with the Jewish community. He is a lobbyist for state and federal legislation on law enforcement and religious issues. Working in Albany one day a week during legislative season, the rabbi has pushed bills on drunk-driving patrols, organ transplants and autopsy waivers. He serves as counselor to members of the force, both Jews and gentiles. He founded the Trooper Foundation, a privately supported group that raises funds for the State Police.

"There is no such thing as a job description," says Gluck, 49, who took his post 18 months ago after serving as assistant to three New York mayors and two governors. "A job description is just an outline."

A rabbi is supposed to be concerned with his community," he says of his interest in public service. "The Orthodox community is very pro-law and order. We all want to have safer and more secure communities."

As the highest-ranking Jew in the State Police, Gluck literally wears two hats—a homburg to the office, a wide-brim khaki trooper's hat during his sensitivity training lectures to police. And he frequently combines his religious and law-enforcement interests.

When a camper was reported missing upstate last year, he enlisted 60 boys from a Satmar camp to comb nearby woods. When civilian complaints are filed by members of the Jewish community against city police, he holds hearings on occasion in his Borough Park living room. When undercover patrols are requested in Chasidic neighborhoods, he trains non-Jewish city policemen.

One Italian officer, disguised in a long black coat, black hat and sidecurls, came to Gluck's house befuddled one Friday night last year, Chasidim were yelling at him, the officer said. Maybe you should put out that cigarette in your mouth, the rabbi advised.

One undercover officer on foot patrol Pesach night received invitations to join families' seders, Gluck says. Another had his hand slapped by a Chasid, who shouted "Trayfe" when the officer bought a hot dog from a sidewalk vendor. Two others were spotted eating in a non-kosher restaurant during Passover.

The result of that faux pas was "300 people sticking their noses into the restaurant," the rabbi says. "These are the kinds of things I try to explain."

A POTENTIAL CRISIS IN NICARAGUA

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, Tom Wicker discusses in his column today a potential United States-Nicaraguan crisis. I hope that my colleagues will take a moment to read his thoughtful essay. I believe he makes some valid points about the possibility of a direct conflict between the United States and Nicaragua. I am submitting his article for the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 18, 1985]

A NICARAGUAN CRISIS?

(By Tom Wicker)

While the world's attention has been focused on the summit, storm clouds have darkened over Nicaragua. And though "regional disputes" are on the agenda at Geneva, it's unlikely that anything done or said there will much affect what may be the coming crisis in Central America.

Both the Nicaraguan Government and the U.S.-supported "contras" are predicting that that crisis is at hand. When the Sandinistas announced in October the suspension of certain civil liberties, for example, the reason given by President Daniel Ortega Saavedra was that the Government was "on the verge" of routing the contras. The suspension was necessary, he said, to help prevent the rebels from "regrouping."

From the other side of the fence, Arturo Cruz, once a member of the Government and perhaps the most respected contra leader, said this week "1986 is the year when the book will be closed. If [the Sandinistas] are still in power by the end of 1986, that's it."

If Mr. Ortega has judged the military situation correctly, the bad news is that it's highly unlikely the Reagan Administration—in an election year—would stand by and let go down the drain its determination to overthrow the Sandinistas and turn back what it regards as a Soviet threat to the hemisphere. Organizing still another rebel force would take too long and probably prove ineffective; so rather than let the contras be crushed, Mr. Reagan might support them with U.S. air strikes or other U.S. forces.

But if Mr. Cruz is correct that the contras might succeed next year in overthrowing the Sandinistas, not only will the war intensify but so will the danger of its spreading across the Honduran or Costa Rican borders, or both. That would also make it more likely that the U.S. might be drawn in "defense" of these allies. Or, if Washington saw that the Sandinistas were near defeat, the temptation could be great to intervene and give them the final push.

Perhaps even more ominous was the announcement by Humberto Ortega Saavedra, Nicaragua's Defense Minister and the President's brother, that his country might soon acquire new fighter airplanes to counter what he said was a U.S. plan to equip Honduras with advanced F-5's. A State Department official replied that there was no plan to do this—not until the French Super Mystere fighters that already give Honduras the strongest air force in Central America could no longer be repaired. The official said the

Mysteres probably could last a year or two more.

But in this age of deniability, that statement, whether intentionally or not, leaves plenty of room for the U.S. to equip Honduras with F-5's sooner rather than later. If the U.S. did so, Nicaragua would be within its sovereign rights—as it would have been last year or would be right now—to seek advanced fighters of its own, perhaps Soviet MIG's or French Mirages. But the Reagan Administration has termed Nicaragua's acquisition of such aircraft "unacceptable"; and U.S. officials have left the strong impression that the Administration might mount air strikes to destroy the planes before they could be used.

Thus, if the Pentagon sent F-5's to Honduras during the crucial coming year, and if Nicaragua then acquired advanced fighters of its own, the Reagan Administration might have just the excuse it would want to enter the war—either to finish off the Sandinistas or to rescue the contras. It's even possible, given the depth of the Administration's hostility, that the F-5's might be sent deliberately to trigger off a Nicaraguan reaction that would give Washington an excuse to intervene.

On the other hand, the Sandinistas might acquire the aircraft even without the provocation of F-5's going to Honduras. That, too, would raise the grim possibility of direct U.S. intervention in the war.

The consequences in Latin America—either from open U.S. military action or from the downfall of the Sandinistas under pressure from U.S.-backed contras—probably would be severe. To mention only two possibilities: the trend toward democracy in several Latin countries could be reversed by an emboldened right; and Latin debtor nations would find it more difficult to repay the gringo interventionists.

But these are not possibilities the Administration seems to fear, or even to contemplate.

KRAUTHAMMER ON MEDVID'S LEAPS TO FREEDOM

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, it is remarkably easy to forget what freedom is when one never lives without it. Fortunately, Americans are continually reminded of the meaning of freedom by foreigners who knock on our door seeking admission.

The case of Miroslav Medvid, the Ukrainian sailor who attempted to defect to America, was for him an unqualified tragedy. For us it has been and should remain a deep embarrassment. Perhaps it will also be a reminder of what it is that Mr. Medvid wanted so badly when he jumped—twice—from a Communist ship.

The following comments on the Medvid incident by Charles Krauthammer were of particular interest to me, and may be as interesting to my colleagues.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 15, 1985]
HOW TO TREAT DEFECTORS—THE MEDVID RULES

(By Charles Krauthammer)

The United States is of two minds about defectors. It appreciates the sentiment but not the hassle. Every defector is confirmation that America is the promised land. Too many defectors—a whole world of tired, poor, huddled masses is yearning to be free—and the promised land gets crowded.

Worse, too many defectors can be bad for business. Embassy business, for example, U.S. embassies in the Soviet bloc discourage locals from jumping their walls and seeking asylum. It means added work and headaches. A group of 16 Siberian Pentecostals lived for five years in the basement of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. Embassies don't like running hostels.

But hurt most of all is the business of business. If every Soviet trading vessel on the Mississippi brings a ship-jumping, what happens to the grain trade?

Accordingly, defection is tolerated, not encouraged. There are exceptions, of course. For some defectors, mundane considerations don't apply. Nureyev and Baryshnikov bring glory, and you can't buy that. Unfortunately for Miroslav Medvid, he doesn't dance.

He is a jumper. Medvid is the (Ukrainian) Soviet sailor who twice jumped ship in New Orleans only to be twice returned by U.S. authorities. He is now on his way to an unhappy fate in the Soviet Union.

More sophisticated defectors come better prepared. An acquaintance of mine, a psychiatrist, planned his escape from the Soviet Union for many years. He signed on as a ship's doctor and made a break for it at a West African port. He bolted from his group on shore leave and, after a taxi chase, made it to the American Embassy.

Had he acted on impulse? Embassy officials wanted to know. If he left the embassy right away, he could say he had gotten lost and no one would be the wiser. Had he been drinking? Did he have a fight with someone on board? I planned my whole life for this moment, replied Victor, and for emphasis he pulled down his pants and produced his trumps—his underwear, into which he had sewn his medical diploma. That seemed to convince the staff. He got a 10 for seriousness (if only an 8.5 for form) and a ticket to the U.S.A.

Sailing to the U.S.S.R. is poor Medvid. Just a sailor with no English. When he turned up on shore, he was carrying merely a glass, screw-lid jar containing his watch and some pieces of paper. The immigration agents were not impressed. They sent him back.

Now, these agents are either very hard or very stupid, and they are in for some punishment. But this is not just a case of human error. The rules are absurd.

First, when a guy jumps 40 feet from a ship that, and that alone, should be considered a request for asylum. And if he subsequently offers his signature on a piece of paper, so much the better.

After four days back aboard ship, Medvid was presented to American officials for re-interview. This time he said he wanted to go home. This being the land of freely expressed will, his request was granted. It should not have been.

At least not immediately. That should be rule two: not every wish deserves immediate honoring. Consider this analogy: the suicide jumper perched on a ledge who refuses rescue. Shall we tackle him and drag him to safety? Of course. By what right do we forc-

ibly thwart his will? The answer is easy. He has no single "will." If he really wanted to die, he wouldn't be on the ledge: he would be lying on the sidewalk, and the question would be moot. And if he really wanted to live, he wouldn't be on the ledge either: he would be inside. He is on the ledge because he is of two minds. Society then decides to ally itself with the life-seeking mind and often locks him up for a couple of weeks, waiting for that mind to retake command of the other.

By the time Medvid was brought back for a final interview by U.S. officials, he had no doubt been threatened (if not worse: his wrists had been cut) and, according to the psychiatrist's report, heavily drugged. This Medvid said: I want to go back to the Soviet Union. Days before, another Medvid had said: I want to come to America. Which was the real Medvid? Why not wait at least a few days to find out—at least enough time for the effects of the brutalization and the drugs to dissipate?

And if we were to err on the side of the wrong (West-seeking) Medvid, so what? He can always walk back to a Soviet Embassy and go home. Spies do it. As in suicide, only one choice is irreversible.

And third, why must a defector have Soviet officials present during his interviews? Look at it from Medvid's point of view. The first time he jumps, he is interviewed by Americans only, he asks to stay, and they send him back kicking and screaming. He is then re-interviewed by Americans, his final chance, and this time a Soviet embassy official is always present. Is he supposed to confess now his rejection of the Motherland and his embrace of America? He's only a sailor, but he's not crazy.

A few more Medvids and the old joke—definition of a Soviet trio: a quartet returned from abroad—may lose some of its truth. We are giving enormous attention to that shiny new paint job for the Statue of Liberty. Why not divert some effort to preparing a better welcome for those who believe its inscription? The Medvid rules—that wretched man deserves some memorial—are a start.

CAULKING THE LEAKY SHIP OF STATE

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks, Washington has been awash with leaks that have seriously damaged U.S. intelligence interests. One begins to wonder how many more of these media torpedos the ship of state can absorb before it goes under.

It is with great dismay that I see stories attributed to congressional and administration sources regarding the wisdom and details of various intelligence activities. Such disclosures have made a joke of congressional intelligence oversight while jeopardizing the lives of American intelligence officers and their foreign contacts. It is time to return to the old-fashioned concept of putting America's national security interests first.

When Congress decided in the wake of Vietnam and Watergate to exercise more

oversight over the intelligence community, it took on a heavy responsibility with overriding national security implications. As the result of this action, our two intelligence committees are now privy to highly sensitive information and material that must be jealously guarded as precious national resources.

Sometimes what's proposed by the administration does not receive the blessing of everyone on the two intelligence panels. Unfortunately, when disagreement does occur, the nature of the disputed activity is often leaked with the intention of sabotaging it before it gets off the drawing board. Such tactics may be politically clever and effective, but they are dangerously shortsighted and their impact on our intelligence capability is devastating.

Mr. Speaker, with these observations as prologue, I would like to make some recommendations as to how we should address this problem.

First, those in the so-called "intelligence information loop" must stop immediately airing their opinions and differences publicly. This applies not only to Congress, but also the executive branch from whence a number of these egregious leaks have sprung.

Second, we must drastically reduce the number of individuals with access to secrets in both Congress and the executive branch. In this regard, I believe Congress must set an example by establishing a Joint Intelligence Committee which would replace the House and Senate Intelligence Committees. This is not a new idea. In fact, I authored legislation to bring this about 10 years ago. Moreover, I was not alone as such respected colleagues as ED BOLAND, SILVIO CONTE, LEE HAMILTON, BILL FRENZEL, AND DANTE FASCELL sponsored similar bills.

All of these recent disclosures have severely undermined relations between Congress and the intelligence community. For Congress to practice meaningful and responsible oversight over the intelligence agencies, it must first earn the trust of those whose activities it reviews.

That trust is totally lacking now and won't begin to develop until there is some clear-cut assurance that what is said in closed session remains a secret. Chances of that happening are much better when secrets are reported to a very limited group of responsible and senior Representatives and Senators backed by a small group of professional staff experts. Furthermore, under this kind of arrangement with so few in the loop, leakers would be much easier to identify. Presently, there are so many with access to secrets that the FBI and Justice Department seldom, if ever, unmask these anonymous sources who are consistently undercutting our national security.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the time has come to revamp our congressional oversight system with the establishment of a Joint Intelligence Committee along the lines proposed by Congressman HENRY HYDE in House Joint Resolution 7. I urge my colleagues to join me and some 70 other Mem-

bers in cosponsoring this timely and extremely important initiative that is rapidly gaining widespread bipartisan support.

LINE-ITEM VETO: A CHALLENGE TO REPUBLICAN BELIEFS

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, there is no one in Congress who has taken a more intense interest in the proposed Presidential line-item veto than my friend and colleague MICKEY EDWARDS. His commitment to educating other Members to the effects of passing this legislation is to be commended. I know he has changed a lot of minds.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the historical record this recent article written by Mr. EDWARDS that appeared in the October 1985 issue of the Ripon Forum. Entitled "Line-Item Veto: A Challenge to Republican Beliefs," the article makes a strong case against giving any President line-item veto. I urge my colleagues, on both sides of the issue, to read it.

[From Ripon Forum, October 1985]

LINE-ITEM VETO: A CHALLENGE TO REPUBLICAN BELIEFS

(By Mickey Edwards)

On September 3, meeting behind closed doors with members of his Cabinet, President Reagan expressed his growing frustration over the increased reluctance by members of his own party to support presidential initiatives.

"Now's the time to go along, and be Republicans," he said.

His complaint raises a serious question, of course. To what extent should we, as Republicans, feel obligated to support the initiatives of a Republican president—especially one who has been twice elected by sizable margins and has the clear support of a majority of the American people? Are there transcendent issues which go to the heart of our common Republican identification and which not only unite Republicans within the Ripon Society with Republicans within the American Conservative Union (which I chaired for nearly five years)? Are there issues which may require us, in order to be true to Republican principles, to oppose part of the president's legislative program?

UNITING REPUBLICANS

Clearly there are. Conservatives like myself have used our own understanding of Republican principles to reach positions which differ from the president's on the question of sanctions against South Africa, certain changes in the tax code, and the need to institute reforms at the Pentagon.

I believe one of those issues—one of those fundamental concerns which unite Republicans, whether Ripon Republicans or ACU Republicans, require us to oppose, as well, the president's attempt to transfer to the executive branch of government (to himself, that is), powers specifically denied the president by the Founding Fathers.

To the casual observer, there is a vast political distance between the Ripon Society and the American Conservative Union, and

there's no question that on a wide range of issues the differences are vast and real. But there are common threads, the most important centering on a belief in the necessity of restraining government to protect human liberties. While there are great differences of opinion in "Republican" political circles as to how useful government can be, there is substantial agreement that it poses great potential for suppression of individual freedoms—and shared concern which has its antecedents in the constitutional deliberations of the nation's founders.

That concern, which is expressed in a carefully drawn system of separated powers, and an intricate web of checks and balances, not only placed great power in the presidency—command of the armed forces, the power to appoint the judiciary, the power to appoint the heads of every federal department and agency—but it deliberately withheld power as well. Most notably, the Constitution, in its very first sentence, placed all legislative power in a separate branch of government. Only after much deliberation was the president granted any veto power at all.

That carefully crafted balance is now threatened by President Reagan's vigorous campaign to place unprecedented new legislative power in his own hands through the use of the so-called line-item veto.

How much would the line-item veto shift the balance of power?

Today, members of Congress, representing varying philosophies and diverse regions of the country, come to agreement, to consensus, on legislation which a majority of them believe to be consistent with their own views and the best interests of their constituents—in other words, a consensus which benefits the majority of the population. If one more than half of the members present and voting in each chamber of the Congress wants the legislation to pass, it does.

The president has the power to veto these bills, and sometimes presidents veto entire appropriations bills: Jimmy Carter did; Ronald Reagan has. But because the representatives and senators who put the legislative packages together are loath to unravel them, it is harder for a president to gain sufficient support to sustain his veto. Thus the majority will of the Congress prevails more often than not—which is what the Founding Fathers intended.

PRESIDENTIAL LEVERAGE

A president with the power of the line-item veto, however, gains an enormous advantage over the Congress in determining the legislative agenda. In making this argument to conservatives, I suggest that the line-item veto could be used to eliminate such military hardware as the B-1 and the MX, but the point is equally true in reverse.

Suppose a president were to appoint as director of the Office of Management and Budget a budget-slashing conservative like David Stockman, and, guided by such a force, that administration proposed the elimination of subsidized legal assistance for the poor, or student loans, or school lunch programs.

Imagine that the supporters of those programs then launched a nationwide campaign to save them. Under pressure from constituents, the House (which is both less conservative than the Senate and more responsive to immediate constituent concern) votes 435-0 to preserve the programs. And the Senate votes nearly two-to-one to continue the programs. Who wins?

The president, has OMB director and a small band of conservatives in the Senate

would prevail. It's not a matter of consensus, it's a matter of as little as 6% of the 535 members of the House and Senate having the power, with the president, to determine the legislative priorities for the country and overrule the other 94%. That would obviously be a complete inversion of the system envisioned by the Founding Fathers. And this concentration of power is the opposite of the decentralization which is fundamental to Republican beliefs.

The president, who is commander in chief of the armed forces, appoints the Supreme Court, appoints every federal judge, appoints department heads and agency heads and ambassadors and members of the Federal Reserve Board, now would have, in addition, virtual control over the legislative and spending decisions of the federal government.

Thus, the line-item veto would bring about what the nation's founders most feared—a non-hereditary monarchy. The president of the United States already has more power than many kings have had, and with the added ability to control the legislative and spending agendas, he could become, potentially, among the most powerful rulers in world history. It was precisely this concentration of power the republic's founders labored so hard to avoid.

It is the absence of such power, the careful division of authority into separate branches of government, each able to check the other, which has allowed the nation to have both enough strength and efficiency to resist external threats and sufficient guarantees to preclude Americans losing their freedoms to their own government.

Those who propose adding such new powers to the presidency (never conceding, many never realize, that they are proposing a significant change in the basic structure of our government) rely heavily on two arguments: the desperate need to do something about the national debt, and a successful track record in the 43 states which give their governors line-item veto authority.

REBUTTING PROPONENTS

There are two answers to the first point. The first is made most effectively by Senator Mark Hatfield, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Hatfield points out, correctly, that so much of federal spending is outside the regular appropriations process (something like 45 percent of all federal spending is spent on earmarked entitlement programs, for example, and another 12 percent or so is earmarked to pay the interest on the national debt) that even extensive use of the line-item veto, while it would remove priority-making authority from the Congress, would not achieve the balanced budget which its advocates dream.

The second argument is more philosophical: granted that the accumulated debt is a major national problem, the Constitution provided a specific means for dealing with it—and with other problems of congressional mismanagement or inaction—congressional elections every two years.

To those who argue that the political process is too slow, and doesn't work, I point to two elections which prove otherwise. In 1980, frustrated by Jimmy Carter and eager for a change in direction, the American people sent to Washington with President Reagan a Republican majority in the Senate and enough Republicans to form a working majority with conservative Democrats in the House.

In 1982, concerned that the new administration and Republicans had read too much into the 1980 "mandate," and had gone too far, the voters shifted the Congress slightly toward its pre-1980 configuration. It is admittedly harder, more time-consuming, more expensive, more tedious to change things through the political process, and voters having their own opinions, the results might not always be what one wants. But it's far preferable to abandoning our unique form of government and opening the door to future presidents who might not have the internal strength, or the inclination, to resist use of major new powers.

As for the argument that the line-item veto has been used successfully in 43 states, with all due respect to state government, that is much like saying the old "Statute of Liberty" play would work as a part of regular National Football League playbooks because it's been used so well on sandlots. State governments are not "little federal governments." Although the analogy may be helpful in a beginning political science course, or in junior high civics, there is simply no comparison at all between the states and a national government. On social problems, the difference in scope is awesome. No state government deals with a Social Security system covering tens of millions of Americans, nor with the FBI. No state government deals with the implementation of treaties between nations or providing for the national defense.

The truth is, none of the arguments for the line-item veto work: (in California, legislators joke about adding to legislation constituent-pleasing items they never would have considered if not for the assurance a governor would use his veto to "save" the taxpayers money the legislators never intended to spend); it won't seriously reduce federal spending (Hatfield points out that, because of non-appropriated spending, giant programs could be wiped out and we'd still have \$100-billion deficits), and, worst of all, it would place an enormous potential to blackmail in the hands of a president ("If you don't support my program, I'll veto highway funds for your district").

What the line-item veto would do is fundamentally shift the balance of power in America and change, at its roots, our form of government.

Ronald Reagan is correct. It's time to be Republicans. For most of us—whether we belong to the Ripon Society or to the ranks of more conservative Republicans—"being Republican" sometimes means saying "no" to presidents who should never get all the power they want.

IT'S BETTER TO LET AILMENT BE KNOWN

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, a friend and former employee of mine, who, incidentally, is hearing impaired, recently sent me an article from the Sacramento Bee which stressed the positive aspects of being up-front about personal illness or disorders with our friends and coworkers.

The author of the article, Dr. Jon Finkler, who is chief of surgery at Mercy San Juan Hospital in Sacramento, writes

that more and more business people and public officials are being open about specific health problems and "the response from the general public seems to be overwhelmingly positive." He also points out that for those individuals who have diabetes or epilepsy, letting fellow workers know about your disorder could save your life.

As one who has epilepsy, I totally agree with Dr. Finkler's comments about being up-front and open with your friends, loved ones and coworkers and I would like to share this article with my colleagues.

[From the Sacramento Bee, Sept. 23, 1985]

IT'S BETTER TO LET AILMENTS BE KNOWN (By Jon G. Finkler)

(Dr. Finkler is chief of surgery at Mercy San Juan Hospital and is certified by the American Board of Plastic Surgery.)

There was a time not too long ago, when there wasn't a business person around who would admit to having a cold much less having a serious type of disease, such as cancer.

The business person worried that his or her client would feel they weren't as competent or their employer might feel that they were no longer able to give 100 percent to their job and would therefore start interviewing others for their position.

Today, more and more public officials (including President Reagan) and business people in general are becoming more open with the specific health problems that they may be experiencing.

The response from the general public seems to be overwhelmingly positive. The feeling of rallying around and giving support seems to be true in a lot of cases. Some people who have admitted to having a medical problem and what they plan on doing to overcome it, have gained the public's trust and have improved their own public image as well.

It has often been felt, and may be true, that if public official or business person can face a health crisis and carry on, that that same perseverance would prove essential in a variety of business situations.

As a surgeon, I hope that this trend or pattern of behavior continues and gains momentum. It is time that health problems were brought to light and faced as soon as discovered. For too long, people (especially those in important positions) have tried to ignore or hide any medical problems that they might have.

The focus needs to be on recognizing and treating whatever health problem an individual may be having. Recognizing symptoms that are unusual and going to a doctor to find out what is causing them essential, as essential as the early warning signs you might perceive in a shaky business.

I feel it is important and recommend to my patients that they inform their employers or employees if they are having a health problem and are planning on having surgery. The benefits are two fold. First, it gives fellow workers the feelings that you are being up front with them and may stop any rumors that are even worse than the truth from starting.

Second, your time away from work can be scheduled and business can continue to run smoothly. I'm not saying that it will be easy, just easier.

As for medical conditions that individuals must learn to live with for the rest of their lives, such as diabetes or epilepsy, letting fellow workers know is also important as it could save your life.

Often people with health problems are embarrassed to let anyone know and then when they have an attack or seizure no one in their office knows what's happening or how to handle the situation. Besides, today there is much less social stigma related to such conditions.

People often say that they are just too busy to take the time to go see their doctor or have an annual exam. I can't stress enough the importance of a physical as a preventative measure in catching any health problem before it becomes too serious. Know your family health history and act accordingly when it comes to preventative care.

Our careers are often made up of daily stress, your health is just one more worry unless you take the time to insure that all is well. Remember that your health is like a business, communicate your concerns to the appropriate professions, plan your strategy, take action and watch your success become tenfold in body and business.

THE HUMAN COSTS OF TOXIC WASTE

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, as we debate the fiscal and programmatic needs of a reauthorized Superfund Toxic Waste Cleanup Program, it is often easy to overlook the specific impact of this public health problem on the daily lives of literally millions of Americans.

To date, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has not managed to complete cleanup at even one of the Nation's 850 priority sites. Citizens in the communities around these facilities live with daily apprehensions about the ramifications of these hidden pollutants on their health and their environment.

One of the most notorious Superfund sites in the Nation is the Lipari landfill in Pitman, NJ. A recent article in the Washington Times described that community's efforts to come to grips with the landfill's hazards in vivid and insightful detail. I hope my colleagues will keep such experiences in mind as we continue to consider the need to extend and expand the Superfund Program.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 21, 1985]

WASTE DEBATE DRAGS ON WHILE VILLAGE IS DYING

(By Christopher Simpson)

PITMAN, N.J.—For the first 15 years Harry Lindsay lived in this bucolic village south of Camden, he savored the lakefront lifestyle his family had enjoyed since 1968.

Succulent fish caught from Alcyon Lake, which laps within 30 feet of his white stucco home, were common fare on the Lindsay's dinner table. Fresh vegetables flourished in his backyard garden, a robust plot of coal-black dirt that for years was irrigated from the 24-acre lake.

Now the garden is gone and the fishing rods, once used almost daily, are untouched.

And Mr. Lindsay lies awake at night worrying that his two children may be suffering permanent, perhaps catastrophic, health problems caused by the lake and nearby Lipari Landfill, tabbed by the Environmental Protection Agency as the most dangerous toxic dump site in the nation.

"I am trying to figure out what the hell am I going to tell my 12-year-old daughter when she is old enough to have a family," said Mr. Lindsay, who with his children once swam and fished in the lake now believed to contain a toxic stew of chemicals known to cause cancer and genetic mutation. "I have read about that gene-altering business. I think it is really possible that it has happened to some of the kids here."

For Mr. Lindsay, an electronics salesman turned angry environmentalist, the Lipari Landfill and Alcyon Lake have become a notorious nightmare in his hometown of 12,000 residents. Its unwanted fame stems from Lipari's No. 1 ranking on the toxic national map, a grim chart of 850 Superfund sites the EPA has found to pose serious health threats to residents.

Federal efforts to remedy the likes of Lipari are at the center of the current congressional wrangling to reauthorize Superfund, the fledgling EPA cleanup program that expired Oct. 1. The unresolved debate is expected to come to a head this week as the House begins final discussions on a five-year extension to the controversial program.

Since its inception in 1980, the \$1.6 billion Superfund program logged more failures than successes. Critics are quick to note that only six of the 850 Superfund sites have been cleaned since 1980, and at least one of those is again polluting the environment. That dismal record was further compounded by prolonged EPA controversy that led to administrator Anne Burford resigning in 1983 and Rita Lavelle, head of the Superfund project, being jailed for six months and ordered to pay a \$10,000 fine for lying to a congressional committee investigating the cleanup program.

While EPA has worked to correct its once endemic problems with Superfund, political bickering from myriad sides has slowed the reauthorization, which, in turn, has further slowed current cleanup efforts.

Congressional debate, mired for more than a year, has failed to fashion a renewal bill lawmakers from both chambers can accept. On Sept. 26, the Senate passed a new \$7.5 billion, five-year Superfund bill that environmentalists and House members attacked as too weak.

Five key House committees have approved a \$10.1 billion package that includes tough cleanup standards and schedules the EPA is fighting. President Reagan has endorsed the \$5.3 billion Superfund package recommended by EPA Administrator Lee Thomas, who argues the agency is ill-equipped to handle a more ambitious program.

Perhaps least heard in the debate, but more affected, are residents living near the nation's * * *. "The president doesn't think this is a serious problem," said Doug Stuart, president of the Pitman, Alcyon Lake, Lipari Landfill Community Association here. "The folks from EPA come here, then leave and go back to Washington. But we have to live with the problem."

"We didn't put the chemicals here, we're just the victims," he said bitterly. "You don't have to worry about [President Reagan's proposed] 'star wars' killing us. We're killing ourselves."

The story of Lipari Landfill mirrors that of hundreds, perhaps thousands, of deadly

dump sites around the country that a new Superfund bill is expected to address.

As in Lipari's case, often it begins with the discovery of huge caches of dumped chemicals, followed by years of debate on potential health threats and costly ways to right the toxic wrongs.

Meanwhile, frightened residents living near sites worry about the effect the past has on their future health. Tiny Pitman, a picturesque bedroom community, is no exception. Residents here said Superfund's reauthorization is badly needed, but they wonder if help may be too late in coming. In any case, they are thankful for their supply of city water.

Federal court records in New Jersey show the 15-acre Lipari Landfill was used as a commercial gravel pit and dump site from 1958 to 1971, when the state closed it as a potential health threat. During that time, owner Nick Lipari was paid to dump an estimated 3 million gallons of toxic chemicals into trenches that were later covered with dirt.

Hundreds of thousands of gallons of contaminated water subsequently flowed from the landfill into nearby creeks leading to Alcyon Lake, about 1,000 feet away. Of the 155 chemicals identified as seeping from the landfill, some of the most dangerous include benzene, Bis, toluene, arsenic, chromium, lead, mercury, zinc and six types of PCBs.

In 1980, a federal district court in New Jersey found "direct contact with or exposure to these carcinogenic, mutagenic and teratogenic substances . . . pose a serious imminent threat to the health of those" living near the lake and landfill.

EPA, which under Superfund is mandated with the cleanup of Lipari and the adjacent area, has spent \$4 million since 1980 to try to contain chemicals spilling from the landfill. A six-acre bathtub-like container was built around the most dangerous portion of the landfill, the entire area fenced and ways to find more permanent solutions are underway.

Those efforts aside, an estimated 400 to 2,500 gallons of contaminated groundwater continues to leak from Lipari each day, quickly flowing into Alcyon which is rimmed with tasteful homes. Lakeside residents, who said they often can watch the water change from its normal coffee color to blue, yellow and orange hues, have accelerated demands for a federal probe into health risks.

But despite those pleas and warnings voiced by the 1980 federal court, the question remains unanswered. The first study to determine if the known carcinogens—believed to still be in the ground, water and air—pose a serious threat to residents in a month from completion, EPA officials said.

"On a practical point of view, the EPA has known about the risk for years," said Stevens Lester, science director for the Citizens Clearinghouse for Hazardous Waste Inc., based in Arlington, VA. "No one has done anything about it and that is the crime. What you have is highly carcinogenic chemicals . . . and there hasn't been any kind of assessment to define what has gone on."

"Could it be as bad as Love Canal," he asked. "Ultimately, the answer is yes. But this is typical of a lot of cleanups done by EPA."

Herman Phillips, an EPA spokesman in New York, said the agency has worked assiduously to clean Lipari. Those efforts, he said, will continue for years.

In Pitman, the 40-plus members of the community environmental group are not mollified by EPA's promises, however.

"I went through two pregnancies here and no way would I go through those had I known what I know now," said Pat Stuart, a high school home economics teacher who lives with her husband, Doug, and two children within 50 yards of Alcyon Lake. "Until recently, none of us were real concerned about the chemicals in relation to our health. Now we don't even know if it is safe to live here anymore."

JOHN DAVIS LODGE

HON. DAN MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, when I was first elected to the Congress in 1978, I was appointed to serve on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Two weeks later, I was invited to participate in a foreign policy debate in my Florida district. Although I had served on a congressional staff for several years prior to my election, I had not worked primarily on foreign policy matters. I was somewhat chagrined to find that for my first public foreign policy debate, my opponent would be John Davis Lodge.

As a freshman Member of Congress, it was quite an experience to debate foreign policy with a man who had been a past member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, former Governor of Connecticut, Ambassador to Spain and Argentina, and would several years later be Ambassador to Switzerland and a special Presidential Ambassador to Panama, Costa Rica, and Puerto Rico. I was, and remain, impressed by his gracious manner, his intellect, and his experience.

Eight years later, I had the distinction of meeting Ambassador Lodge once again, as a fellow U.S. delegate to the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly. As this session opened at a time when U.S. criticism of the United Nations has been at its height, I began this session reassured that Ambassador Lodge would be able to provide the delegation with the benefit of his experience and his wisdom at this critical time. I was shocked to learn of the Ambassador's death and am saddened by the loss his death represents both to his family and to his country.

John Davis Lodge was a man of varied talents and interests. His biography provides a career description diverse enough for several men and several lifetimes. He was an attorney, an actor, an adviser to Presidents, a statesman, and a decorated soldier. Even though my contacts with this gentleman have been limited, they have left me with a warm memory. I regret that I will not be able to work closely with him at the United Nations this session. I will miss his energy and his guidance.

THE ANGLO-IRISH AGREEMENT—A FRAGILE FIRST STEP

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the bipartisan ad hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs I have a deep interest in the problems of and the possible solution to Northern Ireland. In that regard, I think the agreement signed this past Friday between England and the Republic of Ireland represents a fragile first step in the direction of a political solution.

The Anglo-Irish agreement as signed represents at best a shaky foundation which will not support an enduring political solution without some major additions and changes. Without these changes the agreement is far more symbolic than it is substantive.

I contend that at the very least, the Anglo-Irish Intergovernmental Council and Conference agreed to should provide access to all segments of political thought in Northern Ireland in their deliberations. An agreement between the two Governments is not enough to develop a lasting political solution.

The major flaw inherent in this agreement is the fact that it does not alter the existing political status quo in Northern Ireland one iota. The role which is granted to the Republic of Ireland is a consultative one. It does establish an Irish Government presence in Northern Ireland. Yet to offer the Irish Government even a consultative role in Northern Ireland while the British maintain their brutal direct rule policies over the North is no bargain for anyone. There can never be a united Ireland while British troops patrol the streets of Northern Ireland. There cannot be unity where there is partition as there is today in Northern Ireland.

I would hope that as a significant next step, the British Government would issue a declaration of intent to withdraw from Northern Ireland in a phased and orderly fashion. This would most clearly be the catalyst for genuine movement toward a political solution.

What does not seem to be in issue is the fact that United States economic assistance is needed by and should be provided to the beleaguered people of Northern Ireland. I have introduced legislation to accomplish this in each of the past two Congresses. My current bill H.R. 2597 would provide some \$500 million in U.S. economic assistance over 5 years to Northern Ireland. I was pleased to note the statements of both President Reagan and Speaker THOMAS P. O'NEILL in support of future United States economic aid to Northern Ireland.

At this point in the RECORD I wish to insert the following related to the Anglo-Irish agreement:

First. Text of the agreement as printed in the New York Times on Saturday, November 16.

Second. Article and analysis of the agreement from the New York Times Saturday, November 16.

LONDON, Nov. 15.—Following is the text of the agreement signed today by Britain and Ireland giving Dublin a consultative role in Northern Ireland:

The Government of Ireland and the Government of the United Kingdom, wishing further to develop the unique relationship between their peoples and the close cooperation between their countries as friendly neighbors and as partners in the European Community,

Recognizing the major interest of both their countries and, above all, of the people of Northern Ireland in diminishing the divisions there and achieving lasting peace and stability,

Recognizing the need for continuing efforts to reconcile and to acknowledge the rights of the two major traditions that exist in Ireland, represented on the one hand by those who wish for no change in the present status of Northern Ireland and on the other hand by those who aspire to a sovereign united Ireland achieved by peaceful means and through agreement,

Reaffirming their total rejection of any attempt to promote political objectives by violence or the threat of violence and their determination to work together to insure that those who adopt or support such methods do not succeed,

Recognizing that a condition of genuine reconciliation and dialogue between Unionists and nationalists is mutual recognition and acceptance of each other's rights,

Recognizing and respecting the identities of the two communities in Northern Ireland, and the right of each to pursue its aspirations by peaceful and constitutional means,

Reaffirming their commitment to a society in Northern Ireland in which all may live in peace, free from discrimination and intolerance, and with the opportunity for both communities to participate fully in the structures and processes of government,

Have accordingly agreed as follows:

A. STATUS OF NORTHERN IRELAND

Article I

The two Governments

(a) affirm that any change in the status of Northern Ireland would only come about with the consent of a majority of the people of Northern Ireland;

(b) recognize that the present wish of a majority of the people of Northern Ireland is for no change in the status of Northern Ireland;

(c) declare that, if in the future a majority of the people of Northern Ireland clearly wish for and formally consent to the establishment of a united Ireland, they will introduce and support in the respective Parliaments legislation to give effect to that wish.

B. THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE

Article II

(a) There is hereby established, within the framework of the Anglo-Irish Intergovernmental Council set up after the meeting between the two Heads of Government on 6 November 1981, an Intergovernmental Conference (hereinafter referred to as "the Conference"), concerned with Northern Ireland and with relations between the two parts of the island of Ireland, to deal, as set out in this Agreement, on a regular basis with

- (i) political matters;
- (ii) security and related matters;

(iii) legal matters, including the administration of justice;

(iv) the promotion of cross-border cooperation.

(b) The United Kingdom Government accept that the Irish Government will put forward views and proposals on matters relating to Northern Ireland within the field of activity of the Conference in so far as those matters are not the responsibility of a devolved administration in Northern Ireland. In the interest of promoting peace and stability, determined efforts shall be made through the Conference to resolve any differences. The Conference will be mainly concerned with Northern Ireland; but some of the matters under consideration will involve cooperative action in both parts of the island of Ireland, and possibly also in Great Britain. Some of the proposals considered in respect of Northern Ireland may also be found to have application by the Irish Government. There is no derogation from the sovereignty of either the Irish Government or the United Kingdom Government, and each retains responsibility for the decisions and administration of government within its own jurisdiction.

Article III

The Conference shall meet as Ministerial or official level, as required. The business of the Conference will thus receive attention at the highest level. Regular and frequent Ministerial meetings shall be held; and in particular special meetings shall be convened at the request of either side. Officials may meet in subordinate groups. Membership of the Conference and of subgroups shall be small and flexible. When the Conference meets at Ministerial level an Irish Minister designated as the Permanent Irish Ministerial Representative and the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland shall be joint Chairmen. Within the framework of the Conference other Irish and British Ministers may hold or attend meetings as appropriate; when legal matters are under consideration the Attorneys General may attend. Ministers may be accompanied by their officials and their professional advisers; for example, when questions of security policy or security cooperation are being discussed, they may be accompanied by the Commissioner of the Garda Síochána and the Chief Constable of the Royal Ulster Constabulary; or when questions of economic or social policy or cooperation are being discussed, they may be accompanied by officials of the relevant Departments. A Secretariat shall be established by the two Governments to service the Conference on a continuing basis in the discharge of its functions as set out in this Agreement.

Article IV

(a) In relation to matters coming within its field of activity, the Conference shall be a framework within which the Irish Government and the United Kingdom Government work together

(i) for the accommodation of the rights and identities of the two traditions which exist in Northern Ireland; and

(ii) for peace, stability and prosperity throughout the island of Ireland by promoting reconciliation, respect for human rights, cooperation against terrorism and the development of economic, social and cultural cooperation.

(b) It is the declared policy of the United Kingdom Government that responsibility in respect of certain matters within the powers of the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland should be devolved within Northern

Ireland on a basis which would secure widespread acceptance throughout the community. The Irish Government support that policy.

(c) Both Governments recognize that devolution can be achieved only with the co-operation of constitutional representatives within Northern Ireland of both traditions there. The conference shall be a framework within which the Irish Government may put forward views and proposals on the modalities of bringing about devolution in Northern Ireland, in so far as they relate to the interests of the minority community.

C. POLITICAL MATTERS

Article V

(a) The Conference shall concern itself with measures to recognize and accommodate the rights and identities of the two traditions in Northern Ireland, to protect human rights and to prevent discrimination. Matters to be considered in this area include measures to foster the cultural heritage of both traditions, changes in electoral arrangements, the use of flags and emblems, the avoidance of economic and social discrimination and advantages and disadvantages of a Bill of Rights in some form in Northern Ireland.

(b) The discussion of these matters shall be mainly concerned with Northern Ireland, but the possible application of any measures pursuant to this Article by the Irish Government in their jurisdiction shall not be excluded.

(c) If it should prove impossible to achieve and sustain devolution on a basis which secures widespread acceptance in Northern Ireland, the Conference shall be a framework within which the Irish Government may, where the interests of the minority community are significantly or especially affected, put forward views on proposals for major legislation and on major policy issues, which are within the purview of the Northern Ireland Departments and which remain the responsibility of the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland.

Article VI

The Conference shall be a framework within which the Irish Government may put forward views and proposals on the role and composition of bodies appointed by the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland or by Departments subject to his direction and control including

the Standing Advisory Commission on Human Rights;
the Fair Employment Agency;
the Equal Opportunities Commission;
the Policy Authority for Northern Ireland;
the Police Complaints Board.

D. SECURITY AND RELATED MATTERS

Article VII

(a) The Conference shall consider

- (i) security policy;
 - (ii) relations between the security forces and the community;
 - (iii) prisons policy
- (b) The Conference shall consider the security situation at its regular meetings and thus provide an opportunity to address policy issues, serious incidents and forthcoming events.

(c) The two Governments agree that there is a need for a program of special measures in Northern Ireland to improve relations between the security forces and the community, with the object in particular of making the security forces more readily accepted by the nationalist community. Such a program

shall be developed, for the Conference's consideration, and may include the establishment of local consultative machinery, training in community relations, crime prevention schemes involving the community, improvements in arrangements for handling complaints, and action to increase the proportion of members of the minority in the Royal Ulster Constabulary. Elements of the program may be considered by the Irish Government suitable for application within their jurisdiction.

(d) The Conference may consider policy issues relating to prisons. Individual cases may be raised as appropriate, so that information can be provided or inquiries instituted.

E. LEGAL MATTERS, INCLUDING THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Article VIII

The Conference shall deal with issues of concern to both countries relating to the enforcement of the criminal law. In particular it shall consider whether there are areas of the criminal law applying in the North and in the South respectively which might with benefit be harmonized. The two Governments agree on the importance of public confidence in the administration of justice. The Conference shall seek, with the help of advice from experts as appropriate, measures which would give substantial expression to this aim, considering inter alia the possibility of mixed courts in both jurisdictions for the trial of certain offences. The Conference shall also be concerned with policy aspects of extradition and extrajudicial jurisdiction as between North and South.

F. CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION ON SECURITY, ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL MATTERS

Article IX

(a) With a view to enhancing crossborder cooperation on security matters, the Conference shall set in hand a program of work to be undertaken by the Commissioner of the Garda Síochána and the Chief Constable of the Royal Ulster Constabulary and, where appropriate, groups of officials, in such areas as threat assessments, exchange of information, liaison structures, technical co-operation, training of personnel, and operational resources.

(b) The Conference shall have no operational responsibilities; responsibility for police operations shall remain with the heads of the respective police forces, the Commissioner of the Garda Síochána maintaining his links with the Minister for Justice and the Chief Constable of the Royal Ulster Constabulary his links with the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland.

Article X

(a) The two Governments shall cooperate to promote the economic and social development of those areas of both parts of Ireland which have suffered most severely from the consequences of the instability of recent years, and shall consider the possibility of securing international support for this work.

(b) If it should prove impossible to achieve and sustain devolution on a basis which secures widespread acceptance in Northern Ireland, the Conference shall be a framework for the promotion of cooperation between the two parts of Ireland concerning cross-border aspects of economic, social and cultural matters in relation to which the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland continues to exercise authority.

(c) If responsibility is developed in respect of certain matters in the economic, social or

cultural areas currently within the responsibility of the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, machinery will need to be established by the responsible authorities in the North and South for practical cooperation in respect of cross-border aspects of these issues.

G. ARRANGEMENTS FOR REVIEW

Article XI

At the end of three years from signature of this Agreement, or earlier if requested by either Government, the working of the Conference shall be reviewed by the two Governments to see whether any changes in the scope and nature of its activities are desirable.

H. INTERPARLIAMENTARY RELATIONS

Article XII

It will be for parliamentary decision in Dublin and in Westminster whether to establish an Anglo-Irish parliamentary body of the kind adumbrated in the Anglo-Irish Studies Report of November 1981. The two Governments agree that they would give support as appropriate to such a body, if it were to be established.

I. FINAL CLAUSES

Article XIII

This Agreement shall enter into force on the date on which the two Governments exchange notifications of their acceptance of this agreement.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed this Agreement.

Done in two originals at Hillsborough on the 15th day of November 1985.

GARRET FITZGERALD.

For the Government of Ireland

MARGARET THATCHER.

For the Government of the United Kingdom.

BRITAIN AND IRELAND SIGN ACCORD THAT GIVES DUBLIN ROLE IN ULSTER

(By Joseph Lelyveld)

HILLSBOROUGH, NORTHERN IRELAND; Nov. 15—Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher signed a treaty here today giving the Irish Republic a formal consultative role and official presence in this province, long a sectarian battleground. It was the first such arrangement since Ireland's partition 65 years ago.

Under the potentially far-reaching accord, the Dublin Government is given a mechanism for pressing its views on virtually all matters touching the Roman Catholic minority here, including the security policies of the army and the police, the administration of justice and prisons.

This is to be done through a joint secretariat of Irish and British officials to be set up here, officials said, within a matter of weeks to serve a "conference" of Cabinet ministers from the two countries that will be more or less permanently in session to discuss sensitive issues and matters of policy.

A SUBTLY-BALANCED ARRANGEMENT

The primary objective of the subtly balanced and possibly fragile arrangement is to ease the minority's sense of alienation from the local government without provoking a violent Protestant backlash.

Garrett FitzGerald, the Irish Prime Minister, whose mere presence here was taken as a provocation by Protestants protesting outside the castle where the signing took place, said he hoped that the willingness of Catholics to tolerate the terrorist activities of the

Irish Republican Army would be "eroded" once the accord began to take effect.

In the treaty as well as his statement at a news conference, Dr. FitzGerald formally conceded that the Protestant majority of the province rejects the nationalist goal of Ireland's unification. The agreement he signed provided that Northern Ireland would remain British until a majority of its inhabitants freely consent to a change.

I BELIEVE IN THE UNION

In present or foreseeable circumstances, that means indefinitely—a point Mrs. Thatcher was careful to stress. Sitting alongside her Irish counterpart beneath a painting of Windsor Castle, she said:

"I want to offer hope to young people particularly that the cycle of violence and conflict can be broken. I believe in the union and that it will last so long as the majority so wish."

She meant the union of Britain with Northern Ireland and the majority here. Irish nationalists have traditionally argued that the majority that needed to be heard on the question of partition was the majority of Ireland as a whole.

Repeatedly the British Prime Minister characterized herself as a "unionist" and "loyalist"—terms that are the focus for the political identity of Protestants in the province—and insisted that the new arrangement would involve no sacrifice of British sovereignty.

But Protestants leaders, who see any involvement by Dublin in the province's affairs as a retreat threatening eventual Catholic domination, were quick to promise boycotts and resistance.

The Rev. Ian Paisley, a loyalist stalwart who sits in the House of Commons in London, denounced Mrs. Thatcher from the steps of the Hillsborough courthouse as a "quiescent" who was conspiring with a "foreign Government that protects the murderers of our people."

From the balcony of the local council chamber nearby a banner had been hung proclaiming a single word, "Betrayal." Even before Mr. Paisley spoke, the tricolor flag of the Irish Republic had been burned on the balcony. Partisans of the Unionist cause brandished placards that said, "Loyalists Awake" and "No Pope Here."

2,500 DEAD IN 16 YEARS

The Protestant majority accounts for more than 90 percent of the Royal Ulster Constabulary and the Ulster Defense Regiment, the police and home guard army units operating in the province. Protestants are organized into extralegal armed militias such as the Ulster Defense Association, whose potential for violence it take seriously.

The Protestant militias have been responsible for many fewer deaths than the Irish Republican Army among the 2,500 people killed in more than 43,000 incidents of shooting, bombing and arson in the last 16 years, in part because it has generally been possible for the militias to regard themselves as being on the same side as the security forces.

This morning, near the village of Crossmaglen in South Armagh, a member of the constabulary was killed in a land mine explosion. A key advantage of the British-Irish accord from the British standpoint is that it commits the authorities in Dublin to closer cooperation on a cross-border basis in incidents such as that.

Balanced against Dublin's security commitment is a British willingness to consider

the possibility of mixed courts involving judges from the Irish Republic, as well as a possible bill of rights for Northern Ireland, to respond to the sense of vulnerability of Catholics and nationalists—the terms are virtually interchangeable here—who make up nearly 40 percent of the province's population of about 1.6 million.

The initial mechanism of cooperation, after approval by the two Parliaments, will be the "intergovernmental conference" in which a member of the Irish Cabinet, designated as the Permanent Ministerial Representative, will meet regularly with the Secretary for Northern Ireland, the top British official in the province. Mrs. Thatcher said the new British-Irish secretariat would be located in Belfast unless security considerations made that impossible.

TRIBUTE TO MAGNUS "MUNGO" NILES

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, November 16, 1985, I lost a personal friend, and the U.S. Virgin Islands lost one of its most cherished native sons, Magnus "Mungo" Niles.

Mungo, as he was called, spent most of his 69 years of life sharing. Whether it be through his music, talent, or knowledge, Mungo committed himself to keeping the rich heritage of our islands alive.

Upon returning to the islands from the States, Mungo organized a variety show using local talent. Next he taught traditional dances and music for youngsters which led to his formation of the Mungo Niles Cultural Dancers. In 1984 Mungo and other performers made their first tour throughout various States, among them, Washington, DC, where he and his group performed on the Capitol steps, and participated in the Fourth of July parade, where they won an award for their performance and originality.

I would like to share with my colleagues the editorial eulogizing Mungo Niles that appeared in our local newspaper the Daily News.

[From the Daily News, Nov. 19, 1985]

MUNGO NILES' LEGACY

Magnus "Mungo" Niles gave more than he took from these islands—and that legacy will keep his memory alive for years to come.

Dancer and musician, singer, cabinetmaker, preserver of Virgin Islands culture, and—above all—disciplinarian, Mungo Niles died Saturday morning after a long illness. He will be missed.

Niles accomplished a lot. He organized the Mungo Niles Cultural Dancers, which has transmitted a touch of Virgin Islands culture to people across the United States. He formed a Christmas caroling group. As a recreation leader, he was instrumental in creating a youth recreation center in Hospital Ground, a senior citizens recreation program and a senior travel club.

But his accomplishments on a personal level were just as important: Not only did Niles give lovingly of himself and his tal-

ents, but he demanded the best from his students and proteges. And because Niles was so disciplined himself and regarded his work so seriously, his students responded by striving to meet his demands to do their very best.

There is a good lesson here for all of us.

ARMISTEAD SELDEN—FORMER MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the passing of Armistead Selden, a former Member of this body and a colleague who was highly respected by all of us who served with him. Armistead was a native of Greensboro, AL, and was educated at the University of the South and the University of Alabama where he earned a law degree.

He served in the Navy in the North Atlantic during World War II and remained in the Reserves until he retired as a captain in 1981. In 1950, he was elected to the Alabama Legislature where he served one term before his election to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1952. During his distinguished 16-year career in this body, Armistead was particularly active in helping to shape our Nation's foreign policy. He served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and chaired the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs.

From 1970 to 1973, Armistead was the principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security. In 1974, he was appointed U.S. Ambassador to New Zealand, Fiji, Tonga, and Western Samoa where he served until 1979. Since 1981, he had been president of the American League for Exports and Security Assistance.

Armistead Selden was a man who devoted his life to public service and made many valuable contributions to the Government and people of the United States. It was a privilege to have served in this body with Armistead, and I want to extend my deepest sympathy to his wife, Mary Jane, and his entire family.

H.R. 2211

HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, this past summer, the Members of this body approved legislation, H.R. 2211, aimed at easing the burden and strain associated with farm bankruptcy. I commend my House colleagues for this action.

Present U.S. bankruptcy laws only complicate and compound the pain of the bankruptcy experience for American farmers.

H.R. 2211 would allow "family farmers," as defined by the legislation, access to the

much less complex chapter 13 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code by raising the debt ceiling eligibility level of present law.

Simply stated, Mr. Speaker, a farmer may not have to give up his farm if this legislation is enacted. In fact, depending on individual circumstances, a farmer may be able to reschedule the payment of his debt and extend the repayment period for up to 10 years, instead of the 5 years present law allows.

H.R. 2211 is by no means the answer to all farm problems, but it affords U.S. farmers an opportunity to deal with their financial problems in a reasonable and fair manner, while maintaining their dignity.

Because the other body has yet to act, H.R. 2211 has not become law. With time running out for many U.S. farmers, I urge my colleagues in the other body to act promptly on this legislation. Let's give our farmers a fighting chance.

IN HONOR OF DR. EVELINA LOPEZ-ANTONETTY

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, last November 19, Dr. Evelina Lopez-Antonetty passed away. Recently, she was honored by Gov. Mario Cuomo of New York, when he requested that the open area around the new Fordham Plaza be called the Dr. Evelina Lopez-Antonetty Mall.

She was a true community leader, founding in 1965, the United Bronx Parents, an organization concerned with the quality of education of Bronx children. She was by no means demure. If there was a fight to be fought in the side of right, she would not shrink away from it. She was a community activist in the true sense of the word.

Dr. Evelina Lopez-Antonetty is missed by her community, but perhaps not as much as she might have been had she not left her daughter, Lorraine Montenegro, behind to follow in her footsteps. I am submitting a November 14 article from the Daily News on Evelina so that my colleagues will have an opportunity to learn more about this fine woman.

[From the Daily News, Nov. 14, 1985]

GOV. HAILS PUERTO RICAN HEROINE

(By Dan O'Grady)

Evelina Lopez-Antonetty was a busy woman all of her life. Most of the time she was working at helping heal the deep, searing wounds of poverty and reaching out from her South Bronx neighborhood to those in need, until she eventually was linked with struggling communities in far-flung lands.

She died last Nov. 19—a date that some might consider a touch of poetic justice, since next Tuesday is Puerto Rican Discovery Day.

It is the day when Puerto Rican history and culture are nurtured and celebrated, a time when food and good times are shared with relatives, friends and neighbors, a day of special shows and exhibits, and a day for

Puerto Ricans to remember and honor their heroes and heroines.

Gov. Cuomo was one of the myriad of politicians who knew her. Speaking recently at a construction workers' topping-off party for the \$85 million 13-story Fordham Plaza, Cuomo said, "There was a marvelous woman who stood for all sorts of things virtuous and even heroic. Her name was Dr. Evelina Lopez-Antonetty."

Although she never finished college, Manhattan College awarded her an honorary doctorate degree in humane letters.

At his request, Cuomo said, the open area around the new building will be named Dr. Evelina Lopez-Antonetty Mall.

"That for all time here at Fordham Plaza, her memory will be revered, and her works recalled and serve always as an inspiration to the rest of us."

Antonetty, undoubtedly, also will be remembered by her people on future Puerto Rican Discovery Days.

Her daughter, Lorraine Montenegro, who also is a community activist, followed the governor to the microphone. The crowd packing the construction site at Third Ave. and Fordham Road listened as she read an open letter to the governor:

"There are great men and women in our history, but those who have impressed me most have been those that have dared to stand alone, those who dared to be first. One such great person was Vito Marcantonio, who, although he was not Hispanic, was admired as a champion of civil rights in the Hispanic community."

"Dr. Evelina Lopez-Antonetty once was one of his tireless youth workers."

That was where it had all started for her mother, a native of Salinas, Puerto Rico, who came to Manhattan's El Barrio as a saucer-eyed 9-year-old. As a teenager, she got a job working for Marcantonio, a firebrand politician of the 1930s and 1940s who was known as a champion of the underdog.

Montenegro continued, "No words would be adequate to describe the honor you have given my mother, her family and her community. I believe that this is the first time a major site in the Bronx, in New York City, in New York State and, possibly, in the nation has been named after a Puerto Rican woman."

Antonetty met and married draftsman Binaldo Montenegro in 1941 and moved to an apartment in a frame brownstone-type building at 625 Jackson Ave. in the South Bronx. Her husband is now retired. Lorraine was their only child.

Antonetty often relaxed by strolling through malls and plazas, her daughter said.

"It is almost poetic justice that she should have one named after her . . . I want to give you humble thanks from the hearts of her family and from the community she loved so much. Gracias."

Some time later, she spoke of her mother and the rest of her family.

"People just seemed to bring their problems to our family," she said. "Even when my family was in Puerto Rico, we never had a chance to do anything else but be involved in community problems."

"We became a very politically active family. It started with my grandmother and her sister in Puerto Rico."

Antonetty's mother, Eve Lopez, and her aunt, Vincente Godreau, helped organize a hotel workers' union and later served as union representatives.

Lorraine, now 42, added, "And I have five children to follow me."

Now, Lorraine Montenegro serves as executive director of United Bronx Parents at its headquarters at 773 Prospect Ave., once a Head Start center and later a bilingual public school satellite.

In 1965, Antonetty was PTA president at Public School 5 when the school erupted with reports that a teacher had sexually abused some students.

Antonetty led the battle to investigate the charges and subsequently fought to have the teacher ousted from the school, along with the district superintendent who refused to investigate the parents' initial complaints. Along the way toward getting a reluctant Board of Education to move, she had enlisted the help of local businessmen and other community groups.

When that battle ended, Antonetty recognized the strength of the diverse group that had rallied to address the school issue and sought to preserve that community coalition of concerned parents, neighborhood businessmen and other community groups.

Local businessmen had not only given donations, but also helped plan strategy in dealing with the problem.

"They realized that together they could accomplish something," her daughter said.

So, in 1965, Antonetty founded United Bronx Parents.

"Her biggest concern was what kind of education the kids were getting. We had school problem centers—storefronts with workers who answered parents' problems and acted as advocates for them, especially when there was a language barrier."

"The workers would go to the school with them and get the other side of the story and try to work things out."

It was the time of President Johnson's Great Society policies and federal money was available for a wide range of programs aimed at fighting poverty. United Bronx Parents started writing proposals and put together programs for the elderly, for teenagers, for housing and welfare and drug rehabilitation.

Antonetty started a day care center for working mothers which is currently at 888 Westchester Ave. Other programs provided adult bilingual education, distributed federal surplus food and prepared hot meals for 100 people.

And what does the Puerto Rican community think of the honor bestowed on one of their own, their Evelina? Her daughter said, "The people are very proud."

TRIBUTE TO NAPPER H. HESTER III

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an inspiring member of the Philadelphia community, Napper H. Hester III.

On Sunday, November 24, 1985, Mr. Hester will be honored by his church, Mt. Carmel Baptist Church of Philadelphia, for 50 years of faithful service.

Since the age of 25, Mr. Hester has been the organist at Mt. Carmel. Many times, when visiting or preaching at Mt. Carmel, I have marveled at the virtuosity of his blessed performance. Truly, when his hands

grace the keyboard, the spirit of God is within him.

In addition to his outstanding tenure as organist, Mr. Hester has served as choir-master and worked with each and every musical group in the church. He has taken the Mt. Carmel Choir to over 40 concerts a year all over the eastern seaboard.

Mr. Hester, whose father was pastor at Mt. Carmel, has inspired the congregation with his steadfast presence. During his decade of service, he has never been absent.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in saluting a very special individual. The entire community of Philadelphia can be proud of our remarkable friend and neighbor, Napper H. Hester III.

AFGHAN CHILDREN MAIMED INTENTIONALLY

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, America's children are blessed with freedom by which they can enjoy their formative years without the trauma and sorrows of war, pestilence, destruction, and those horrors which accompany life under the gun. Simply stated, American children are lucky.

Afghan children, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, do not share this luxury of freedom. The children of Afghanistan yearn to play and frolic and learn just like their American counterparts. They, too, desire to see life the way other children do—that is, free, uncomplicated, wholesome and fun. They also see the world through children's eyes, but instead of seeing friends and toys and cheer and freedom, they confront a world marred by war. For the Afghan nation has been engulfed with the hatred and destruction which accompany the war cast upon them by Soviet imperialism. It is a sad day when a child's innocent world has been crushed by the sounds of the mighty Russian Army destroying Afghan villages and murdering innocent tribesmen.

Mr. Speaker, the children of Afghanistan are caught in the middle of today's most brutal and terroristic war of oppression. A large portion of the Afghan population has either been murdered by the Soviets, and their Afghan Army lackeys, or has been forced to flee to neighboring Pakistan and Iran. All told, almost half of the Afghan nation has either perished or no longer resides in that once peaceful and unrulable land.

Afghan children also face one of the most barbaric displays of inhumanity known to man. For in Afghanistan, Mr. Speaker, the Soviets intentionally target innocent children for crippling attack. They have created a device, unheard of in the West, which can have only been designed to injure innocent Afghan children. The device is known as butterfly bomb due to its appearance. It is shaped like a butterfly,

and drops to the ground after being dispensed from Soviet military helicopters. Upon impact, it ejects a small spring which makes the device spin, so that from a distance all Afghan children see is a whirling, butterfly-shaped toy.

That toy, Mr. Speaker, is nothing of the kind. Once in the hands of an innocent Afghan child, the device explodes. The amount of explosive material is not enough to kill the victim, however. Instead, it is designed to maim, to cripple, the Afghan child. After all, an Afghan child whose hands are crippled is unable to take up arms against his Soviet oppressors.

Mr. Speaker, Jehan Zeb Khan, an Afghan child, was recently victimized by the Soviets' ruthless toy bomb. This is his interpretation of the events which led to his crippling injury:

TESTIMONY BY JEHAN ZEB KHAN, TOY BOMB VICTIM

One day I took my goats to surrounding areas close to our cave at a mountain. I found a toy like a bird. I picked it up happily and started to play with it. It had two wings and in the middle the heavy part, the body of the bird which was exploded and burned my face and eyes and cut my left hand fingers.

I cried and asked the other boy who was with me and remained unharmed to go to my family and let them know what happened to me. I was taken to my home and then to Mujahideen stronghold. Then I was taken to Pakistan for treatment. First I received treatment at German Hospital where my left eye was taken out and then in Afghan Surgical Hospital my fingers were treated.

It was then that an American lady from Committee for a Free Afghanistan, Mary Spencer picked me and brought me to the United States. Here I was treated nicely. I had an eye operation and fingers treatment.

Thousands of other children have been injured or killed this way. When I had my sight I was happy and played with other children. But now I am blind, disappointed and sad to live through all my life as blind.

Mr. Speaker, Jehan Zeb Khan is not the only Afghan child to be crippled by the infamous Soviet butterfly bomb. But the Soviets' use of these devices raises several fundamental questions: How in the name of decency can the Soviets do this? How can they possibly see any profit in intentionally maiming innocent Afghan children? How can we prevent such barbarous behavior? Has American and Western insensitivity to the plight of the Afghan nation, and culture, and people, and children, actually encouraged such behavior? How should this affect our relations with the Soviets? Should we not raise the level of humanitarian assistance to the courageous Afghan people? If they are not deserving, then who is?

Mr. Speaker, the life of that proud, ancient Nation is slowly being drained. The people and the children of Afghanistan look to us, as the moral and spiritual leaders of freedom, for assistance in the form of medical supplies, food, cash for crops, and other aid. They do not want us to fight the Soviet aggressors, Mr. Speaker, they merely want our commitment to assist them in their jihad, or holy war, against

the ruthless and shameless Soviet invaders. And we, Mr. Speaker, have a moral responsibility to help them.

CONGRESSMAN JIM COURTER DISCUSSES THE ABM TREATY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, our colleague JIM COURTER of New Jersey has become one of the leading experts in the House on strategic defense systems. He believes, as I do, that the highest goal of our defense program as well as our arms control and reduction efforts is increasing the safety and security of our people.

Congressman COURTER recently gave a speech on the problem of the 13-year-old ABM Treaty, in which he makes a strong case that the treaty has resulted in a greater imbalance of nuclear arms rather than balanced force reductions which were hoped for by the signers. Moreover the treaty is now constraining our effort to develop and deploy the most hopeful program yet devised for nuclear offensive weapons control, the Strategic Defense Initiative proposed by President Reagan.

I urge Members to read Congressman COURTER's thoughtful speech.

THE FAILURE OF THE ABM TREATY

When I think of the ABM Treaty of 1972, I am reminded of a proposal that was being discussed when I first ran for Congress in 1978. It was a proposal to enact "sunset" legislation that would apply to all government agencies, and give them a fixed expiration date after which the agencies would automatically go out of business unless Congress passed legislation to keep them alive. It was a good idea that was aimed at curtailing the growth of bureaucracies that somehow seem to keep on growing even after they have outlived their usefulness. At the very least, this kind of legislation would force Congress to undertake a critical, top-to-bottom review of all agencies every few years to see how well they are functioning.

We should apply the same kind of scrutiny to the ABM Treaty. For if ever there was an agreement that has failed to achieve the goals it was expected to achieve, it is this treaty. I will leave to the political scientists, and historians of nuclear strategy the question of whether we should have entered into this agreement in the first place—but I will assert that from the perspective of today's security requirements, the ABM Treaty has outlived any utility it may have had. To my mind, the only question is when—not whether—we should notify the Soviets that we are no longer prepared to live by the letter of this failed treaty.

The ABM Treaty is a legal instrument that codifies a particular nuclear doctrine called Mutual Assured Destruction, which holds that states will be self-deterred from a nuclear attack as long as they know that such an attack will invite unacceptable retaliation. We should not discuss the treaty without also discussing the doctrine itself. I will briefly outline what I view as the main deficiencies of this doctrine as a long-term instrument of our national security. When

we examine it, we see that it is based on several critical assumptions that must always be fulfilled. These are that both sides accept the principle that defensive systems should be banned, that all states will act rationally and never mount a first strike, that no accidents or mistakes will ever occur, that terrorist nations will never acquire an ICBM, and that deterrence itself will never fail.

We should all be glad that these conditions have held for as long as they have, but I would prefer to build a system of security that doesn't depend on each of these conditions holding true for the indefinite future.

Today's debate over the Strategic Defense Initiative often seems to take place in a double vacuum, insulated from discussion of the original purposes of the ABM Treaty and from Soviet doctrines and activities in the field of strategic defense. Today I would like to look back to the ABM Treaty debate to see exactly what this treaty was intended to achieve, and why the Senate approved it by a vote of 88 to 2.

In 1972 we were seeking the same results from arms control that we are still seeking today: a stable balance of forces that denies each side the capability to disarm the other through a first strike. At that time, we were about to field defenses that would protect our missile sites and population centers. This would have been a stabilizing factor from our point of view, since it would have made a Soviet first strike senseless.

But we were concerned about the prospect of an open-ended competition in offensive arms, so we agreed to seek stability through negotiated agreements. We accepted the idea of a trade-off: the United States would forgo wide deployments of ABM systems if the Soviets would agree to join us on a path toward reductions in offensive arsenals.

The result was two agreements, SALT I and the ABM Treaty, which dealt respectively with the offensive and defensive sides of the strategic equation. The limits on defenses were definitive: we agreed that each side could deploy defenses in two locations only, then we reduced this to one location by mutual agreement in 1975. On the offensive side, the results were far less sweeping, and we expected real reductions to be achieved in the SALT II treaty. That is why the SALT I treaty was labeled an "interim" agreement and given a five-year life.

Thus the Nixon Administration presented the Senate with two main strategic arguments for the approval of these agreements. First, the Administration argued that Soviet agreement to the ABM Treaty implied a willingness to forgo the development of Soviet territorial defenses. Second was the argument that a ban on defenses would lead to an end to offensive arms racing. In the words of one Senator during the 1972 debate, the ABM ban "reduces the incentive for continuing deployments of offensive systems," because "offensive missile forces have, in effect, a free ride to their targets."

From the US point of view, these conditions had to be met if we were to maintain a long-term commitment to the ABM Treaty. We even added a unilateral statement to the ABM Treaty which notified the Soviets that we expected "more complete strategic offensive arms limitations" to be achieved "within five years"—if not, we stated that "US supreme interests could be jeopardized," which means that we would be prepared to abrogate the treaty and return to the pursuit of defensive systems.

In practice, these conditions were not met once the treaty was approved and entered into force.

On the offensive side, we all know that no agreement to reduce forces was reached. A one-sided arms race ensued between the signing of SALT I and the signing of SALT II seven years later. In this period, the Soviets deployed three new land-based multiple warhead missile systems, two new submarine-launched missile systems, and the Backfire bomber. We made no similar deployments, cancelled the B-1 bomber and took the ABM system at the Grand Forks, North Dakota missile field out of operation.

So here is the first failure of the ABM Treaty: it did not lead to reduced offensive forces, as it was expected to do. I hardly need to point out that these trends have continued unabated since SALT II—an agreement that merely presided over the growth of offensive arsenals, and did not limit them—was signed. Today we face a Soviet nuclear force with over three times the megatonnage of our force. As we begin to deploy 50 MX missiles, after much agonizing debate and scores of Congressional votes, we note that the Soviet SS-18 force alone has more megatonnage than our entire strategic arsenal. Just last year, the Soviets produced 200 ICBM's and they are now ready to deploy two types of mobile land-based missile—one of which violates SALT II—while we embark on years of debate on our own mobile missile, the Midgeman.

The net result of these developments is that our land-based missile force, the key to our retaliatory capability, is more vulnerable today than it was in 1972. This is, of course, the opposite result of what the treaty was supposed to achieve, and it is precisely what we were alluding to when we said that our supreme interests could be jeopardized by the lack of strict limitations on offensive forces.

Perhaps we should not be surprised that the Soviets pursued this offensive advantage, since Soviet military doctrines have been known to us for some time. In May 1972, the very month in which the ABM Treaty was signed, an article in the Soviet journal *Kommunist* proclaimed that Soviet policy "is directed toward creating and maintaining military superiority."

And this goal of superiority has a defensive dimension as well.

Had the Soviets done what the ABM Treaty proponents expected them to do, they would have had to reverse their established strategic doctrine. Deliberate strategic vulnerability has never been an objective of Soviet strategy—not before the ABM Treaty, and certainly not after it was signed. The Soviets have long believed in surviving a nuclear war and have sought ways to defend their homeland to make this belief a reality. In 1972 they were outspending us in strategic defense by a factor of five; by 1980, according to the CIA, their effort was 25 times the size of our effort, mainly because we cut back our ABM activities so severely after the treaty went into effect, while they did not.

What have the Soviets got for all the rubles they have spent on strategic defense? They have the world's only operational ABM system protecting Moscow and its environs. They have extensive air and civil defense networks. They have built a large radar in southern Siberia, at Krasnoyarsk, in clear violation of the ABM Treaty, thus completing their nationwide network of large phased-array early warning radars. They have surface-to-air missiles, one of which has been tested in an ABM mode against a ballistic missile warhead. They

have a mobile radar system, the Pawn Shop, and a moveable, rapidly erectable system, the Flat Twin system, that would be used to guide ABM missiles to their targets. They have an ongoing research effort, in many respects ahead of our own, in lasers and directed energy weapons.

All in all, the Soviets are conducting such a robust and broad strategic defense effort that the President's statement of earlier this year, that the Soviet Union "may be preparing an ABM defense of its national territory," probably qualifies as the understatement of the year. And it places the current Soviet protests over our own SDI program among the most disingenuous statements of diplomatic history—even when other Soviet statements are taken into account.

In sum, both of the strategic criteria of the ABM Treaty—reduction of offensive forces and restraint of defensive forces, not to mention compliance with the agreement itself—remain unfulfilled thirteen years after the treaty was signed.

I know that there are many former government officials who negotiated the ABM Treaty who are saying that the treaty has worked well in practice, that it represents the most successful arms control agreement in history. But I would point out that the failure of the ABM Treaty has been acknowledged by its architect, Henry Kissinger, in an article he wrote two months ago. Dr. Kissinger enumerated the failure of offensive arms control efforts, described the Soviet strategic defense effort, and acknowledged Soviet violation of the ABM Treaty. He concluded that we should continue our negotiations with the Soviet Union, but if the Soviets refuse to agree to phased deployment of defenses, then "the United States would have no choice except to build a strategic defense unilaterally . . ."

So what should be done? We should give the Soviets our six months notice, as required by the treaty, that we intend to withdraw from the treaty because it no longer serves our national security interests. There are numerous reasons for ending our adherence to the treaty: the strategic paradigm on which it is based has not been fulfilled, the Soviets have violated it, and the technologies on which a missile defense would be built offer far more promise today than they did in 1972. Yet the treaty remains in effect, restraining our effort to research strategic defense, and it will stop any move to deploy defenses beyond a system that would cover a single missile field.

I believe that we should make the decision now to deploy point defenses to protect our land-based retaliatory forces, communications centers and command centers. There is no disagreement, even among those who question the feasibility of population defense, that this type of defense is technologically possible. It would increase stability by making our forces more survivable and by making the Soviets far less certain that they could execute a successful first strike against our strategic forces. Research on population defenses could continue, and such defenses could be deployed when they become available. But we should not wait until we have a so-called "perfect and leak-proof" defense before we act—this would subject SDI to the same "technological filibuster" that dooms so many of our military programs to endless delay and indecision. In fact, such a defense, while limited in terms of the long-range technological possibilities, would in fact protect people. It would protect some of the tens of millions of people

who would be annihilated in a Soviet attempt to destroy our nuclear forces. It would also be highly useful to our European allies, whose populations are much more concentrated than ours and are thus more vulnerable to the effects of a nuclear attack on purely military targets.

In recent weeks we have been treated to a major controversy, played out in the pages of our newspapers, over the exact interpretation of the ABM Treaty. The Administration reached the conclusion, with the State Department concurring, that the ABM Treaty permits far more research into space-based systems than was previously through permissible.

In spite of this conclusion, the Administration decided that we should impose upon ourselves a much more constraining set of SDI program limitations than the treaty requires. The rationalization for these limitations has been that SDI planning has not required use of the full range of activities permitted by the ABM Treaty. This view is in fact an ingenious misstatement of cause and effect. The facts are not that SDI would find no benefit in a wider range of allowed activities, but that the wider range of activities was explicitly denied to the SDI program during its formulation and planning stages. What is represented today as a product of the SDI planning process is in fact a constraint externally imposed upon that process.

Many observers of this controversy are not convinced that the ABM Treaty allows research, development and testing of systems based on new technologies, or "other physical principles," to use the words of the treaty itself. In my opinion, the Administration's legal analyses are clear and persuasive on this score. As further evidence, let me offer the interpretation of Gerard Smith, the ABM Treaty negotiator, given to the House Armed Services Committee on July 25, 1972. Ambassador Smith said:

"Of even greater importance as a qualitative limitation is the prohibition on the deployment of future types of ABM systems based on physical principles different from present technology."

"On this point, Mr. Chairman, there is an agreed interpretation with respect to ABM systems based on different physical principles, and including components capable of substituting for those components used at present—that is, launchers, missiles and radar components. If such new systems are developed, and one or the other side wants to deploy them under the limitations of this treaty, there would have to first be a discussion of the question in the Standing Consultative Commission we are proposing to establish under this treaty, and then the treaty would have to be amended before such novel ABM systems could be deployed."

Note that he referred to deployment several times, and he did not say that the treaty would require amendment before such new systems are developed or tested.

The missing element in this entire discussion was why an Administration that has certified that the Soviets are violating an agreement is tying itself in legal knots to determine how we must comply with that very agreement. Either compliance matters, or it does not. If the Soviets are violating the ABM Treaty, and if the ABM Treaty holds us back in our own research efforts, then we most certainly should not be drawing tighter limits around our programs, unless we want to establish a dangerous, one-sided standard of compliance with arms control agreements.

It would be preferable to reach agreement with the Soviets on phased deployment of the defenses that we and they so clearly want, but it is difficult to be optimistic on this score. Soviet treatment of the Krasnoyarsk radar issue is an informative guide on this question. Recently we have learned of their offer to make what appears to be an accommodation on the Krasnoyarsk radar—but when we examine the particulars of their offer, as is so often the case, it is not a serious proposal. The Soviets did not offer to dismantle the illegal radar—they offered to stop construction on it. But external construction was completed several weeks before they made their momentous offer. They could continue interior work on the radar installation, which we could not verify. In addition, their side of the bargain was conditioned on a halt in US modernization of two existing legal radars—radars in Greenland and Great Britain that provide early warning of attack—that are fully permissible under the ABM Treaty. So, in essence, they offered not to give up their illegal battle management capability if we gave up our legal early warning capability. This is hardly a good sign that we will see Soviet willingness to negotiate an agreement that will permit deployment of defenses.

Only by withdrawing from the ABM Treaty can we hope to give the Soviets incentive to agree to the gradual deployment of defenses. Only by taking this course will we show that we are serious in our effort to build defenses, and to cease our reliance on a policy based on the idea that it is safe to be vulnerable, but somehow dangerous to be defended from the threat of nuclear weapons.

THE GREEN MOUNTAINS ARE ALIVE WITH THE SOUND OF MUSIC

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, recently the House passed H.R. 3248, the Arts, Humanities and Museums Amendments of 1985. One concern raised during the debate on the bill was the ability to bring the arts to rural areas of our country. As a Member from one of the most rural States, I share this concern.

The Vermont Symphony Orchestra is celebrating its golden anniversary with a statewide tour entitled the "251" Project. The objective of the outreach effort is to give every Vermonter a chance to hear the orchestra perform. Over a period of approximately 2 years, the orchestra plans to visit all 251 of the States towns and cities. Hence the name of the project.

Over the years, the National Endowment for the Arts has provided significant support to the Vermont Symphony Orchestra. I submit that my colleagues read the enclosed article by Chester Lane to learn about one way that the "rural barrier" of accessibility to the arts can be overcome. The article follows:

[From Symphony Magazine, June/July 1985 Issue]

MUSICAL ODYSSEY IN THE GREEN MOUNTAIN STATE

(By Chester Lane)

"The Symphony's unfamiliar and 'enriching' entertainment was greeted variously. One hard-shell Vermonter, looking for a carnival, blundered instead onto an outdoor concert at a local racetrack. 'By gum,' he told Lou Levy at the end, 'you fellers can come back anytime you want to. That beats a movie all hollow.'"

This is the way Levy, a violinist in the Vermont Symphony Orchestra, recalls his encounter with an unlikely but pleasantly surprised concertgoer back in the days when the fledgling orchestra played with more enthusiasm than finesse. The incident is captured in *The Vermont Symphony Orchestra: The First Fifty Years*, recently published by the VSO to commemorate its golden anniversary. Levy's anecdote, one of many delightful tidbits in this twelve-page booklet, says a lot about the people-to-people tradition that has been this orchestra's backbone for fifty years—a tradition that is now manifesting itself with unparalleled vigor in a statewide touring program, the "251" Project. The objective of this unique outreach effort is to give every Vermonter a chance to hear the VSO's sound and meet its musicians by bringing ensembles from the orchestra, over a period of approximately two years, to all 251 of the state's towns and cities.

Lou Levy joined the Vermont Symphony two years after its founding. At 80 years of age he still plays in the orchestra, and last fall he was on hand for a festive ceremony in Montpelier, the state capital, inaugurating the "251" Project on September 21. Remarks made on that occasion by VSO Manager Morris Block and Music Director Efraim Guigui caught the spirit of the "251" adventure. Block, alluding to the intrepid brass players who were entertaining the crowd and gearing up for the first "251" concerts that weekend, said, "They're freezing, but they're doing it as a favor to us. They usually won't play when it's below 65 degrees." Guigui, a native of Argentina, anticipated the lighthearted, down-to-earth quality of the upcoming concerts while indulging in some local humor that elicited roars of delight from the crowd: "I hope you understand my English. I learned my accent in Boston." He went on to say that "good music doesn't have to be boring or stuffy. It can be uplifting." And in a gesture entirely in keeping with a tour that would bring music to hundreds of children along with older people, 50 birthday cakes baked by students in the Montpelier public schools were brought out for the assembled guests.

Not surprisingly, the "251" kickoff and Vermont Symphony birthday party made headlines in Burlington, Vermont's largest city and the one in which the statewide orchestra is based. But the ensuing publicity via print, television, and radio has gone beyond the wildest dreams of most Metropolitan orchestra managers. Besides the September 22 story in the *Burlington Free Press*, articles have appeared in the *New York Times*, the *Wall Street Journal*, and the Massachusetts-based *New England Monthly*. IBM's General Technology Division, headquartered just outside Burlington in Essex Junction, devoted four pages of its house organ *Burlington Closeup* to a lavish picture story on the "251" Project, heralding the fact that the corporation has

pledged \$50,000 toward the VSO's 50th anniversary celebration. The orchestra was the subject of a feature by Fred Briggs wrapping up the NBC Nightly News on March 15, and a longer one by Charles Kuralt on the April 12 edition of CBS's "Sunday Morning" program. With the April broadcast of a radio feature taped by Voice of America, the Vermont Symphony Orchestra became an international story. Scripted by Rosanne Skirble, the program documented an appearance by the VSO's Brass Trio in the far-north town of Jay, where the musicians performed in the local firehouse and demonstrated the mechanics of their instruments for an eager crowd. The sound of the full orchestra was represented by a taped rendition of Berlioz' *Symphonie Fantastique*. And the voices of Efrain Guigui (interviewed in Spanish by the bilingual Skirble) and Morris Block were heard by millions of overseas listeners, not only through the VOA's Worldwide English Division, but in Spanish and Portuguese translations broadcast by its American Republics Division.

Since the Friday afternoon kickoff party in Montpelier, thousands of Vermonters have heard the orchestra's woodwind, brass, and string players in schools, grange halls, churches, community centers, town halls, even firehouses. For the most part the concerts have been given by ensembles of three to five musicians—an October 28 concert at Dover's elementary school marked the debut of the VSO String Quartet—but some localities are being treated to the full orchestra or its twenty-piece Little Orchestra. The musicians have played for a wide variety of functions including craft shows, a chicken pot pie supper, and a fireman's banquet. Concerts are hosted locally by such personages as Jim Simon, owner of the country store in Albany, Vermont, and Colise Brown, a woodcarver from Waterville.

Passive concertgoing has little or no place in this scheme, since the performance venues are informal and the musicians always close at hand, eager to demonstrate their craft or to field questions from curious audience members. At the Dover school concert, for example, people asked "the sorts of questions a big-city audience might be embarrassed to ask," wrote Linda Charlton in that quintessentially "big-city" newspaper, the Wall Street Journal. (The question she has in mind was, "Is the music scored so you all turn the pages at the same time?") Trumpeter Dave Brubaker tickled his audience during a brass instrument demonstration with his friendly jab at the keyless design of the trombone: "Of course it's quite obvious that it's more efficient to move fingers than it is to move arms," he said. "So we get to play things that trombone players only dream about." Bob Wigness, the trio's trombonist, got a laugh of his own with the one-word answer to what kids could do to prepare for a future orchestral career: "Practice!" And Wigness had his own "instrument" demonstration, a real crowd-pleaser. Fox Butterfield of the New York Times witnessed one such demonstration, reporting that the trombonist "puckered his lips and played the scale with no instruments. Then he attached his mouthpiece to a strip of garden hose that he said was the same length as an unwound trombone and played the 'The Farmer in the Dell.' After applause, he added a funnel to the contraption and played the tune again, recreating a trombone's sound."

Charles Kuralt's nationally televised report made much of the fact that Vermont

is a state whose harsh winters put the dedication and goodwill of both the touring musicians and their audiences to the test. "One string quartet drove six hours through a blizzard to get to a concert in Waitsfield," he said. "And there at the top of the stairs waiting for them was their audience." In true New England fashion, quartet violinist Evelyn Read explained that the musicians "would go anywhere, whether the weather is bad or not. It wouldn't have occurred to us not to come because it was snowing. You don't let anything stand in your way." This spirit, she said, was "sort of contagious" and accounted for the fact that audiences did in fact turn out during outrageous weather.

Freda Hart ("Freddie") Levin, the project's energetic coordinator and chief publicist, described the musicians' do-or-die spirit from another angle: "Once, just before a performance by the Brass Trio, the horn player's back went out. The concert was scheduled for 7 p.m. and we got a substitute at quarter to 6. They taught the substitute what she needed to know and the program went well."

The gratitude of concert patrons and sponsors has expressed itself in many tangible ways. "The audiences come with cakes and cookies and invitations for the musicians to come to dinner and stay overnight in the spare bedroom," reported Charles Kuralt. And the result is not only warm feelings but warm musicianship: violinist Yenoin Guilbory, one of the VSO musicians interviewed by Kuralt, observed that "People seem to go out of their way to do something a little bit extra, to be extra human, extra nice in a way that maybe you don't have to be a large city. I think the musicmaking really benefits from that."

Testimonials continue to pour into the Vermont Symphony's office. One enthusiastic concertgoer wrote that a performance by the Alcott String Trio, one of the touring ensembles, was "delightful. The selections played and presented were just right for the audience. Also, it was wonderful that the players could stay for a bit after the concert to chat over coffee." A lively letter from Mary Jane Dexter of Wolcott reported that the String Quartet's concert in the Town Hall was "well balanced, starting with the spirited *Eine Kleine*. That brought the audience to attention, and from then on they could have played the laundry list and the audience would have listened. . . . The young people who attended the concert had a mixed bag of feelings. One wondered why there was no horn, another girl thought the cello was the greatest instrument, and a fourth grade boy just loved the violins (sexist?). Anyway, you provided the community with something rich and special and memorable."

Sarah Barnett, a high school sophomore from Newport, Vermont, wrote that "after the concert in Newport I had a chance to talk to the cellist and the violist [of the Alcott String Trio], two extremely nice ladies whose names I've unfortunately forgotten. . . . Thank you so much for being an inspiration to me and all of the many other young artists in Vermont. . . . My boyfriend and I have already started making plans to hear the full orchestra at the Flynn [Theatre] in Burlington as soon as possible."

And one wag from a very small town in the state's northwest corner wrote that "until our school bus driver got arrested for DWI yesterday," the concert was "the biggest and best thing to happen" in her community in years.

The idea of celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Vermont Symphony by bringing

its musicians to every town in the state originated with broad member Ron Nief. It seemed like a crazy scheme to some, involving insurmountable problems of logistics and financing. But not long after it was proposed; VSO Manager Block came up with a plan for implementing it. The "251" Project had the support of IBM from its very early stages. Vermont Symphony Vice President Grant Bush, who is employed at IBM as logic products operation manager and also serves on the orchestra's 50th Anniversary Committee, initiated a \$4,000 IBM Fund for Community Service Grant to get the project going. The corporation subsequently pledged \$50,000, making it the project's sole "Angel."

Many other companies have pledged lesser amounts to become "Benefactors" or "Sustainers" of the "251" Project, which the orchestra has estimated will cost between \$150,000 and \$175,000 over the two-year period. Freddie Levin and Gretchen Amussen, the VSO's director of development, say that what continues to be effective in securing "251" underwriting is "the kind of three-pronged approach used. First, there is the number 251 itself—representing the 251 towns in Vermont—on which to base a whole fundraising package. The concept of a '251 Club' (contributions made in multiples of \$251) stimulated interest and imagination. Second, this 'magic number' afforded excellent flexibility: the range of multiples allowed for both the smaller gifts of \$1,000 and under (\$251, \$502, \$753) and the larger gifts (\$1,004 and up). Finally, there was the grooming and training of our board members and volunteers to go out with our development director, or with our manager, or on their own, to excite businesspeople about the project. Our longstanding network of friends all over the state was a godsend; their enthusiasm and input have been critical in finding the funding for our '251' Project."

Ms. Levin has assiduously courted these "friends." One of her standard tools has been a letter addressed "Dear Board Member/Friend of VSO" which asks for help in identifying concert sites, special events to commemorate in a given area, names of individuals who could host a concert, groups that could help with local publicity, etc. Enclosed with the letter is a map of the state, to be returned "with initials placed in any town in which you can locate a '251 Wonder.'" No stone is left unturned: the letter ask that "if you have a cousin in some far-off corner of the state who'd be perfect for this project, don't hesitate to include her/his name."

Coordinating logistics for the "251" concerts is a formidable task. Since they are held in such a wide range of venues, and are often hosted by individuals or groups with little or no experience as concert presenters, the agreement form that Ms. Levin sends to individuals who will be hosting "251" concerts contains instructions of the most basic sort. Hosts are told, for example, that they will be responsible for "having a sturdy, armless chair for each musician, set up where they will be performing," and "seeing that the building is clean, adequately lit, and well-heated if necessary—it's very difficult for the musicians to play if the temperature falls below 68 degrees."

Business support, and the modest size of the touring ensembles, have enabled the orchestra to keep admission prices extremely low—anywhere from five dollars down to an optional donation. Towns are requested to raise \$120 to host a trio, slightly more to

bring a quartet or quintet to town, although these fees are sometimes waived. Admission receipts are split between the orchestra and each town, with the town using the money for nonprofit community projects. (In one notable instance, proceeds from the concert in Island Pond were earmarked for Ethiopian famine relief.)

As of late April, seven months after the first of the "251" concerts, Freddie Levin was exuberant about what she calls the "the momentum of this peripatetic project. Towns are now clamoring for their turns—what a contrast from last September when I had to dredge up names of strangers who might be willing to help, then call and explain, to incredulous ears, the details of our zany scheme, right from square one. Now when I do have to contact a 'new friend'—because that's what so many of these hosts have become—they have already heard about our plan and are eager to participate."

Needless to say, the Vermont Symphony has come a long way since its first concert, described as follows in the orchestra's newly published commemorative history: "... from the opening roar of *Finlandia* to the end of the concert, the audience responded with enthusiasm, despite the competitiveness emanating from the stage. Haydn's *Surprise* Symphony followed, with a few more surprises than usual. Lacking a second oboe, that part was played on the flute. Saxophones substituted for bassons, of which there were few in the Vermont of 1936. The biggest surprise of all was how many Vermonters left the warmth and comfort of their hearths to go hear some "culture."

A very different kind of *Surprise* Symphony was heard on October 20, 1984 at the first concert of the VSO's 50th season. Commenting on the Vermont Symphony of today, one informed listener, composer Jan Swafford, wrote in the aforementioned *New England Monthly* article that "one finds a group on the threshold of equality with such other New England ensembles as those in Springfield and New Haven but waiting for the goose to the budget that will make it possible."

The Vermont Symphony claims to be the oldest state symphony orchestra in the country. Its founding conductor, Dr. Alan Carter, began collecting musicians in 1934 and led the orchestra in its first concert in January of 1936. By 1938 his ensemble had become sufficiently recognized to win an invitation to play at the World's Fair in New York City the following year. To help finance the New York trip, the Vermont legislature appropriated \$1,000 to the orchestra—which, according to the VSO's commemorative history, made the state of Vermont "the first in the nation to contribute to the support of a symphony—support that continues to this day." State funding now accounts for a relatively high 7.6 percent of the orchestra's \$620,000 budget (which has doubled in the past two years, according to Block).

Aside from its financial relationship with the state, the Vermont Symphony has long had a tradition of covering the state with its concert activity. Right from the start, the VSO dedicated itself to traveling to any gym, armory, racetrack, or ski slope where an audience could be found. The musicians, whose numbers included barbers, lawyers, mail carriers, doctors, and farmers, came from all across the state to rehearse and perform.

Today nearly 40 percent of the musicians live out of state—not the 50 percent claimed

by Fred Briggs in his NBC Nightly News report—and the orchestra's commemorative history laments the fact that "this necessarily deprives Vermonters and their children of having musicians live and teach here and act as a musical influence among us." But the VSO has made great artistic strides under Music Director Efrain Guigui, the conductor hand-picked by Dr. Carter to succeed him in 1974. The orchestra presents more than 20 full-orchestra concerts all over the state each year, playing for an estimated 75,000 Vermonters and reaching 10,000 children through its ensembles in the schools. And the \$60,000 debt faced by the orchestra ten years ago has been erased.

Where does the "251" Project go from here? The orchestra and its Green Mountain Odyssey recently received a vote of confidence from the National Endowment for the Arts, whose grant to the VSO for 1985-86 is \$18,000, nearly 30 percent more than last year's. And one of several possible scenarios for winding up the project next year is a 252nd concert in the nation's capital. In the meantime, VSO musicians will press on relentlessly with their goal of playing in every town, village, hamlet, city, and gore in this overwhelming rural state. (For those not privileged to live in the hinterlands of Vermont, a gore is an exceedingly small unincorporated community; Webster defines it as a "small usually triangular piece of land," with no mention of *people* at all.)

While the concept of a gore may be foreign to most people, one of Vermont's gores has attracted national attention through the "251" Project. Fox Butterfield, for example, announced in the *New York Times* that "at Buel's Gore, a hamlet of nine people on the western slope of the Green Mountains, near Starksboro, a lone bugler will play taps." At this writing, the "lone bugler" has not yet made his appearance. But one of Freddie Levin's many "friends" is eagerly awaiting word as to when the Buel Gore "concert" will occur. This concerned individual wants to make sure the bugler doesn't get lonely and has enough to eat. She has offered to help out in whatever way she can.

DRUGS AND THE DESTRUCTION OF YOUNG PEOPLE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the world's most charismatic and respected world leaders is His Holiness, Pope John Paul II. The *New York Post* of November 4, 1985, included an article entitled "Drugs and the Destruction of Young People—Selected Observations of Pope John Paul II." Former drug addicts, parents, educators, and police officers have all warned drug users repeatedly of the dangers of drug abuse. Here is what the Pope has to say on the subject:

Among today's tense threats against the young, and against society as a whole, drugs are placed first as a danger that is all the more insidious since it is less visible and not adequately evaluated according to the full extent of its gravity.

The Pontiff offers drug users hope when he says "drug addiction is not an irreversi-

ble disease." He stresses the positive contribution therapeutic communities can have in curtailing drug abuse. He tells us that:

Drug addiction cannot be cured by drugs. Some of you may be tempted to take flight from responsibility in the fantasy world of alcohol and drugs. Put yourselves on guard against the fraud of a world that wants to exploit or misdirect your energetic and powerful search for happiness and meaning.

Pope John Paul II warns us that:

Neither alarmism nor oversimplification serves to confront drug use. Rather, what is effective is an effort to know the individual and understand his interior world; to lead him to the discovery, rediscovery, of his own dignity as a person; to help him to review and nurture those personal resources that drugs have buried, by reactivating the mechanisms of the will and directing them toward certain and noble ideals.

Mr. Speaker, in January 1984, I was privileged to lead a delegation of the select committee to Hawaii, Hong Kong, Thailand, Burma, Pakistan, and Italy to study narcotics eradication and control efforts in these countries. On January 19, 1984, we were privileged to have a private audience at the Apostolic Palace in Vatican City, with His Holiness, Pope John Paul II. At that time the Pontiff remarked to us that:

Among those factors which menace the individual and impede the growth of a healthy social climate is the problem which brings you together in this assembly: Namely, the scourge of narcotics trafficking and drug abuse.

Pope John Paul II stressed the important role the family can play in curtailing drug abuse saying:

The Church's interest and pastoral concern both for the individuals whose lives are marked by devastating personal tragedies and for the societies which must come to grips with an increasingly dangerous phenomenon is focused on the crucial role that the family must play in the solution to the problem. As you try to make your fellow citizens more and more conscious of the dangers of drug abuse as you promote legislation on the national and international level, which seeks to draw up a comprehensive plan of deterrence against trafficking in narcotics, may you ever strive to meet the needs of the family, for it is a key element in establishing stable loving relationships and in offering to every person the support needed for a fulfilling life.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that some of the approximately 25 million people in America who use marijuana, the 8 million to 20 million people who use cocaine, and the approximately 500,000 people who are addicted to heroin will read this article, take hope from it, and rededicate their efforts to overcoming their individual drug dependencies. For the information of Members and the public I ask that the article entitled "Drugs and the Destruction of Young People—Selected Observations of Pope John Paul II" be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

[From the New York Post, Nov. 4, 1985]

DRUGS AND THE DESTRUCTION OF YOUNG PEOPLE—SELECTED OBSERVATIONS OF POPE JOHN PAUL II

EDITORS'S NOTE.—One of the most rampant and relentless destroyers of human life in modern society is drug addiction, especially among young people. What can be done to reverse the trend and restore the victims to a happy and meaningful life? Pope John Paul II offers some insights and encouragement, particularly to the young.

Among today's tense threats against the young, and against society as a whole, drugs are placed first as a danger that is all the more insidious since it is less visible and not yet adequately evaluated according to the full extent of its gravity.

What is most striking is the observation that despite the sight of the sad spectacles which drug addiction places before everyone's eyes in the daily news, the infection spreads rapidly, progressively extending its tentacles from the centers, from the richest and most industrialized nations, to the Third World.

On the basis of the experience that patients can be brought back again to a normal life, the positive nature of the response consists in the factual observation that drug addiction is not an irreversible disease. The increasing requests to enter therapeutic communities are proof of this.

The results already achieved constitute the experimental basis of hope for a complete victory which will cut to the very roots of the many causes of this evil.

This fundamental answer is backed by another consideration of no minor importance. Drug addiction cannot be cured by drugs.

Substitute drugs are not sufficient therapy, but rather a half-hidden way to give in to the phenomenon.

The way to bring about a return from the hallucinating world of narcotics is to have recourse to the personal commitment of the one concerned, his will to revive and his capacity to start again.

It is the common opinion of worthy observers that the holding power of drugs over the young mind lies in disappointment with life, fallen ideals and fear of the future.

Lacking a perspective of the great values, the human person, especially if he is still in the springtime of life, when he has no reason for living or for thinking constructively of the future, tries to run away from the present by taking refuge in substitutes or in nothingness.

The therapeutic community, by again proposing true values, provides the energy capable of helping one to live one's own life, striving joyfully to build or rebuild the person, of enabling him to face life and the uncertainties of the future. (Address at San Crispino Therapeutic Center, Viterbo, Italy, May 27, 1984.)

Keeping the objective, "the value of man," constantly in mind, the therapeutic communities, even in their diversity, have shown that they are an effective system.

In fact, they have proved themselves to be solid means producing solid results, if compared with the ever-impending grave difficulties.

Neither alarmism nor oversimplification serves to confront drug abuse. Rather, what is effective is an effort to know the individual and understand his interior world; to lead him to the discovery, or rediscovery, of his own dignity as a person; to help him to revive and nurture those personal resources that drugs have buried, by reactivating the mechanisms of the will and directing them

toward certain and noble ideals. (Address to participants in the Eighth World Congress of Therapeutic Communities, Sept. 7, 1984.)

How many young people, succumbing to the fascination of deceptive mirages, give themselves up to the uncontrolled power of the instincts, or venture onto paths which seem full of promise but which in reality are lacking in genuinely human prospects!

I feel the need to repeat what I wrote in the Message which I dedicated precisely to you (the youth of the world) for the World Day of Peace:

Some of you may be tempted to take flight from responsibility in the fantasy worlds of alcohol and drugs. Put yourselves on guard against the fraud of a world that wants to exploit or misdirect your energetic and powerful search for happiness and meaning. (Letter to the Youth of the World, March 31, 1985.)

I have spoken of a new, essentially positive mentality. This should be deeply important. . . to all persons of good will who are truly sensitive to spiritual values.

To cultivate these values is the secret of removing soil from the weed of drug abuse.

As I said in a homily to the members of the Italian Solidarity Center, "man has an extreme need to know if it is worthwhile to be born, to live, to struggle, to suffer and die, if it is worthwhile to commit oneself to some ideal superior to material and contingent interests, if, in a word, there is a 'why' that justifies his earthly existence." (Address to participants in the Eighth World Congress of Therapeutic Communities, Sept. 7, 1984.)

(NOTE.—In consultation with the Vatican Communications Office, the column was edited by the Rev. Joseph A. Vadino, former editor of the English-language edition of *L'Osservatore Romano*.)

HARDBALL TACTICS BY FORD MOTOR CO. MUST BE STOPPED

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to protect American workers from the hardball negotiating tactics of the Ford Motor Co. In an act bordering on blackmail, Ford has threatened the Reagan administration that it would turn two of its big classic American cars into imports if the Government does not grant a long-term reduction in Federal fuel economy standards. The belief is that if Ford does this, General Motors will follow suit.

Remember the days of, "what's good for General Motors is good for America?" Well, now Ford has told the American people that the size of its bottom line is more important to America than are jobs in the auto industry, jobs in the automotive parts industry, industrial competitiveness, energy conservation efforts and the responsibility of the Government to protect the long-term interests of the entire citizenry. And do you know what, Mr. Speaker? If we don't do something quickly, they just might get away with it.

They might get away with it because they're facing down the administration

with a gun to the heads of possibly thousands of workers, saying, in effect, "if we can't dictate Federal fuel economy policy, we'll blow these guys right out of their jobs. Go ahead and make our day." They might get away with it because they have the administration on the defensive, caught between rhetoric and a weak bargaining position, unsure of what to do or where to turn. And they might get away with it because they just don't care about their people and won't lose a bit of sleep if they carry out what they're threatening.

My bill would amend the gas guzzler tax law so that any imports—those cars for which more than 25 percent of the value added comes from sources outside the United States and Canada—produced by or for American corporations, which exceed the total number produced by any of those corporations in the year ending November 1, 1985, and which would violate the gas guzzler restrictions, would be subject to an additional tax equal to the amount of the penalty they would have been subject to under the CAFE standards that they are trying to evade. My bill imposes no additional or outrageous penalties on these companies—it merely forces them to obey the laws that the Congress has set. Ford and GM think they have found a loophole in the CAFE standards and my bill would slam it shut.

Mr. Speaker, there was a long battle over the rollback of the CAFE standards from 27.5 miles per gallon to 26 miles per gallon that climaxed at the end of the summer with the administration granting a temporary rollback to 26 mile per gallon. I fought against that rollback because I thought it was contrary to the long-run interests of this country but I lost. Now, Ford has indicated that they're not satisfied with their success. They want to take more, a lot more. Let me briefly go over some of the issues in this case so I can demonstrate how bankrupt are the arguments of Ford.

According to the auto companies, forcing them to comply with the fuel economy standards would cost jobs in the industry. In the very short run, this might be true but in the longer run, failure to comply with the standards will cost more jobs. If American companies never learn to manufacture small cars, they will never be able to compete with foreign car makers. Will the lessons of history go forever unlearned? We do not have a pressing oil crunch now but oil is basically a non-renewable energy source and at some point we will run out of it. In addition, there is no guarantee that the Governments of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Mexico will remain stable and friendly—remember Iran? If they do not, we could face drastically reduced fuel supplies, a half-empty strategic petroleum reserve and a lot of huge cars sucking down gas at an amazing rate.

Do we think that because oil prices have fallen that we're less dependent on foreign oil? In 1984, our oil imports rose for the first time since 1975. One-third of our demand for liquid petroleum is met by for-

eign imports, and that figure is projected to jump to 40 percent in the next 4 years. That's not energy independence. What would be our alternatives in an oil crisis? We could either cut back drastically on the amount that we drive or drive a lot more small cars. But if our auto producers never have to learn how to make small cars, we'll have to buy them from overseas. Either option would cost hundreds of thousands of jobs throughout our economy.

The second lame argument advanced is that these companies do not have the money to do the necessary reinvestment. How, then, did Chrysler, up to its neck in debt, manage? That company has a complete line of competitive cars and should reap the benefits of its courage and foresight for years to come. Ford and GM have made a lot of money recently—\$13 billion over the past 2 years between them, in fact. What have they done with it all? Well, GM has been buying into the electronics, defense and financial services industries, and Ford has been buying financial institutions and is planning to get into the computer business. Maybe if these companies would concentrate on their own business, they could run their own businesses and make a larger car that gets decent mileage. We don't need Renaissance men in the boardrooms of Ford and GM, we need auto men.

In addition to those arguments, we must consider ones that haven't been raised—concern for the future and environmental protection, for example. Oil is not a renewable, income asset, it is a capital asset. As we deplete it, we need to find ways to replace it, just as businesses set aside depreciation funds to replace their machinery. Reckless overuse of this capital asset without regard for finding replacements will leave future generations immeasurably poorer. By taxing large cars, we are taxing excessive consumption of oil, and those revenues can help us seek the necessary replacements. Also, the concerted zeal with which we are mining the Earth of its fossil fuels is upsetting the ecological balance in some areas. Government should not be encouraging this behavior by allowing it to occur without regard for its true costs.

I believe the choice we face is clear. Will we allow ourselves to be bullied and blackmailed into accepting a hazardous, counterproductive strategy that is driven by an obsession with short-run profits and a lack of concern for other people and for our descendants? Or will we stand firm against this power play and stand by a policy that is right and fair? I believe that we should meet the hardball tactics practiced by Ford head on. If we break down here, there is no telling how far and for how long the fuel economy standards will be reduced.

EXPECTATIONS OF SUMMIT RESULTS MUST BE REALISTIC

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, as they sit at the negotiation table in Geneva this week, President Reagan and Soviet Secretary General Gorbachev are replaying a scene that has occurred from the earliest days of our country. Since the days of George Washington, American Presidents have directed American foreign policy, written to and talked with foreign leaders, received them in Washington, and visited them abroad.

But what can we expect from this week's summit?

Early in his first term, the President made it clear that he would look unfavorably upon a proposed summit unless there existed prospects for success in issues of substance and concern to the United States. Critics argued that agreements and proclamations were not imperative; that simply meeting with Gorbachev would be achievement enough. Then, as the summit approached, those same critics sang another song and placed enormous pressures upon the President to come home with an arms control agreement, resolution of regional conflicts, or substantive advances on the front of human rights.

Expectations have been raised to an unreasonable level. It is naive to think that 9 hours of discussion can solve United States-Soviet disagreements, and that Reagan will be able to solve the enormous differences and problems that exist between the United States and the Soviet Union. Agreements may come out of the summit, but let us not have false hopes. Let us return to the recognition that a degree of success is achieved by the meeting of Reagan and Gorbachev and the reaffirmation that discussion and dialog have a valuable role to play in United States-Soviet relations.

By arguing that we must not have unrealistic expectations regarding the summit, I do not mean to infer that the American people should not continue to assert their political will or communicate their hopes as they relate to our relations with the Soviets. Americans have made it clear that they want arms control. Our allies in NATO have communicated the same desire. But, we must be aware that Gorbachev has no similar constituency to answer to in the Soviet Union. Gorbachev recognizes the political pressure on Reagan, but Gorbachev has the advantage of not having to answer to a free press, an opposition party, or a public that can freely criticize its government. A summit yielding little imposes much less political cost on Gorbachev than it would on an American leader.

We must not lose our resolve to work for peace and security, but we must not fail to be patient in our quest for these ideals. Arms control involves highly technical talks, requiring months and sometimes

years of preparation, negotiation, and patience—certainly not possible in a 2-day summit meeting. We should not assume that useful agreements come only from summits.

Though the stakes are high and the obstacles to success countless, we should all be supportive of President Reagan who has heeded the words of President Eisenhower who once said, "I will go anywhere, at any time, to meet with any government in the cause of peace."

PRAISING THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE WITH RESPECT TO THE TAXATION OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICE PROVIDERS

HON. JOSEPH J. DiGUARDI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. DiGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the House Ways and Means Committee for the judicious decision they reached concerning the taxation of professional service providers. This action was one that was needed by the American public.

Under the proposal sent to the Ways and Means Committee by the administration, professional service providers were to be taxed by the accrual method. Such a change in long standing and well considered Federal tax law would have created havoc in those sectors of the economy affected by the provision. It has always been the Federal Government's position that professional service providers should be taxed by the cash method because that more clearly reflects income. Nothing has changed that should provoke a reconsideration of that position. The contemplated change would have placed an unfair burden on that sector of the economy in an ill-considered effort to raise revenues. I am pleased that the Ways and Means Committee, in its collective wisdom, chose to retain the cash method.

I have worked extensively for 22 years with the Federal Tax Code. No one appreciates more the need for its reform. This change, however, fails the first test that any such change should be subjected to—fairness. If we in Government knowingly subject sectors of the economy to taxes that do not reflect income, are we reforming the Tax Code or just trying to raise funds? I think it is the latter.

In addition, I believe that this would be bad economic policy. The service sector is the fastest growing in our economy; we should not place barriers to its growth in the Tax Code.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to draw attention to the decision by the Ways and Means Committee because I have personally raised this issue with members of the committee and I would be remiss if I did not commend them for their wise decision, and I will oppose any tax reform legislation that does incor-

porate this change that is sent to us from a House-Senate conference.

SOVIET JEWRY AND THE GENEVA SUMMIT

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that many Members of the House have expressed their concern over the continued violation of human rights for Jews and other religious minorities in the Soviet Union, and I know that President Reagan has assured the Congress that he will bring the issue up during his meetings with Soviet Communist Party leader Gorbachev in Geneva. Yesterday, I had an opportunity to briefly comment on the plight of Soviet Jewry at a conference held by the Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland. I include my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN EDWARD F. FEIGHAN BEFORE THE JEWISH COMMUNITY FEDERATION OF CLEVELAND, NOVEMBER 18, 1985

We meet this morning in Cleveland, on the eve of the historic summit in Geneva, to speak for those who cannot speak—the Jews of the Soviet Union. Soviet Jewry represents 15 percent of world Jewry. It is the largest community of Jews in Europe and the third largest community of Jews on our planet. Yet, the Jews of the Soviet Union continue to live under a dark shadow that grows more bleak with each passing year.

Denied their right to maintain and sustain a Jewish cultural and religious identity, Soviet Jews live under the most intense pressure; they are subjugated to widespread officially endorsed anti-Semitic propaganda, including articles and programs that attack individual Jewish activists, denounce the Jewish roots of Zionism, denigrate Jewish history, and ignore the realities of the Holocaust. In the last year, the brutal campaign against teachers of Hebrew has demonstrated the desire of Soviet officials to eradicate Jewish tradition and consciousness from Soviet society.

Many of us know the extent of the brutality exercised against Jewish activists and the teachers of Hebrew. Yakov Levin of Odessa received three years for defaming the Soviet state. Yokov Mesh of Odessa, arrested for refusing to testify at the Levin trial, lies in grave condition as a result of the severity of his beatings. Yosef Berenshtein of Kiev, sentenced to four years for resisting arrest, has lost an eye after beatings in his prison.

These are but a handful of men whose faith and courage call out to us today for support and strength. Hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews have taken the steps required by the bureaucracy to emigrate to the freedom of the West. Yet the Soviet Government would have us believe that all Jews who wanted to leave the Soviet Union have left. Last month in Paris, Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev went so far as to state that Jews in the Soviet Union have more political and social rights than in any other country on earth. The preposterousness of his remarks demanded a reply. Last week, over sixty of my colleagues in the House joined me in signing a letter to Mr.

Gorbachev, clearly stating that his remarks "do nothing to help increase understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States."

This past summer, my wife and I had an opportunity to travel to the Soviet Union for a week. There we met in small kitchens and in crowded rooms with many refusenik families. No one who has had such an experience will easily forget it. These are men and women of enormous courage, and of even greater spirit. While the conditions they face are grim and bleak, they refuse to give up hope. Often denied the right to work, the right to live adequately, and the right to educate their children to the greatest extent possible, the Jewish refuseniks continue to maintain a faith in the possibility of future emigration and the realization of their cultural and religious heritage in the Soviet Union. Surely, we must match and exceed their determination, perseverance and deep faith.

As President Reagan meets with Secretary General Gorbachev in Geneva, we recognize that the question of arms control will be their primary topic. Yet, we also know that the ultimate success of any agreement on arms will depend on the trust and understanding that exists between our two people and our allies. The Soviets must become aware that many in the United States and around the world remain deeply suspicious of their good faith, in part because of their continued brutalization of Jews, Christian activists, political dissidents and others who seek the human rights that the Soviet Union has in the past claimed to support. The Soviet Government has voluntarily signed the United Nation's Charter, the Universal Declaration on the Rights of Man, and the Helsinki Final Act—all of which require that they guarantee the free exercise of religion, the right of travel and the right of swift reunification of families.

Surely, our responsibility must be to continue to tell the Soviet Union that we expect them to live up to the agreements they sign. Surely, we must speak, boldly and consistently, for those who freedoms are abused and denied by the Soviet system. Surely, we must follow every path and walk each road that can someday result in a lessening of the burdens now being borne by the Jews of the Soviet Union.

Here today in Cleveland we are speaking of our concern for those who suffer so far away in the Soviet Union. In Switzerland this week, we urge President Reagan to insist on tangible progress in the area of Soviet human rights and Jewish emigration. We recognize that progress may take many months, and perhaps many years. But we must continue to speak out until the dark shadow that has fallen over Soviet Jewry has receded into the past. We must continue to voice our concern until Soviet Jews have a chance to walk out of the shadow and gather in the light of freedom. We must continue to understand the responsibility that falls on our shoulders as voices for hope for so many who long for religious freedom in the Soviet Union. In the words of the great teacher Hillel, "if not us, who? If not now, when?"

WHEN L.I.E. REALLY MEANS L.I. EXPORTWAY

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, the subject of trade is one of growing importance to all Americans. As our deficits continue to increase, both the Government and business must do everything possible to expand exports.

Exports have been and continue to be important for the economy of Long Island. They mean significant jobs for the people within my congressional district and the people of the Nassau-Suffolk region. The importance of exports to the Long Island community has been captured in a recent New York Times piece by Robert R. McMillan, one of my constituents. I believe that the Members of this body will benefit from Mr. McMillan's views which follow:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 3, 1985]

WHEN "L.I.E." REALLY MEANS "L.I. EXPORTWAY"

(By Robert R. McMillan)

While there may be a loss of jobs in some areas of the country because of increased imports and the strength of the dollar overseas, that trend has not affected Long Island. The main reason is that Long Island exports are on the increase.

The latest figures show there are over 23,000 export-related manufacturing jobs in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. Translated into sales, exports of manufactured goods from Long Island are running in excess of \$2.2 billion each year. These sales are represented by direct export sales as well as the sales of manufactured goods to other businesses in the United States that incorporate Long Island products into their own exports.

In addition, it is estimated that another 26,000 jobs exist on Long Island to support the sales of export-related manufacturers. These jobs are in transportation, communications and various support services.

Stated another way, Long Island has more export-related manufacturing jobs than 20 states, with over 13 percent of all manufacturing employment on the Island producing goods for export.

There is a tremendous potential for even greater export growth on Long Island. We are in a natural exporting position. Our proximity to both Kennedy International Airport and the Port of New York gives us advantages over most other areas of the country. The Long Island Expressway is, in reality, for jobs on Long Island, the "Long Island Exportway."

We all realize that the electronic equipment industry is one of the most competitive of our country's export businesses. American technology leads the world in electronics. Long Island's electronic industry is one of the centers of our nation's leadership. The electronic equipment industry on the Island alone exports over \$1 billion in goods each year.

While our exports have generally increased over the last several years, there is no reason we cannot reach \$4 billion in exports by 1990. The technical labor force is at hand. The geography is right.

But Long Island businesses should take a harder look at the potential for overseas trade and what it will mean to continued full employment on the Island. One excellent source of information about exports resides at the Long Island Association, with headquarters in Commack. The United States Department of Commerce has a representative in that office who can provide significant information. While the Commerce Department representative encourages visits to his office, he still makes "house calls" to Long Island businesses on request.

The Department of Commerce has overseas market research data. They can be helpful in identifying prospective customers for Long Island-produced goods. The department can also identify agents who might be interested in representing the sales of goods produced on Long Island.

Another important area of advice relates to trade shows and exhibits overseas. Full information and suggestions on how to participate in these shows is available. Finally, the Department of Commerce, through its publication Commerce News U.S.A., will even advertise new products to potential overseas customers.

After identifying which Long Island products are desired overseas, the next question is how to ship them. Most ocean or air freight forwarders are more than willing to participate by providing information on shipping costs. As a result, it is not necessary for a company just beginning to export to actually set up a costly export department. Freight forwarders can be an extension of your own company by handling the intricacies of the paperwork required to ship products overseas.

Export-related jobs on Long Island are certainly one of the reasons Long Island has a relatively low unemployment rate. With the new emphasis by the Reagan Administration and the Congress on developing fairer trade, I believe even greater opportunities for export business will develop.

REMEMBERING JOHN LEE LAIR

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the real pioneers in country and western music died last week.

John Lee Lair is not a name that many country fans of today may know. But this Kentucky farm boy helped lay the foundation for the growth and popularity of the music which millions of Americans enjoy today.

In my district, John is best known as the founder and organizer of the Renfro Valley Barn Dance. From the late 1930's through the 1950's, the barn dance was broadcast daily from Renfro Valley, helping establish many of the early stars of country music, and putting this small community permanently on the map.

Such country and western stars as Red Foley, Lily May Ledford Pennington and Homer & Jethro began their careers through the Renfro Valley Barn Dance, which lives on today with weekly shows from March through November.

But John Lee Lair also contributed much to Rockcastle County and to the Renfro Valley area. A large tourist industry has developed around the barns where the dances were held, and the area is a frequent stopping-point for tourists along Interstate 75.

John's family has indicated that the Renfro Valley Barn Dance will live on, despite John Lee Lair's passing. And Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better lasting tribute to this giant in the country music field than for that to take place.

I ask my colleagues to join me in sending condolences to John's family, and in honoring John Lee Lair for his many contributions to Kentucky, to his community, and to country music.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST IN MIA/POW ISSUE

HON. DOUGLAS APPEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. APPEGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter that I initiated and which 82 fellow Members of the House of Representatives signed asking that President Reagan bring up at the summit meeting in Geneva the matter of missing American servicemen and civilians following the war in Southeast Asia.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Members of the House who supported me in my efforts to keep this issue at the forefront of public discussion as we continue to work toward a resolution of the many unanswered questions that the families and relatives of our missing Americans continue to have after many years.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my thanks to my colleagues—Representatives JIM LIGHTFOOT and JOHN EDWARD PORTER—who indicated their willingness to sign this letter but who were prevented from doing so due to the time deadline for sending the letter to the White House by last Friday morning. Following is the text of the letter to the President and the names of those Members who cosigned:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, November 15, 1985.

HON. RONALD REAGAN,
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned Members of the United States Congress, are calling upon you to bring up the matter of American servicemen and civilians who remain missing-in-action in Southeast Asia during your discussions with Secretary General Gorbachev next week in Geneva.

While we realize that there are many important issues that need to be covered during the summit meeting in Geneva, we feel that the considerable influence that the Soviet Union has with the government in Vietnam should be utilized in bringing forth the fullest possible accounting of our nearly 2,500 missing-in-action who remain throughout Indochina. While this is not the only course of action that can and should be pur-

sued, it is, nonetheless, an important step in the right direction.

Mr. President, each of us realize the considerable interest and devotion that you and your administration have given to the matter of our American M.I.A.s/P.O.W.s who remain unaccounted for following the war in Southeast Asia. In view of the considerable influence that the Soviet Union has with the Government in Vietnam, we feel that the opportunity to present this issue during your talks with Mr. Gorbachev will do much to bring about answers for the families of our missing Americans—if the government in Hanoi is forced by the Soviet Union to assist us, with diligence, in this matter.

Mr. President, not only do we as a nation owe the families of our missing Americans a full accounting and explanation, but we also owe to the memories of these individuals, whether alive or not, the honor and respect that they fully deserve. We sincerely request that you remember our missing Americans during the course of your talks next week with Secretary General Gorbachev.

Sincerely,

Douglas Applegate, Bob Edgar, Robin Tallon, George Gekas, George (Buddy) Darden, Hank Brown, Ike Skelton, Joe Barton, Bob Traxler, Virginia Smith, Carl C. Perkins, Dave Martin, Pat Schroeder, Guy V. Molinari, Chris Smith, Tom Daschle, Mario Biaggi, Marilyn Lloyd, Sam Gejdenson, Mary Rose Oakar, Mike Synar, John G. Rowland, Robert A. Roe, Ben Gilman, Connie Mack, Lindy Boggs, Ken Gray, Daniel K. Akaka, Tony Coelho, Norman Y. Mineta, Julian C. Dixon, Estaban E. Torres, Don Pease, Robert T. Matsui, Dale E. Kildee, Bill Chappell, Richard Shelby, William J. Coyne, Lane Evans, Marcy Kaptur, Daniel Mica, Steny Hoyer, Jim Weaver, Alan Mollohan, Harold L. Volkmer, Lee Hamilton, John P. Murtha, Brian Donnelly, Paul E. Kanjorski, Bernard J. Dwyer, Henry Gonzalez, James L. Oberstar, Timothy J. Penny, Robert C. Smith, James Saxton, Bruce A. Morrison, Earl Hutto, Bill Richardson, Bill Hughes, Nick Rahall, Bob McEwen, Mo Udall, Gus Yatron, Herbert H. Bateman, Tom Luken, Chester Atkins, Eldon Rudd, Norman Lent, John R. Kasich, Bill Young, Ken Kramer, Henry J. Nowak, Raymond McGrath, Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Bill Hendon, Tony P. Hall, Austin J. Murphy, Matt Rinaldo, Charles Wilson, Duncan Hunter, Barbara Boxer, Sander Levin, Frank McCloskey, Jim Slattery.

PROBLEMS IN DEFENSE PROCUREMENT

HON. DENNY SMITH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert for the RECORD a statement that my fellow cochairman of the military reform caucus, Congressman Mel Levine, gave before the President's Blue Ribbon Commission in Defense Management.

I believe my colleagues will find that his statement is a good analysis of the problems in defense procurement:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN MEL LEVINE, (D-CA) BEFORE THE PRESIDENT'S BLUE RIBBON COMMISSION ON DEFENSE MANAGEMENT, NOVEMBER 13, 1985

Chairman Packard and members of the President's Blue Ribbon Commission on Defense Management, I commend you for convening this session on Capitol Hill, and I thank you for giving me the opportunity to share with you my views on an important but difficult subject.

President Reagan, at the White House press conference announcing the formation of the Commission, said that few things are more important to him than the work that this Commission will do. His words are instructive:

"Waste and fraud by corporate contractors are more than a rip-off of the taxpayer—they're a blow to the security of our Nation. And this the American people cannot and should not tolerate."

Mr. Chairman, I share completely President Reagan's view of the significance of the task your Commission has undertaken. I especially share his concern over the seriousness of the abuses in defense contracting. In fact, he makes a point too often overlooked in discussions of Pentagon procurement practices: The harmful effect that these abuses have on our national security.

During my 3 years in Congress, I have witnessed a troublesome transformation in the perceptions of my constituents. Initially, they were most concerned about the threat posed to our national security by the Soviet Union. This concern has now been replaced by what they perceive as an even greater threat to our national security—waste and inefficiency at the Pentagon.

I find this particularly disturbing. After all, our strength as a nation lies not only in the numbers of planes, ships, and tanks in the American arsenal but, more importantly, in the domestic support for decisions made by our military and civilian leadership which affect national security.

Unfortunately, as public awareness of waste and fraud in the military procurement system has increased, support for the military and for defense spending has plummeted. The public consensus which supported substantial increases in defense spending over the last 5 years has evaporated. It has done so as spare parts horror stories, reports of weapons that do not work properly, staggering cost overruns, and admissions by some of the largest defense contractors of illegal practices have appeared almost daily in the press. The seeming lack of concern by some Pentagon policymakers about these problems has further eroded public support for the military.

In this context, I see the goals of this Commission as twofold: First, to develop a series of proposals to deal with the problems which plague our defense procurement system; and, second, to help restore the public's confidence in the integrity of the procurement system and of the defense industry.

At a time when the budget deficit is of increasing concern to most Americans, and additional cuts in important domestic programs are being threatened, it is not surprising that the American people wonder how we can spend so much money on defense and receive what too many people perceive as questionable value in return.

Both the Grace Commission and former OMB Director David Stockman have esti-

mated that \$30 billion could be pared from the Defense budget without harming the effectiveness of the military. As Congress prepares to pass the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings amendment, which very well may result in significant reductions in the Defense budget, the need to find and eliminate that spending which is wasteful takes on even greater importance.

I have a personal perspective on this. My State receives more defense dollars than any other. I represent a district which is home to many large and small defense contractors. In fact, it has more than 60,000 defense workers—the second highest number in California, and one of the largest concentrations in this country.

Earlier this year I conducted a survey of my constituents on this subject. It showed that 92 percent viewed wasteful defense spending as a serious problem. In the same survey, 70 percent of the respondents supported freezing or reducing defense spending, with nearly 50 percent supporting an absolute reduction in defense spending.

If any congressional district should be strongly sympathetic to the defense industry it is mine. The fact that this sympathy has waned considerably in recent months is in my view quite significant.

Clearly, to win back the trust and support of the American people, it is vital to make fundamental reforms in the procurement system.

When I first came to Washington, I became involved in military issues primarily because of the importance of national security issues to my district and to our Nation. I, perhaps naively, expected that my interest in these issues would be positively received and welcomed.

But as I began to try and work with the Pentagon, I frankly ran into a stone wall of indifference and opposition. Routine requests for information were either ignored or responded to in an incomplete fashion. What little information I was given raised more questions than it answered. It was in an effort to represent more effectively the interests of my constituents that I became much more active in the reform caucus.

I have devoted a significant amount of my time to the caucus. It has provided me the opportunity to work with Democrats and Republicans whose unifying concern is to maintain and improve our military strength by making the military as efficient as possible, focusing in part upon improving the way weapons are bought as well as upon their cost-effectiveness and reliability.

During my years of involvement with the caucus, its members have championed legislation to establish an independent Office of Testing and Evaluation (OTE), require warranties for new weapons, require competition in the development and production of new weapons, close the revolving door between the Defense Department and defense contractors, and require contractors to make information available on the efficiency of their operations—"should cost."

We believe that the combined effect of these amendments would help ensure a more efficient military and thereby enhance our national security.

All of these reforms have overwhelmingly passed Congress. Yet they have met with little enthusiasm at the Pentagon. In most cases DOD has actively worked to defeat or overturn them.

For example, the President delayed nominating a Director of OTE for over a year. Although both the Director and the Office are too new to make any final judgments,

the recent experience with the Divad anti-aircraft gun is encouraging evidence of the need, the potential, and the ability for the Office. It is also telling testimony to the need to greatly expand the use of operational testing before we buy a weapon.

Similarly, although the warranty law was initially met with great resistance by officials in the Pentagon, I am in general very pleased with its implementation. To my knowledge, only one waiver has been requested, and the law seems to be working as it was intended.

Since the remaining three reforms have not yet gone into effect, it is much too early to draw any conclusions about their effectiveness or the way in which they will be implemented by the Department of Defense.

Nevertheless, as the author of the amendment requiring increased competition, I have been very pleased to read of the increased interest on the part of the armed services in expanding the number of weapons procured competitively. I was particularly pleased to read the recent comments of the Secretary of the Navy which indicated that he plans to make competition the rule, rather than the exception, for his service.

The strength of our economy, and our free enterprise system, testifies to the significant benefits of the competitive marketplace. Competition has resulted in technological innovation and price competition in every sector of the consumer and civilian economy.

Increased competition in weapons procurement will also result in a number of benefits:

It will provide weapons manufacturers with incentives to hold down costs;

It will expand and maintain our industrial base;

It will provide the Secretary of Defense with increased options in awarding contracts;

It will improve the quality of weapons we are buying;

And, perhaps most importantly, it will improve the procurement process with a minimum of regulation and congressional involvement.

This last point is one which is extremely important. I have never believed that it should be Congress' place to micromanage the Pentagon budget. If the military reform movement is successful, it will facilitate a process whereby those at the Pentagon can do their job with a minimum of congressional interference. I would be the first to stipulate that micromanagement by Congress has added to the problems at the Pentagon.

The Defense budget has been seen by some Members as the ultimate jobs bill, and some have not been willing to implement cuts which would affect their districts. In addition, as a result of ever-shifting attitudes in Congress over "how much is enough," we stretch out programs or we refuse to make multiyear commitments for production of weapons where it would be appropriate.

But when evident problems exist in an area as vital to us all as national security, it would be unrealistic and inappropriate to assume that Congress should look the other way.

I view Congress' role with the Defense Department as similar to that of a board of directors. We should feel confident that the managers at DOD will make the correct decisions, just as the board of directors at any company delegates the day-to-day decisions

of running that company to its salaried employees.

Yet, just as a member of a board of directors is responsible to a corporation's shareholders, I am responsible to my constituents. Until both my constituents and I are satisfied that the system works at the Pentagon, I feel compelled to be much more actively involved than I would prefer.

Mr. Chairman, what we are talking about perhaps more than anything else is attitude, or will, within the Pentagon. It is intangible, but essential.

Our caucus should be understood as a bipartisan effort to work cooperative with the Pentagon to seek the reforms we have outlined and which will help make our defenses more efficient and cost-effective. These initiatives, Mr. Chairman, should be welcomed at the Pentagon, not resisted.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps most importantly, is the treatment of those inside the Pentagon who are responsible for procurement reform. One need only look at the cases of Col. Jim Burton or George Spanton to see how the Pentagon has mistreated those who try and do their jobs too well.

I know neither of these men personally. But many of us are familiar with their reputations as effective, dedicated professionals.

Twice I and other Members have been forced to intervene on Colonel Burton's behalf to ensure that he will be able to complete the important tests he has begun on the Bradley fighting vehicle. George Spanton has yet to receive the thanks he deserves from the Pentagon for his important work.

Rather than make these men outcasts, the Pentagon should hold them up as examples of men who do a job well. Colonel Burton should play a major role in the office of the Director of OTE. George Spanton should teach a class for program managers on how to find and deal with unauthorized expenditures.

Instead Colonel Burton is told to go to the American equivalent of Siberia or else to get out of the military, and efforts are made to remove illegally George Spanton from his position. It is tragedy that we waste human resources like Burton and Spanton and do not use them to their fullest potential.

If some might argue with this perception, let me assure you that it is the perception of citizens at the grassroots. My constituents do not understand why the Pentagon has not more aggressively demanded greater competition, lower prices, and the finest workmanship. The Pentagon's penalizing of cost-cutters and whistleblowers strongly reinforces the view that DOD has no interest in ending waste and abuse.

Neither I nor the military reform caucus claim to have all the answers. However, we do believe that the waste and abuse found in the Pentagon's procurement practices must and can be eliminated. Unfortunately, we also believe that the prevailing attitude at the Pentagon has too often been resistance, rather than assistance, in dealing with this problem. We see our reforms as legitimate responses to a situation that has clearly gotten out of control. We are aware of the possibility of the overcorrection as a result of past abuses, but in these instances we agree with the Washington Post, which stated on October 31 with regard to these reforms, "They deserve to be tried."

Thank you for your time, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. I look forward to your recommendations and hope

that the caucus can be of some assistance in your efforts to tackle the vexing issue of military reform.

MARY McLEOD BETHUNE—CARRYING ON THE GOOD WORK

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, in the November 18 issue of the Washington Post appears a column by Dorothy Gilliam detailing the life and accomplishments of Mary McLeod Bethune. While this article speaks with eloquence of her many political accomplishments, I would like to embellish a bit on her efforts in the field of education.

Bethune-Cookman College, which Mrs. Bethune founded in Daytona Beach, is located in my district and has for many years admirably served the needs of an ever-increasing and aware student body. As a testament to her belief in education, Mrs. Bethune wrote the following in her now famous and often quoted last will and testament:

I leave you a thirst for education. Knowledge is the prime need of the hour. We are making greater use of the privileges inherent in living in a Democracy. If we continue in this trend, we will be able to rear increasing numbers of strong, purposeful men and women, equipped with vision, mental clarity, health and education.

It is in this spirit that I have sponsored H.R. 1715, a bill to honor this fine American through the establishment of the Mary McLeod Bethune Memorial Fine Arts Center at Bethune-Cookman College.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Dorothy Gilliam column be printed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to read it and consider joining the 62 Members already cosponsoring H.R. 1715.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 18, 1985]

CARRYING ON THE GOOD WORK

(By Dorothy Gilliam)

A half-century ago, when Mary McLeod Bethune came up with the idea of organizing all of the nation's black women's organizations under one umbrella as a way to gain power to deal with their economic and political problems, it was a stroke of sheer genius.

Bethune was a former South Carolina cotton picker who founded a school on a garbage dump. The school grew into a college and Bethune advised United States Presidents. Powerful and charismatic, she was also shrewd and practical.

Bethune knew that unifying independent organizations under a single umbrella would be a tough job.

But she pressed ahead and founded the National Council of Negro Women. During 14 years as president, she made the council a major advocate for black women.

Last week in Washington, the council celebrated its 50th anniversary. On that occasion, Dorothy I. Height, the woman who moved the organization closer to realizing Bethune's dream, began her 29th year as its head.

Says historian Bettye Collier-Thomas: "Dorothy Height implemented [Bethune's]

concept . . . vastly expanding the organization's administrative and fiscal base and developing an extensive and impressive array of programs."

With 30 organizations beneath its umbrella and claiming an outreach to 4 million members, the council has developed major programs throughout the United States and in Africa, focusing on youth, employment, civil rights and development.

Besides establishing a black women's archives, the organization spearheaded erection of a Bethune statue here in Lincoln Park, the first memorial to a black American in the nation's capital.

Whereas Bethune's tenure was during the depths of the Depression, Height's leadership encompassed the civil rights movement and its aftermath when issues of social justice pointed a clear direction for an energetic warrior.

Moreover, the council's current focus on such problems as teen-age pregnancy is a realistic recognition that blacks must battle internal forces that threaten their progress.

Further, most black women's groups belong to the council and carry out their own impressive national programs as well.

Just last week, for example, The Links Inc., a 39-year-old black women's public service organization, opened a new national headquarters building at 1200 Massachusetts Ave. NW.

In addition, the group recently made a \$1 million gift to the United Negro College Fund.

According to Links President Dolly D. Adams, these achievements are steps in fulfilling a broader mission of providing support services for numerous local and national programs.

The progress of The Links is also an important development for the council concept, for the success of Bethune's idea depends on member groups' maintaining their individual power and integrity even as they work together.

But the question people are asking today is, how successfully has Bethune's original idea of an "organization of organizations"—wielding real power and affecting economic, political and social change—been implemented?

The answer is that while the council has achieved many of its original aims and racked up impressive achievements against the odds, in a larger sense the challenge of achieving real power remains.

Building on faith, dreams and determination, women such as Bethune and Height have made significant contributions to black women and the nation.

Today's black women face such enormous problems as the devastating gap between the haves and have-nots and the feminization of poverty.

So another question being raised is, how will the next generation advance black women's progress after the era of the 73-year-old Height ends?

Many younger women attended last week's anniversary celebrations. Some have taken their places in the organization's higher echelons of leadership, but there are far too few.

If Bethune's dream of power for black women through unity is to continue to live, this organization must move with more vigor to attract this generation's young women.

ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, while I was in our north Miami Beach office I had an opportunity to talk once again with my constituent, Mr. Jacob Slove, about Alzheimer's disease. Mr. Slove has shown a long-term commitment toward increasing public understanding and awareness about this disease.

Mr. Slove has devoted countless hours and energy to researching this issue and has been instrumental in briefing me on the status of the current research and the need for congressional action.

I wanted to share some of his findings, which are the basis for this Community Reporter article, with my colleagues. The article follows:

TREATING TRAGEDY WITH COMPASSION: THE NEED FOR A FEDERAL RESPONSE TO ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE

The frustrated man, husband of a victim of Alzheimer's disease, voiced the concerns of thousands of people all over the country in recent testimony before the House Select Committee on Aging. "I find it strange that if my wife had a disease from which she could recover, or was ill with something like cancer . . . she could be helped financially," he said. "But, we are told that with this disease there is nothing. Unfortunately, in most cases this is all too true.

Alzheimer's disease is a progressive, degenerative brain disease has been barely discussed outside of medical circles until recently. However, it is an extremely serious problem in our country—the fourth leading cause of death along the elderly—and it merits our close attention and prompt action. Alzheimer's has no known cause, and it strikes every ethnic and socio-economic group. Symptoms include a decline in memory, learning, attention and judgement; disorientation in time and space; word-finding and communication problems; and changes in personality. It cuts the life expectancies of its victims in half, devastates their families financially and emotionally, and accounts for more than half the admissions to nursing homes in this country. There is no cure. In the words of a leading researcher, "All diseases are depersonalizing to some extent. But you are still human. You can still respond to pain, anger and hunger." Alzheimer's steals its victims' humanity. It robs them of their ability to think."

The cost of caring for Alzheimer's victims is estimated at \$17,000 to \$50,000 a year. The vast majority of that cost is borne by family members. Public and private resources available to assist individuals afflicted with other diseases are not available to Alzheimer's patients and their families. Federal coverage under Medicare is minimal. Only Medicaid, of all public programs, provides significant assistance, but only in cases in which the family is impoverished and nursing home beds are available.

I have cosponsored legislation to attack these problems on several fronts:

H.R. 67 would set up demonstration projects to determine the feasibility of providing for alternative benefits under Medicare for individuals diagnosed as suffering

from Alzheimer's disease, similar to the manner in which hospice care was made available under Medicare;

H.R. 66 would establish a national network of support groups for the victims of Alzheimer's disease and their families to provide the educational, emotional and practical support that is often needed in such cases;

H.R. 524 would establish 20 regional centers for the treatment of Alzheimer's disease and related disorders, including diagnosis, evaluation and counseling of patients and family as well as teaching and training professionals in this area; and

H.R. 2280 which would, among other things, expand research into the causes and treatment of the disease.

November has been designated National Alzheimer's Disease Month in an effort to increase public awareness of this tragic disease. It is my hope that Congress will face this problem head-on in the coming months. Despite the budget crunch, compassion is still an essential part of good government.

IN PRAISE OF VERNE ORR

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to highly commend for a "job well done" and wish only the best to U.S. Air Force Secretary, the Honorable Verne Orr, who is retiring at the end of this month.

Secretary Orr, or just simply "Verne" to his friends, has done a fantastic job in overseeing a U.S. Air Force that not only has been changing with the times, but that has in fact been on the forefront of promoting and incorporating such changes. The dramatic and important technological progress within our Armed Forces, especially the Air Force, can largely be attributed to Verne's personal attention and his keen interest and insight into the best way to insure the Air Force remains a superior fighting force throughout the remainder of the 1980's and beyond.

Secretary Orr has performed a great service to this mighty Nation: he has dedicated his time and experience to the security and protection of America and our ideals of peace and freedom. He truly deserves our highest respects for his invaluable and tireless efforts on behalf of each and every American. It can surely be said that without Verne Orr, America would not be as safe and as secure as we are today.

Mr. Speaker, some Americans take their many freedoms for granted; they have come to expect that these cherished gifts will be there for them without stopping to think of how it is that such gifts are maintained and nurtured. We remain a free people, dedicated to removing the bonds that have at times throughout history been used to enslave the human spirit, not because God selected us to be "the chosen few," but instead because we fought for our freedom and every day struggle to preserve it. It is the fine work of the men and women of the U.S. armed services, led by

great Americans like Verne Orr, which allows the rest of us to enjoy these wondrous freedoms.

Americans will never forget the contribution to peace and freedom made by Verne Orr. He has been a tireless and dedicated servant of the people in his leadership and direction of the U.S. Air Force. We will all miss Verne Orr.

Thank you for your service, Verne. Thank you for your leadership and your dedication. Thank you for your insightful knowledge of America's defense and the ways to improve it. Hats off to you!

THE 10 PILLARS OF SOUND MONEY AND CREDIT—PART 2

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, November 13, I commenced a discourse on sound money, as postulated by Prof. Antal Fekete of Memorial University, Saint John's, Newfoundland. He offered a first installment by summarizing the first 5 of the 10 pillars of sound money and credit. Herewith, then, are the remainder:

THE 10 PILLARS OF SOUND MONEY AND CREDIT (PART 2)

(By Antal E. Fekete)

"The Third Pillar of Economic Wisdom: The only valuable money that the government has to spend is that money taxed or borrowed out of the earnings of the people. When the government decides to spend more than it has thus received, that extra unearned money is created out of thin air, through the banking system and, when spent, takes on value only by reducing the value of all money, savings, and insurance." (How We Live, by Fred G. Clark & Richard S. Rimanozy.)

We have stated the ten pillars of sound money and credit as follows:

1. The principle of the gold standard.
2. The principle of free coinage.
3. The principle of redeemability.
4. The principle of monetary policy.
5. The principle of fiscal policy.
6. The principle of no privileges without responsibilities.
7. The principle of liquidity.
8. The principle of matching maturities.
9. The principle of marginal productivity of debt.
10. The principle of marginal productivity of labor and capital.

The first five principles concern money and the government. In paraphrasing them we have seen that it is not proper for the government to use its powers to create money for itself. A government is expected to obtain currency for its functions by taxation or by borrowing from its own or other people. If the government, to meet its expenses, resorts to an expansion of paper money and deposits, as is the case in the United States today, instead of using its appropriate powers of taxing and borrowing from the savings of the people, then an undesirable state of affairs arises. The new currency, into which government debt has been converted by the Federal Reserve

System, bears no proper relation to the production and exchange of goods and services in the country. The credit does not arise out of actual or anticipated production invited by consumer demand, which will liquidate it at the time of the ultimate sale of goods to the cash-paying consumer. Instead, it reflects actual or anticipated expenditures by the government in excess of receipts derived by a transfer of currency by the people to their government in response to its taxation and borrowing of savings. Currency created in this manner constitutes a new and additional demand for goods and services. This demand arises from sources other than the production of goods and services and, therefore, it is not matched by a supply of goods and services in existence. As a result, prices tend to differ from what would otherwise be their proper barter relationships. They tend to rise. Proper economic relationships are disturbed by this outside and arbitrary force. The purchasing power of the people's currency tends to decline. The value of the savings of the people tends to be impaired. By the use of such power, a government can command the wealth of a people and easily become their master. The authority to manufacture such purchasing power can become unlimited, as it has in the United States since the gold reserve requirements for the Federal Reserve notes were abolished by the Congress in 1968; and in the exercise of such authority lies the power of a government to ruin a people.

We shall now turn to the last five principles which concern credit and the banking system. In paraphrasing these principles we must remember that our present regime of irredeemable currency gives special privileges to the banking system in that the Federal Reserve banks are allowed to issue bills of credit without assuming the corresponding responsibility of meeting the obligation upon maturity. To condone such a flagrant violation of the principles of equity, natural justice, and good government, is to invite trouble.

6. Principle of no privileges without responsibilities. Banks should enjoy no exemption from the provisions of contract law which allow the creditors to sue for liquidation in case of breach of contract. Banks earn their way in the world by substituting their own credit, which is well-known and well-respected, for the credit of their customers which is less well-known or respected. The acid test of the quality of bank credit is that the bank pays its liabilities at maturity without fail. If a bank cannot meet this test, it should be allowed to fail and be liquidated. Protection of poorly managed banks by the use of public resources is indefensible.

7. Principle of liquidity. The sight liabilities of the commercial banks, called deposits, must be balanced by self-liquidating assets of the highest possible quality. The only type of earning asset that qualifies as self-liquidating is the commercial bill, drawn on actual goods on the way from the producer to the market, goods which are going to be sold to the cash-paying consumer in 90 days or less. Bonds, mortgages, stocks, treasury bills, or commercial bills drawn on goods stored up for speculation, have no proper place in the asset portfolio of a commercial bank.

8. Principle of matching maturities. This principle could also be called the prohibition against borrowing short while lending long. It applies to investment banks and savings and loan associations whose liabilities must be matched, dollar for dollar, by assets

maturing no later than the maturity date of the corresponding liability.

9. Principle of marginal productivity of debt. The total debt in the country is not there for its own sake, but must be subordinate to the growth of wealth. The total debt promotes the total welfare only if it materially contributes to the growth of the national income. If ever greater increases of the debt result in ever smaller increases of the national income or, worse yet, they result in a net decrease, as they do today in the United States, then the new debt has no economic justification. It should not have been incurred. The danger signal should be sent out, to make the public aware of a potentially dangerous situation. Voluntary debt liquidation should be encouraged.

10. Principle of marginal productivity of labor and capital. The labor force and the capital part of a country has a certain rate of productivity. If the rate of interest exceeds that rate, as it does today in the United States, then unemployment will inevitably result. Conversely, if the rate of interest stays below that rate, then the country is utilizing its marginal labor and capital resources, and general prosperity is prevalent.

It is not true, as Marxians and Keynesians maintain, that "unemployment is a congenital disease of mature capitalism". If money and credit is sound, then the rate of interest is low, and unemployment or idle capital resources are nonexistent. The main cause of unemployment today is the exorbitant rate of interest, exceeding by far the rate of productivity of labor and capital, and forcing labor to compete with the "productivity" of government bonds. The capitalist is buying government bonds, thereby avoiding the risks inherent in owning capital goods, and the agony inherent in hiring labor. But as soon as money and credit is made sound once again, interest rates will fall below the productivity of labor and capital in the country with a corresponding rise in bond prices. The capitalist is then tempted to take profits by selling his government bonds, and to invest his resources in productive enterprise instead. Job creation through government spending, financed by the sale of government securities to the Federal Reserve banks, is an illusion; an illusion no less dangerous than the belief of medieval doctors in the curative powers of bloodletting.

EXPORT OF ALASKAN OIL MAKES NO SENSE

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend the following article to my colleagues in the House. Exporting Alaskan oil makes no sense today, just as it has made no sense for the past 10 years. In the Export Administration Act, recently reauthorized by Congress, we affirmed our staunch commitment to the domestic use of Alaskan oil—protecting American economic and national security interests. The most recent administration proposal to export up to 6,000 barrels a day of Cook Inlet oil from Alaska is a clear attempt to circumvent the demonstrated will of Congress. Furthermore, it is sheer fallacy and wishful

thinking to suggest that exporting this oil will improve the U.S. balance-of-trade. Any oil we export will be matched by the importation of a equal quantity of foreign oil at the same, or higher prices. In addition, any positive impact that oil exports could have vis-a-vis our trade balance with Japan is nothing more than a dangerous smoke screen that masks the fundamental problems underlying our trade inequities with Japan. Such an illusion of progress could actually undermine our efforts to reduce Japanese barriers to American manufactured and agricultural goods. The Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, will be holding a hearing on the proposed export tomorrow, and I urge my colleagues to join me in a reaffirmation of congressional interest and concern.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Oct. 30, 1985]

NOT WORTH THE TROUBLE

For years many economists and politicians have looked north when searching for a solution to the giant U.S. trade deficit with Japan. Alaskan oil, they say is the key to reducing this deficit, which may reach \$50 billion in 1985.

However, Monday, President Reagan gave the go-ahead for the State of Alaska to begin selling its royalty oil from Cook Inlet to Japan. But this oil comes to only 6,000 barrels a day; a drop in the bucket when you consider the Japanese import 3.7 million barrels a day.

If U.S. oil sales to the Japanese are going to make a dent on the deficit, proponents of exporting the oil say much more is needed—what is needed, they say, is exports from the vast holdings of the North Slope. This is a trickier proposition because the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Act of 1973 prevents such a sale. The law was written at the time of the Arab oil embargo when supply was tight, but the oil market is flooded and those in favor of export sales say "with the Japanese looking to diversify their source of oil supply why not sell?"

At the suggestion of Rep. Don Young, R-Alaska, House minority leader Robert Michel, R-Ill., has now included a provision in his trade package that would eliminate these barriers and legalize the exportation of North Slope oil. But before this bill goes into committee and before it can be brought to the floor for a vote, a number of serious questions must be answered.

First, how much would the sale of North Slope oil to Japan really reduce the trade deficit? Currently, about 1.8 million barrels a day are being extracted from the North Slope. About half of this is shipped from Valdez to the West Coast, where it is refined. The other half is shipped through either the Panama Canal or the trans-Panama pipeline and brought to the Gulf Coast for refining.

Of these 1.8 million barrels a day, about 800,000 would be exported, congressional sources say. Japanese officials refuse to speculate on how much of this total they would import but industry analysts put the maximum figure at about 200,000 to 300,000 barrels a day. Oil sales of this magnitude would reduce the Japan-U.S. trade deficit by \$2 billion to \$3 billion a year, which looks pretty small next to a \$50 billion deficit.

Sure, every little bit helps, but in this case the United States would need to import oil to replace the oil exported to Japan. This

may not be such a bad idea if we were to buy from say, Mexico. Low transportation costs make Mexican oil attractive and anything that boosts the Mexican economy is a good idea. But the Mexicans are wisely trying to diversify their markets and may be reluctant to make such a large increase in exports to the United States. Another option is OPEC, but OPEC is responsible for the trans-Alaska Pipeline Act in the first place and any further reliance on the cartel is risky at best.

Further export of North Slope oil would not attack the real reasons behind the U.S. trade deficit (which reached \$123 billion in 1984), the overvalued dollar, high labor costs, questionable management strategy, lagging productivity in basic industries, and some questionable practices by Japan.

The export of North Slope oil would, however, result in a loss of business for the U.S. maritime industry. Under the Jones Act, 100 percent of all cargo shipped between domestic U.S. ports must move on U.S.-flag carriers. Revenue from Alaskan oil cargo has been a boon to struggling U.S. shipping interests and has meant thousands of jobs for U.S. seamen.

If the oil were exported to Japan, at least some—and maybe most—of these jobs would be lost. Officials say Japanese oil companies would use U.S. bottoms to move the oil if the price were competitive. But due to higher safety standards and higher labor costs—among other things—U.S.-flag carriers are not price competitive with foreign carriers.

According to Rep. Young's office, the House Republicans' bill would include a rider stipulating that at least some of the oil would have to move on U.S. carriers. In addition, the bill says that for the privilege of buying U.S. oil the Japanese must make "substantial concessions regarding imports of agriculture products, wood products (and) processed petroleum products." Needless to say, the Japanese believe these issues should be addressed separately.

So we have legislation that: would not reduce the total U.S. trade deficit; that would hurt the U.S. maritime industry; that U.S. oil companies say would have only marginal impact on profits; that may antagonize Japan and/or Panama and that might make the United States even more dependent on OPEC oil.

Sounds like more trouble than it's worth.

EVERY DAY IS THANKSGIVING FOR DADDY BRUCE

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues a People Magazine profile on Denver's most famous, most beloved philanthropist, Daddy Bruce.

Every Thanksgiving, Daddy Bruce puts on a turkey dinner for tens of thousands of needy Denverites. "It makes me feel good to help somebody," is Daddy Bruce's motto. DENVER GIVES THANKS FOR DADDY BRUCE, WHO HANDS OUT 50,000 FREE DINNERS ON TURKEY DAY

It's a day seemingly like most days at Daddy Bruce's Bar-B-Q, a ramshackle restaurant plunked down in one of Denver's shabbier neighborhoods. The ribs are smok-

ing in the four-foot pit and the lunchtime crowd is pouring in, led through a succession of rooms by the husky smell of the house barbecue sauce. But today is different at Daddy Bruce's, a little hectic, and as Thanksgiving approaches each day promises to be more so. Daddy Bruce is off somewhere trying to figure out how to cook the deer meat the Colorado Division of Wildlife will soon be sending him. There are already, 1,700 pounds of donated potatoes sitting out back, a mere drop in the bucket—another trailer-truckload is expected. Two tons of ribs are coming, not to mention three tons of turkey.

Turkey? In a rib joint? That's right, turkey—we're talking turkey about the spirit of Thanksgiving feast and clothing fair put on each year by the 85-year-old Daddy Bruce. Some 50,000 people partook of his free fare last year. Even more are expected this time around, many of them hungry and homeless, some not. Last year half a dozen lines snaked around the block, as the humble and well-heeled alike made their way to the tables set up in the street, loaded their plates with turkey parts, ribs and fixing, then sat down to eat.

The labors of some 2,500 volunteers, aroused by the rib man's enthusiasm, oil the festive process. The volunteers sort thousands of items of clothing and, the Wednesday before Thanksgiving, pile them on tables in front of Daddy Bruce's—first come, first served. On the Big Day they package hundreds of dinners and send them to shut-ins, gratis, by way of a fleet of cabs and delivery trucks.

In the middle of last year's repast, radio and TV crews announced over the airwaves that they'd run out of desserts, and the response was amazing. Within the hour trucks showed up from nowhere bearing cakes and pies. Daddy Bruce himself looked on with warm and unmixed feelings about what he'd wrought 23 years ago this Thanksgiving, when he took a truckful of ribs to a nearby park and simply started feeding the hungry. "I've seen a whole lot of raggedy days myself," he says, chuckling.

Daddy Bruce Randolph grew up in Pine Bluff, Ark., where, after his parents separated, he was passed around among relatives. As a teenager he picked cotton and worked in a bauxite mine. He recalls buying, when he was in his early 20s, his first hog for \$5, butchering it and barbecuing it with a special sauce concocted by his grandmother, a freed slave. He promptly opened a ribs stand, married and fathered Bruce Jr. (who now runs a Daddy's in Boulder). After his wife died, he moved to Pampa, Texas and for 25 years ran a successful restaurant, liquor store, dance hall, and cab company.

Then, he says, his world fell apart. He married again—and the subsequent divorce cost him plenty. At 59, and living in Denver, he says, "I couldn't afford a pack of cigarettes." Daddy Bruce mopped floors for a time, then one day he became inspired. He drew a picture of a barbecue pit and took it to a bank in nearby Englewood. After checking his history in Pampa, the bank lent him \$1,000 and the rest is local history.

These days spending time with Daddy Bruce in Denver is like spending time with royalty. He walks into Denver's Dept. of Public Works, where they are painting signs—the city is renaming the street outside his restaurant in his honor—and a city worker jumps up to meet him. "Just wanted to shake your hand," says another worker about the forthcoming Bruce Randolph Avenue. "You deserve this, sir." Lately the

honors and awards have been coming to the restaurateur in a torrent (Representative Patricia Schroeder just nominated him for the Presidential Medal of Freedom). Yet Daddy Bruce is not, at least in financial terms, a rich man. He lives as he has for years, in a scuffy set of rooms above his restaurant.

He believes he is on God's errand and gives the bulk of his money away. The Thanksgiving supper is just one of his blow-outs. He also entertains friends en masse at Easter, Christmas and on his birthday. "I'm just one of His servants," he explains. "I try to do His will, not my will." Then he adds, unconvincingly, "If I did my will, I'd mess up a lot."

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SCHICK SHADEL HOSPITAL SYSTEM

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, alcoholism is a disease which affects men and women in every social and economic walk of life, and is our Nation's third most critical disease. In 1935, Charles Shadel, seeking a solution to what he saw as a physiological problem, opened the Shadel Hospital in Seattle, WA, and utilized a medical treatment for alcoholism. In 1964, Patrick J. Frawley, Jr., chairman of the Schick Safety Razor Co. was successfully treated for alcohol addiction at the Shadel Hospital. Believing that the medical treatment he received should be available to more people suffering from alcoholism, Patrick J. Frawley initiated the purchase of the Shadel Hospital and renamed it the Schick Shadel Hospital. He invested \$6 million in further research and later opened hospitals in California and Texas. The Schick Shadel Hospital system has directly helped over 40,000 men and women suffering from alcoholism and indirectly affected the lives of many thousands of family members, friends, and employers. Individuals and organizations are joining together to recognize and honor Schick Shadel Hospital on its 50th anniversary—a half century of dedication to and leadership in the treatment of alcoholism. I would like to acknowledge Schick Shadel Hospital as a valuable asset to the productivity of our Nation and the contribution this hospital has made to restoring persons with alcoholism to whole health and well-being. I offer my congratulations to Schick Shadel Hospital.

BROAD COALITION SUPPORTS STRONG SUPERFUND BILL

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, the health and environmental hazards posed by toxic wastes have widespread ramifications for

all segments of our society. Virtually no community in America is safe from these hidden poisons and rural towns are now realizing that toxic wastes are threatening their drinking water, soil, and air to the same degree as their urban counterparts.

The broad-based nature of America's concerns over this important public health issue was reflected in a recent letter we received from an unusual coalition of public interest organizations representing literally millions of our constituents. The letter calls for decisive action by the Congress to enact strong and effective Superfund reauthorization legislation.

Of the two versions of Superfund legislation (H.R. 2817) recently reported by the primary authorizing committees, this unusual coalition supports the version adopted by the Public Works Committee. This bill much more closely resembles the legislation the House approved overwhelmingly—323 to 33—last year than the bill reported this past summer by the Energy and Commerce Committee.

I urge my colleagues to keep the coalition's views in mind as we continue to consider how to revitalize this important environmental—and public health—program.

SUPERFUND CAMPAIGN,

November 14, 1985.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations urge you to support the provisions of the Public Works Committee Superfund reauthorization bill, H.R. 2817. This bipartisan bill, passed unanimously by the Public Works Committee, is substantially stronger than the version of H.R. 2817 passed by the Energy and Commerce Committee. The Public Works Superfund bill contains the minimum necessary provisions which will enable the House to pass a bill at least as strong as last year's reauthorization package. It also addresses new concerns raised by the recent toxic releases in Bhopal, India, and Institute, West Virginia.

Some of the essential provisions adopted by the Public Works Committee, but lacking in the Energy and Commerce Committee vehicle, include:

Enforceable mandatory schedules.—The Public Works bill places the Environmental Protection Agency on a reasonable schedule of beginning 150 cleanups per year. The Energy and Commerce Committee vehicle provides EPA with a schedule of 600 starts, but requires only that these commence a full year after the law expires.

Mandatory cleanup standards.—The Public Works bill requires EPA to use Clean Water Act water quality criteria as a standard for cleanup. The Energy and Commerce bill does not require their use and provides EPA with broad-based waivers under which the Agency can avoid meeting the standards set by other environmental laws. In addition, the Public Works Committee bill improves upon the Energy and Commerce Committee bill by prohibiting EPA from sending wastes to a RCRA (Resource Conservation and Recovery Act) site which is leaking into groundwater or surface water.

Citizen suits.—The Public Works bill gives citizens the right to sue in federal court to stop toxic releases from waste sites that pose imminent and substantial dangers to their health. The Judiciary Committee also adopted a similar provision. The Energy and Commerce Committee bill does not give citizens this right.

Liability cap for leaking underground storage tanks (LUST).—The Public Works bill distinguishes between operator and owner liability for LUST contamination, replacing an Energy and Commerce committee provision which placed a \$3 million cap on liability for petroleum from LUST regardless of the size or assets of the responsible party.

Hazardous substances inventory.—The Public Works Committee took the first step toward the development of a system where EPA must identify and gather information on releases on hazardous chemicals.

When the Public Works Superfund bill reaches the House floor, we urge you to support passage and resist any weakening amendments. In addition, our organizations support amendments to strengthen the Public Works vehicle with provisions such as a federal cause of action and a more complete hazardous substances inventory.

It is crucial that Members regard the Public Works vehicle as a base from which to build in order to provide the strongest possible protection to the public health and environment, not a ceiling for House action. As this critical piece of legislation moves toward consideration by the full House, we look forward to working with you to pass a Superfund bill comparable in strength to the bill passed overwhelmingly by the House last year.

Sincerely,

Laurie Rogovin, American Association of University Women; Julia A. Holmes, League of Women Voters; Gene Kimelman, Consumer Federation of America; Alden Meyer, League of Conservation Voters; Victor W. Sidel, M.D., American Public Health Association; Martha Broad, Natural Resources Defense Council; Jeff Tryens, Conference on Alternative State and Local Policies; Linda Goldmann, National Consumers League.

Chris Cowop, Division of Church and Society National Council of Churches; Erik Jansson, National Network to Prevent Birth Defects; Janet Hathaway, Congress Watch; David Zwick, Clean Water Action Project; Helen Burstin, American Medical Student Association; Mike Gemmel, Association of Schools of Public Health; Michael Jacobson, Center for Science in the Public Interest; Leslie Dach, National Audubon Society.

Geoff Webb, Friends of the Earth; Kenneth Melley, National Education Association; Rodney Leonard, Community Nutrition Institute; Blaise Lupo, Clergy and Laity Concerned; Raymond Nathan, American Ethnical Union; Dan Becker, Environmental Action; Blake Early, Sierra Club; Rick Hind, U.S. Public Interest Research Group.

Norman Solomon, Fellowship of Reconciliation; Kathleen Tucker, Health and Energy Institute; Anthony Guarisco, International Alliance of Atomic Veterans; Allen Spalt, Rural Advancement Fund; Jim Lintver, United Church of Christ, Office of Church in Society; Luther E. Tyson, General Board of Church and Society, United Methodist Church.

Jack Sheehan, United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO; Jay Feldman, National Coalition Against the Misuse of Pesticides; Charles Lee, United Church of Christ, Commission for Racial Justice; William J. Price, World Peacemakers; George Coling, Rural

Coalition; Sally Timmel, Church Women United.

QUOTATIONS FROM CHAIRMAN JONAS SAVIMBI—II

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, last week our colleague Representative HOWARD WOLPE gave us the benefit of some quotations from Dr. Jonas Savimbi, leader of the UNITA insurgency in Angola which is supported by South Africa. These citations punctured the myth abroad in some quarters that Dr. Savimbi is a democrat and a capitalist who opposes the Socialist MPLA Government of Angola.

Today I would like to present some quotations from Dr. Savimbi and his colleagues on UNITA's foreign relations which I hope will provide food for thought to those who think of UNITA as a "pro-Western" group.

SAVIMBI AND UNITA ON FOREIGN POLICY

"No progressive action is possible with men who serve American interests . . . the notorious agents of imperialism"—Jonas Savimbi, outlining his reasons for breaking with Holden Roberto's FNLA in 1964, published in *Remarques Congolaises et Africaines* (Brussels, Vol. 6, No. 21 (25 November 1964), pp. 489-93).

"UNITA is aware that the struggle against U.S.-led imperialism in Angola is a vital key to the heart of the entire Southern Africa problem"—Jorge Sangumba, UNITA Secretary for External Affairs, Open Letter to Organization of Solidarity of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, *Tricontinental*, 6 April 1970.

"If I am getting support from the U.S., it doesn't mean I support the U.S. I will get support where I can get it. Chinese support for UNITA doesn't mean I am pro-Chinese. Now people say I'm pro-South Africa. Guns don't drop from the skies. I have to get them where I can."—Jonas Savimbi, quoted in Steve Mufson, "Angolan Rebel Leader Courts U.S. Aid," *The Wall Street Journal*, December 17, 1981.

"You know that I had many contacts with the Cubans—especially with Che Guevara—and we had a good deal of sympathy for the Cuban revolution. And they know this, because our relations with Cuba were no secret, they were official. Except that the Cubans' entry into Angola created a very traumatic aspect as regards how we used to view Fidel Castro. He is a very intelligent politician. On the issue of Angola, I would like to believe that he will use his intelligence to realize that intransigence does not serve Cuba's purpose in the future."—Jonas Savimbi, interviewed by Joaquim Vieira in *Expresso* (Lisbon, Portugal), September 8, 1984.

"There are two countries with which UNITA has never had relations and does not intend to have them: Israel (because of our Arab friends) and Taiwan (owing to our relations with the PRC)."—Jonas Savimbi, interviewed by Joaquim Vieira in *Expresso* (Lisbon, Portugal), September 8, 1984.

"The South Africans were in Angola on our side, we are not ashamed they were sent

in."—Jonas Savimbi, quoted in Bernard D. Nossiter, "Angola Rebel Leader Says His Forces Are Beating the Cubans", *New York Times*, November 8, 1979.

"(Question:) Do you mean that UNITA is opposed to the existence of an anti-apartheid movement in South Africa?"

"Savimbi: No. Let them continue, but they will achieve nothing. I believe that Pretoria is taking steps which, if they are fully understood by African strategists, could open up a solution for South Africa's blacks. There is another way".—Jonas Savimbi, interviewed by Joaquim Vieira in *Expresso* (Lisbon, Portugal), September 8, 1984.

SOVIET SCIENTISTS TO PRESIDENT REAGAN

HON. VIN WEBER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was sent to President Ronald Reagan on the eve of the Geneva summit, by 12 former Soviet scientists who urged the President to not make any concessions on the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] Program.

These scientists have lived and worked under the Soviet system. They know the capabilities and the goals of the Soviet Union.

The support of the SDI Program from people who view this system as the "greatest hope for a stable and enduring world peace" makes it imperative that we stand firm in our commitment to the SDI Program.

AN OPEN LETTER TO RONALD REAGAN ON THE SUMMIT FROM FORMER SOVIET SCIENTISTS

DEAR PRESIDENT REAGAN: On the eve of the Geneva Summit, we feel the need to tell you of something of great concern to us. We admire you as a man of great integrity, insight, and good will. But, we are concerned about the growing pressures on you to make vital concessions to the Soviet Union on the Strategic Defense Initiative in order to achieve an agreement providing the short-lived illusion of peace—concessions that would endanger America's security and the long run prospects for continued world peace.

We believe that your quest for strategic defenses combined with mutual reductions in offensive nuclear weapons offers the American and the Russian people, and all the peoples of the world, the greatest hope for a stable and enduring world peace in our lifetimes.

When we were scientists in the Soviet Union, we belonged to a privileged part of the Soviet society. We had the opportunity to observe the Soviet ruling elite, its way of looking at the world and its view of the Soviet-American rivalry in particular, and to learn of many of its programs and intentions.

We can say unequivocally that the Soviet party elite honestly believes no genuine co-existence between socialism and capitalism is possible. Despite all the talk about peaceful coexistence and detente, the Soviet ruling elite is convinced that one of the two superpowers is destined to dominate the other and makes every effort to ensure that it will be the Soviet Union.

Consequently, the structure of Soviet society is designed to best contribute to the ultimate worldwide victory of the Soviet communist system. We know that the Soviet leadership spends enormous resources, in fact, all it can, to surpass the United States in the military field because it believes overwhelming military superiority will be a decisive factor in the victory of communism.

We have witnessed that not only the best scientific research and technology is channeled into the military spheres, but in fact, all the finest achievements of Soviet economics, culture, and even sports are automatically requisitioned for the "defense of the Motherland"—a euphemism for the promotion of the final victory of communism. Only then, the ruling Party elite thinks, will its power be finally secured.

From our own experience and understanding we want to tell you, even though Soviet leader Gorbachev may deny it, that:

1. The Soviet scientific community and government leaders believe that effective strategic defenses are technically possible and doable;

2. The Soviet Union has been intensely working on its own version of the Strategic Defense Initiative since the 1960s, and puts much more of its efforts and resources into its "Star Wars" program than does the U.S.

3. Development and deployment of Soviet strategic defense is intended as a part of the Soviet Union's global offensive strategy against the non-Communist World, which seeks coercion to usher in the final historical era of world-wide communism and "peace" maintained by Soviet military power.

4. The Soviet Communist leaders can be expected to continue working on their "Star Wars" system, either overtly or covertly and with high priority, no matter what they say or what they sign, or what the U.S. does.

5. Soviet Communist morality and the history of Soviet behavior teaches us that the Soviet leaders do not consider it immoral to cheat or deceive their "mortal enemies"—and, unfortunately, Mr. President, they consider the U.S. their Number One Enemy. Therefore they will break any international agreements the moment it serves their interest to do so, as they have done many times before. As a result, everything in agreements must be strictly verifiable.

As former Soviet citizens we love the country of our birth as much as we love the country of our choice. We want for all the millions of our former countrymen a future of peace and eventually, freedom. The Strategic Defense Shield will, we believe, help achieve these goals by discouraging the Soviet leaders from using nuclear blackmail to gain their ends, and instead encourage them to turn inward and begin addressing the needs of the Russian and other peoples subjugated by them.

As scientists, we strongly advocate TRUE coexistence and understanding among nations as the only ultimate guarantee of a secure future for humankind. But for that to occur, the Soviet leadership will first have to establish a genuine coexistence with Soviet intellectuals and scientists, renounce its mission of spreading communism throughout the world, and open Soviet society to non-communist ideas and influences. Only such steps can produce confidence that the Soviet elite's supposedly peaceful intentions are authentic.

Finally, you can take critically important steps to preserve world peace at Geneva if you:

1. do not hurry to reach an agreement for agreement's sake;

2. do not yield on development of the Strategic Defense Peace Shield;

3. do not give the Kremlin leadership a veto on the Peace Shield's deployment;

4. constantly remain aware of the messianic character of the true nature, aims, and motivations of the Soviet leaders with whom you will be negotiating; and

5. do hold fast to your commitment to liberating the world from being held hostage to the threat of nuclear holocaust.

Sincerely,

Dr. Joseph Goldman, Department of Physics, American University; Dr. Alexander Kastalsky, Electronics, N.J.; Dr. Vladimir Kresin, Physics, Lawrence Berkeley Lab; Dmitry Mikhayev, Physics, Virginia; Dr. Artem Kulakov, Physics, Stanford; Dr. Semyon Friedman, Chemical Engineering, Johns Hopkins; Dr. Alex Borsh, Materials Science, Palo Alto, California; Yuri Tuvim, Mechanical Engineering, Boston; Dr. Serge Luryi, Physics, New Jersey; Dr. Athraim Suhir, Mechanical Engineering, N.J.; Dr. Igor Levin, Computer Science, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Vladimir Ozernoy, Cybernetics Engineering, California State-Hayward.

REAGAN-GORBACHEV SUMMIT— HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUE

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev begin their formal meetings today in Geneva, it represents the first time in 6 years an American President has met with the leader of the Soviet Union. Such meetings provide each a valuable opportunity to assess the other's character, resolve, and commitment to addressing bilateral issues like arms control and human rights.

While we should not expect miracles of the Reagan-Gorbachev summit, we can hope and anticipate that certain issues will be discussed in a forthright manner. As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and Commissioner on the Helsinki Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I am particularly concerned that human rights violations receive top billing at the summit.

We cannot force the Soviet Union to respect basic human rights principles in their treatment of their citizenry, or in their international conduct. We do, however, have a right to expect the Soviet Union to live up to its international agreements and yet, as members of the Helsinki Commission, we have witnessed and heard testimony about the brutal repression of basic freedoms in the Soviet Union again and again.

Less than 1,000 Jews were permitted to emigrate to the West last year and yet hundreds of thousands seek permission to leave. Of these, Mr. Speaker, many are the targets of official harassment and arbitrary arrest. While some are exiled to places like Siberia, others are sentenced to long terms in labor camps or prison or psychiatric

hospitals where the treatment is especially inhumane.

During my visit to the Soviet Union in 1982, I had the opportunity to meet with a Jewish dissident and teacher, Yuli Kosharovsky, who has suffered imprisonment, beatings and job loss because of his culture and faith. Since that time I have pressed for Kosharovsky's freedom and for the emigration rights of Soviet Jews. In fact, in this Congress I introduced legislation, House Resolution 74, which calls upon the Soviet Union to cease its unconscionable persecution of Hebrew teachers and Jewish cultural activities in that country.

Persecution often awaits other Soviet citizens who speak out in defense of freedom of religion, free unions, or academic and cultural freedom. Nobel Peace Prize winner Andrei Sakharov is perhaps the best known of such dissidents. As we all know, Sakharov lives in forced isolation in the town of Gorky because of his willingness to speak out against the Soviet invasion of neighboring Afghanistan. Dissidents like Sakharov who have no voice in their own country rely on the West to make their case for freedom for them.

These are several reasons why I have joined my colleagues in urging the President to raise the issue of human rights abuses at the summit.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I have been joined by scores of school children from the Grace Norton Rogers School in my district who each wrote a letter to the President expressing their concern for the plight of one whose life has embodied the willingness to protect our fellow man from death and destruction. These children requested that President Reagan remind Mr. Gorbachev that the American people have not forgotten Raoul Wallenberg and the role he played in saving the lives of thousands.

Mr. Speaker, whether this summit blazes a path for a breakthrough in United States-Soviet relations or merely lays the groundwork for another step in ongoing bilateral negotiations, I believe the dialog between our two leaders will be helpful to our relations. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that raising the issue of human rights will assist those striving to emigrate from the U.S.S.R. and be joined with their families, and those who are witnessing the abuse of their human rights firsthand.

DR. MILFORD BARNES RECEIVES AWARD

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to draw your attention to Dr. Milford E. Barnes, Jr., who recently received the "Award for Outstanding Commitment to Children," bestowed annually by the children's Service Center of Wilkes-Barre, PA, to an individual who has advocated the rights of children and demonstrated leadership on their behalf.

Having devoted his considerable talent and energy to the care of children throughout his life, Dr. Barnes is exceptionally qualified to receive this award. The son of a medical missionary who served as court physician to the King of Siam, Dr. Barnes followed his father's footsteps in the medical profession. After receiving his medical degree from the University of Iowa, he served as a captain in the medical corps during World War II before returning to the United States as assistant chief of neuropsychiatric service for the Crile General Hospital in Cleveland, OH. He completed his psychiatric residency at the Iowa State Psychopathic Hospital in 1948 and moved to Wilkes-Barre, PA, to train for 2 years under the late Dr. J. Franklin Robinson at the Children's Service Center of Wyoming Valley, Inc. He continued his prestigious career in child psychiatry as a consultant, professor, practitioner and medical director in the Midwest before returning to Wilkes-Barre in 1967 to serve as director of the Children's Service Center.

Dr. Barnes has devoted his life to helping emotionally disturbed children become healthy, productive members of society. His traditional family values and old-fashioned love of children have led him to search for innovative ways of assisting children of all ages. Dr. Barnes developed a "parent counselor program," which provides community-based residential psychiatric treatment in a family environment for emotionally disturbed children and adolescents. This program has become a model for community residential treatment programs throughout Pennsylvania.

Dr. Barnes has traveled all over the world, and we in the Wyoming Valley are fortunate that he has chosen our area to serve. His professional skill and warm compassion make him a doctor widely loved and respected in his community. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to share with my colleagues in the House of Representatives that deeds of this unique individual.

TRIUMPH OR MISTAKE? THE GRAMM-RUDMAN BILL

HON. ROBIN TALLON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, did you miss anything in October while the Nation was watching the World Series?

Not many people know it, but the U.S. Congress is on the verge of passing the most important legislation in decades. Hum, you might say. But this bill will affect your life and not necessarily for the better.

The bill is called Gramm-Rudman after its primary Senate sponsors. For a month now, it has been moving through Congress with the power and speed of a freight train. When it hits the American economy, the impact will be felt by everyone.

What is Gramm-Rudman? The bill requires the President and Congress to balance the Nation's budget within 5 years, by

1991. To accomplish this, it requires us to reduce the current annual budget deficit by one-fifth each year until the budget is balanced.

The mechanism is this: Congress can still have its own spending priorities, as long as it does not exceed the deficit target for the year. If Congress exceeds the target by more than 5 percent, then the President is authorized to make enough cuts to reach the target. There are some limits on Presidential discretion, but so far, the Social Security Program is the only major program that is certain to be safe from any cuts. Virtually everything else is threatened.

Sounds about as simple and popular as a recipe for ice cream, doesn't it?

Gramm-Rudman is popular. It swept the Senate by a vote of 75-24, a whopping 3-1 margin. It has been endorsed in principle by the House of Representatives.

Some of this popularity is forced. The President is requiring Congress to complete consideration of the measure by December 14. He has threatened the Nation with economic default unless Congress completes action on the bill. He has already disinvested Social Security trust fund assets for the first time in our Nation's history to prove that he is serious.

But the real reason for the bill's popularity is the fact that it does the one thing which Congress has not had the guts to do: reduce the deficit. This is the fundamental reason the bill has advanced so far. The bill has backbone and, unfortunately, Congress does not.

Then what's the problem? Why not welcome the bill with open arms? After all, I'm a fiscally conservative Democrat who has voted for virtually every deficit reduction measure in my 3 years in Congress. The problem is that even its sponsor admits that it's a bad bill. Senator RUDMAN himself said, "It's a bad idea whose time has come." This, the most popular bill in modern times, is about to become terribly unpopular.

Why is this prince of a bill about to turn into a frog? There are several reasons.

First, Congress is creating an artificial mechanism to do what Congressmen and Senators were elected to do. We are abdicating our responsibility as elected officials. We should have the courage to develop a balanced fiscal and monetary policy.

Second, since Congress is unlikely to be able to meet the declining deficit targets for each year, the automatic mechanism is likely to be invoked. This mechanism is crude at best, and frighteningly arbitrary at worst. Some of our most deserving South Carolinians will have their programs slashed, and many who don't need Government help will be left unharmed. The automatic mechanism is a solution that is satisfactory to no one.

Let me give you an example. Regardless of your feelings about our massive defense buildup in the last few years, defense spending will probably be cut in a clumsy, even dangerous, fashion. Most weapons systems will be preserved intact, while our personnel and readiness will be drastically

cut. Gramm-Rudman may well mean that we will be less able to fight and win a war.

One analogy to Gramm-Rudman is a crazy diet. We are angry at being too fat and decide to stop eating as much. So far, so good. But to punish ourselves when we eat dessert, we decide that our next meal will be dog food.

Third, the inflexibility of Gramm-Rudman could mean that a future recession would be longer and deeper than it should be. The only legitimate place that deficits have in our economy is when they are used as a tool of our fiscal policy. We often need a stimulus when the economy is in a downturn.

Finally, the real irony of Gramm-Rudman lies in our own hearts. Many of the critics of Federal deficits today do not realize how dependent, and, in some cases, addicted, they are to Federal help. But when these programs are cut, we will all realize it. To be honest, a few programs won't really be missed. But others are vital. As a nation, we must begin the painful task of deciding which ones really are worthwhile, and then paying for them.

Unless the courts strike Gramm-Rudman down for being unconstitutional, or unless the White House turns on its own offspring and tries to kill or repeal it, every question that a South Carolinian asks of the Federal Government for the next 5 years will be answered with two words: Gramm-Rudman. This is a sad answer, but in view of Congress' and the President's failure to solve the deficit problem, it seems to be the only possible answer.

Some have claimed that Gramm-Rudman is tantamount to repealing the New Deal and Great Society. This claim is probably exaggerated. The values behind those programs remain, but much of their bureaucracy will probably not. The main consolation will be that it is better to take our medicine now than later, when our deficit problem would have been that much worse.

Today, you may not have heard of Gramm-Rudman. Tomorrow, you may wish you never had.

JCS REFORM

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, let me briefly state what I think needs to be done to make sure that the proposed JCS reform bill helps instead of hurts. To further this end, I propose to submit four amendments to the bill and to oppose the existing committee amendment, as follows.

First to help our men in combat, I propose to amend the bill to point the JCS toward the appointment of a single commander for every major fighting task. Together with this, the JCS must recommend a clear and undivided chain of command with the fewest possible levels.

Second, to further help our fighting men, I am submitting an amendment to keep the

JCS staff from mushrooming by reinstating the 400-officer limit, that is current law.

My third amendment improves the military advice to the President and the Secretary of Defense and strengthens the vital principle of civilian control, by requiring the individual chiefs to forward separate and independent views on each issue in final dispute before the JCS.

Fourth, I am proposing to amend the bill to allow the President to decide when he needs the Chairman present at National Security Council meetings rather than forcing him on the President as the current bill does.

Last, to avoid yet another large procurement bureaucracy in the Pentagon—and one with no responsibility at all for the outcome of their procurement advice—I am urging the House to join me in opposing the present committee amendment requiring the JCS to submit a detailed budget and five year program every year.

OPERATION CARE AND SHARE

HON. JOSEPH J. DiOGUARDI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. DiOGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, Monday, November 25, marks the national start of Operation Care and Share. This month is dedicated to the caring Americans who will volunteer to collect and distribute food to the needy. Not only does Operation Care and Share represent local groups and organizations, but it is also represented nationally by the White House Office of Private Sector Initiatives.

Over the years, Americans have shown great caring spirit to help those in need, especially during the holiday season. President Reagan has supported such endeavors and previously has had the Federal Government donate surplus food for distribution. Aiding those in need without help from the Government is a unique American characteristic that reflects the true caring and compassionate spirit that built this country.

One of these food distribution programs will take place in Westchester County, NY. The citizens of Westchester value life and are doing their part to help those who are less fortunate. As winter approaches, those needy families and individuals who find that it is hard to make ends meet will have someone to turn to this year.

This Monday the people of Westchester County will kick off their cares and shares program in White Plains. They have setup the ecumenical food pantry at St. Matthew's Church as the distribution center.

I would like to commend the chairperson, Elaine Ostrowski, who is spearheading this effort in White Plains. I have confidence that she will make this program a success and show that the families and individuals of Westchester are willing to help those who seek assistance. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

TRIBUTE TO EDWIN R. FISHER

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of Long Island's outstanding citizens. Edwin R. Fisher is widely known in Suffolk County because of his unceasing and dedicated involvement in the area of veterans' affairs. It is my privilege to bring some of Ed's accomplishments to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. Congress.

Over the years, Ed has taken an active role in guaranteeing that the men and women who have served in our Armed Forces will continue to be honored by their country. During times of peace it is all too easy to overlook the enormous sacrifices that our veterans have made in service to the ideals we cherish as a nation. Ed's good works have helped to ensure that the word "veteran" remains synonymous with "honor."

Ed's service to his community has been long and varied. Going back as far as 1946 Ed has played a leadership role within the American Legion, as well as having served on numerous committees. From post commander to county commander, Ed's influence has made an important difference in a wide variety of the Legion's projects. I think it's important to also note that many of these activities reach far beyond what we consider traditional veterans' issues.

Significant, too, is Ed's ability to work equally well with town, county, State, and Federal officials alike. As an appointee to a New York State committee responsible for recommending possible sites for a veterans nursing home, he helped bridge the distance between Washington, DC and Long Island, and thus, has brought the project closer to reality. As with so much else Ed has been involved with, the welfare of others remains his primary concern.

That spirit of giving, so typical of our Nation's veterans in general, is clearly embodied in this man. Ed Fisher has contributed much to help make Long Island a better place to live. For this, he deserves our gratitude. It is my sincere hope that Ed will continue his outstanding service to the community for many more years.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the family and friends of Ed Fisher in paying tribute to this fine citizen.

A TRIBUTE TO BROTHER COURTNEY WILSON

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Brother Courtney Wilson, beloved pastor of the First Baptist Church in Hendersonville, TN. On Sunday, November

24, I will be joining many of Brother Wilson's friends, colleagues, and parishioners in a celebration of Brother Wilson's retirement as pastor.

Born in Paducah, KY, Brother Wilson was ordained in 1946 and served his student pastorate at the Immanuel Baptist Church in his hometown. In 1953, he became pastor of the Woodbine Baptist Church, and in 1958, became pastor of the First Baptist Church. With Brother Wilson's guidance and leadership, the congregation of the First Baptist Church has grown from 125 to 3,500 members today. Throughout his ministry, Brother Wilson has served as a source of strength to his parishioners. He has never been too busy to lend a helping hand. In addition, his church is recognized throughout Tennessee for its innovative community programs.

Brother Wilson's leadership extends well beyond the walls of the First Baptist Church, and his contributions to his community are well known. As a result of his efforts, he has received the Sertoma Service to Mankind Award, presented by the Sertoma Club, as well as the Service Above Self Award from the Rotary Club of Hendersonville.

In addition to his pastoral and community responsibilities, Brother Wilson also found time to serve as chaplain of the Tennessee House of Representatives and president of the Tennessee Baptist Convention.

Throughout his ministry, Brother Wilson's wife, Betty Roberts, has always been by his side playing an active role in church and community projects. They are the proud parents of Jerald, Sylvia, Phillip, and Laurie.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to pay tribute to such a fine Tennessean as Brother Wilson.

SOUTH COLUMBIA LITTLE LEAGUE WINS STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and pleasure that I bring to your attention the accomplishments of the junior division all-star team of the South Columbia Little League of Columbia County, PA.

This year the junior division all-star team took the district 13 title, the section 3 title, the Pennsylvania State title, and went on to win third place in the eastern regional Little League competition. These boys had a stellar season, distinguished not only by their fine baseball skills, but also by their team spirit and good sportsmanship. Little League is an opportunity for young people to develop personal character as well as athletic ability, and the junior division all-star team of South Columbia exemplifies the best spirit of the organization.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the team manager, Tom Bucher; the coaches, Tim Fedder, Russ

Dunkleburger, and Jim Dunkleburger; and the members of the team: Denny Hashagen, Dave Yost, Kirk Seesholtz, Chad Rarig, Brian Kishbaugh, Eric Wagner, Jeff McKinnon, Joe Finn, Steve Drumheller, Doug Bower, Sean Rowe, Brady Taylor, Steve Belles, and Dave Stoker.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues in the House of Representatives will join me in applauding the efforts of the South Columbia junior division all-star team and Little League players across the country who are devoted to excellence.

RABBI HILLEL COHN: HADASSAH'S HONOREE OF THE YEAR

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a longtime friend, Rabbi Hillel Cohn of San Bernardino County, a truly remarkable man whose humanitarianism has caused him to be named by the Arrowhead Chapter of Hadassah as its Honoree of the Year for 1985.

This is truly a deserved honor, for Rabbi Cohn has always been ready to lend a helping hand, and provide whatever assistance was needed to help continue the worthy work performed by Hadassah. To honor his distinct involvement and contributions, a major piece of medical equipment will be donated to Hadassah Hospital in his name.

Rabbi Cohn has labored for over 22 years on behalf of the entire San Bernardino community, as well as those he serves as spiritual leader. His years of dedicated service as a rabbi, educator, and administrator, on both the local and national levels, have indeed earned him the respect and admiration of all who know him.

I have, thus far, spoken of Hillel Cohn in his professional capacity as a rabbi. For a moment, however, let me also express my personal feelings and great admiration for Hillel Cohn—my friend. He has, over the years, always been ready to give me truthful answers to difficult questions. To see him bestowed this great honor by an organization whose only reason for being is to help others, regardless of religious affiliation, is indeed appropriate. I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to be among the many who rejoice in seeing his contributions recognized in such a fitting manner.

CRISIS OF THE FAMILY FARM FACES NATION THIS THANKSGIVING

HON. ROBERT LINDSAY THOMAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, next week is the time when America's families gather for the traditional observance of Thanksgiving. It will be a time when we thank God for the blessings of His bounty

and for the privilege we have in living in a Nation where freedom is our foundation.

But for all the joy that will be in our hearts this Thanksgiving, there will be a sad irony in the traditional celebration of our bounty. The irony will come because this is a year when the American family farmer is harvesting a crop of record-breaking proportions, and yet his own financial survival is in peril.

Not since the Great Depression has such a cloak of darkness enveloped the system of agricultural production that has in large measure forged the prosperity of modern American life. Here, in the committee rooms and Chambers of the House and Senate, we have seen the numerical accounting of bankruptcies, foreclosures, and defaults. But the numbers, for all their magnitude, tell only a fraction of the story.

The true tragedy of the crisis of the family farm is the stark human tale of men and women and children who have worked their hearts out to provide the bounty of our table, and yet who have as their reward the prospect of losing the farms that are at the center of their lives.

We, here in the Congress, will continue our work to give the farmer the chance to survive. That is all the farmer has ever wanted—a fighting chance to produce and to earn a living wage. The Congress will be deeply involved in that effort, but the solution to the human side of the farm crisis is not to be found in Washington. Instead, it will be found in communities, both large and small, throughout America.

One of the best examples I have heard of regarding support for our farmers has come recently from the South Georgia Conference of the United Methodist Church. The conference, working through the recommendation of its Commission on Church and Society, is calling on Methodist congregations throughout Georgia to take time in their Thanksgiving services next week to remember the family farmer.

In addition, the denomination will be producing a video presentation on the farming situation for district pastors' meetings and for commercial broadcast. There is also a plan to have churches become more involved with agencies that assist farmers and to hold ecumenical services involving farm families.

The Reverend Tom Mason of Claxton, GA, is chairman of the Commission on Church and Society, and Dr. Andy Summers, of the Pastoral Counseling Service, is involved with preparing materials for use by pastors. The Reverend Terry DeLoach, pastor of Pittman Park Methodist Church in Statesboro, GA, is very active in this effort and will be leading his church in a special observance of the farm problem this Sunday.

Throughout our State, concerned men and women will be taking the time to remember those who brought us our bounteous national harvest during this time of the farmers' great travail. And more than that, they will be setting the stage for direct help to our farm families.

In doing so, they will be recognizing the needs of those who all too many of us have come to take for granted.

The crisis of American agriculture will not be resolved in 1 week or 1 month or 1 year. It is a crisis of awesome dimensions. But when the men and women and children in our churches join hands, there is no crisis that cannot be overcome.

Mr. Speaker, my prayers and my personal thanksgiving this year goes to our family farmers and to those who join hands to help them. Let us all work to make this year a turning point in the economic lives of our farmers. Thank you.

"HOW CLEAN IS CLEAN" KEY ELEMENT IN SUPERFUND DEBATE

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, the need for the Congress to establish uniform national cleanup standards for the cleanup of abandoned hazardous waste sites is perhaps the most important issue facing us as we consider legislation to extend and expand the Superfund Program.

Up until now, the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] has determined "how clean is clean" on an ad hoc, site-by-site basis. This approach has led to inconsistent and ineffective decisionmaking influenced by a variety of inappropriate factors that have nothing to do with the protection of public health and the environment.

The Wall Street Journal recently carried an article describing how the absence of uniform standards affected the cleanup process at one typical Superfund site. I commend this article to my colleagues' attention as we prepare for the debate over how to extend and expand this major environmental program.

TOXIC-WASTE CLEANUP ON A BALTIMORE BLOCK RAISES A KEY QUESTION: HOW CLEAN IS CLEAN ENOUGH IN THE NATION-WIDE EFFORT?

(By Francine Schwadel)

BALTIMORE.—On a corner lot in a neighborhood of modest row houses, leaky chemical drums once were piled high. A blue-green runoff flowed over sidewalks whenever it rained. From the other end of the block, strong fumes poured out of a chemical plant, driving residents indoors and sometimes forcing them to evacuate. Neighbors blamed the odor for headaches, eye irritations and nausea, and they lived in fear of fires and explosions.

William Cragg, now 37, grew up next to the chemical plant. He remembers stepping in contaminated mud as a teen-ager and seeing the shoelaces of his sneakers eaten away. "I felt a burning sensation," he recalls. "My shoe just dropped off my foot."

Mr. Cragg didn't suffer any permanent injuries, but a neighborhood dog named Rebel was burned so badly by chemicals that his owner had to have him destroyed.

THE FEAR IS GONE

These days, Mr. Cragg and his neighbors aren't fearful anymore. In 1981, the U.S.

Environmental Protection Agency carried out an emergency cleanup of the plant, which had been abandoned, and of the nearby drum-filled dump. The properties are one of six priority sites cleaned up so far under the EPA's \$1.6 billion hazardous-waste program known as Superfund. In Mr. Cragg's neighborhood, people assume that means all the dangerous chemicals are gone.

But completion of a cleanup is no guarantee that a site is 99 44/100% pure. "Why would you need to get to the pristine state when there's so much else to do?" asks Ronald Nelson, the director of Maryland's Waste Management Administration.

And, in fact, quantities of metals and organic chemicals remain in the soil and groundwater at the Baltimore site. Despite assurances from EPA and state officials that the site is nevertheless safe, critics of the cleanup contend that Mr. Cragg and his neighbors may be breathing dangerous chemicals that are evaporating through the ground.

ISSUE IN DEBATE

This difference of opinion illustrates one of the issues in the congressional debate about the five-year-old Superfund, which technically expired Monday but will undoubtedly be renewed. Policy makers are still grappling with the question of how clean is clean enough. That question will become more important as the EPA proceeds with plans to clean 850 sites, and possibly thousands more. Estimates of the cost range as high as \$100 billion. The job could take decades.

In Baltimore, decisions about cleanliness were left primarily to EPA officials, who say they tried their best to alleviate serious health or environmental threats while keeping the cost down. When an emergency cleanup like the one in Baltimore is completed, it may mean only that "the problem isn't as severe as hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of other problems throughout the U.S.," says Edmund J. Skernolis, the EPA's chief of Superfund site investigations for the mid-Atlantic region.

But critics of the cleanups say the agency often chooses the least expensive, short-term option rather than a permanent solution.

THOROUGHNESS DISPUTED

"In most cases, they either excavate the waste and move it to another landfill that often leaks itself, or they leave the waste in the communities and put very flimsy barriers around it," says Michael Podhorzer, the director of the National Campaign Against Toxic Hazards, a coalition of community groups.

Last year, Mr. Podhorzer's group studied records of the six completed priority cleanups. Its conclusion: Three of the six cleanups, including the one in Baltimore, weren't thorough enough, leaving open the possibility that neighbors still could be exposed to "serious toxic hazards."

In Pittston, Pa., for example, oily discharges into the Susquehanna River from an old coal-mining tunnel were fully cleaned up, but the source of the discharges—millions of gallons of illegally dumped toxic waste—remained in the tunnel, which is riddled with sewage bore holes. The Podhorzer group warned that discharges could still occur.

Last weekend, after heavy rains from Hurricane Gloria pounded the area, an estimated 100,000 gallons of a smelly black substance poured out of the tunnel and into the river. EPA and state officials say the

latest discharge doesn't pose a health threat to communities that draw drinking water from the river downstream. Still, they have constructed flotation devices with skirts around the tunnel to collect the continuing flow of oily pollution.

The cleanup in Baltimore was among the first undertaken under Superfund. The abandoned plant and dump site, with 20 row houses between them, had been discovered accidentally by an official of the Maryland Office of Environmental Programs in the summer of 1981. After determining that the chemicals threatened to contaminate the neighborhood, or possibly to explode, the EPA responded quickly to the state's call for assistance.

During a two-month period in the fall of 1981, EPA contractors removed 1,500 chemical drums that had been piled haphazardly on the corner lot. Since many had leaked, allowing chemicals to seep into the ground, some tainted soil also was removed. EPA records don't say exactly how much. Officials estimate that perhaps the top foot of dirt was scraped up and carted away. "It wasn't much," recalls Thomas Massey, an EPA official who supervised the cleanup.

CONCRETE, CLAY AND SOD

Gasoline, water and waste oils were pumped out of underground storage tanks dating from the days when a Sinclair gasoline station occupied the lot. The tanks were then filled with concrete. The lot eventually was covered with a 12-inch clay cap and sod in preparation for use as a playground.

The procedure was similar at the abandoned plant, which now houses a field office of the state's Waste Management Administration. Chemicals, drums, aboveground storage tanks and processing equipment all were removed. An unspecified amount of soil also was removed before the yard was covered with a 2½-inch layer of asphalt for use as a parking lot. "Cost considerations prevented the removal of more" dirt from the plant property, according to EPA records.

The total cost of the project, including contributions from state and local authorities, was about \$350,000. Efforts to get the owner, Chemical Metals Industries Inc., to pay for the cleanup had been unsuccessful. The company was bankrupt.

COMPLETION ANNOUNCED

Despite soil and groundwater contamination detected in state sampling at depths of as much as 15 feet, EPA and state officials announced on Dec. 18, 1981, that the cleanup was completed. The residual contamination, they had concluded, wasn't a serious problem because area residents get their drinking water from city pipelines rather than from wells that might tap the tainted groundwater. This summer, after reviewing a consultant's finding that the nearest well was 2½ miles away, EPA and state officials agreed formally that no further Superfund activities were required.

"The real issue, to me, is potential for exposure. And I don't think there is any," says Mr. Nelson, the director of the state's Waste Management Administration. "I don't believe we're jeopardizing people's health." Given his assessment of the situation, Mr. Nelson says the cost of removing remaining contaminants isn't justified.

To keep tabs on the underground contamination, though, Mr. Nelson plans to drill a new set of monitoring wells next spring. State officials assume that the chemicals haven't spread enough to contaminate the Gwynns Falls, a murky urban

creek across the street. That assumption is based on groundwater monitoring done in 1982, before the old wells dried up.

CONSULTANT UNSATISFIED

But those results don't satisfy Richard C. Bird Jr., an environmental consultant who reviewed records of the six completed cleanups while working as technical assistance director for the National Campaign Against Toxic Hazards last year. He says he would have pumped and treated the groundwater and installed a vapor collection system in the ground, at an estimated cost of \$5 million.

"The reason it's important to do a thorough job," he says, "is because we don't know what is going to happen with these contaminants, and we don't know what safe levels (of exposure) are. I truly believe it was irresponsible to leave it as it is."

Mr. Bird contends that people in the area probably are breathing toxic chemicals that are evaporating through the ground, especially on hot days, and possibly collecting in the stagnant air of neighboring basements.

His analysis received an imprimatur of sorts from Congress's nonpartisan Office of Technology Assessment, which summarized his findings in a recent report. However, the section on the Baltimore cleanup prompted a complaint from Maryland Gov. Harry Hughes, who objected to Mr. Bird's contention that gases were collecting in the basements. The state "does not have any data supporting that statement," the governor said in a letter to the OTA, adding: "We are very much concerned that such statements will raise unnecessary fears in the community."

In interviews, the state's Mr. Nelson at first said that recent air sampling in the basements hadn't turned up any signs of toxic vapors. Later he acknowledged that basement air hadn't been sampled since 1981. But he said he doesn't believe that vapors are collecting in the basements, because tests done during the cleanup—in one basement—were negative and because residents haven't complained since about any odd odors.

TEST AT PLAYGROUND

Frank Henderson, who works for Mr. Nelson, says air was sampled one day this summer at the playground, at the old plant and in groundwater monitoring wells around the area. Since organic vapors were recorded only inside a wellhead at the old plant's parking lot, Mr. Henderson concludes that "there's no reason to be concerned about breathing the air in that area."

Mr. Bird, the consultant, calls for more testing. His concerns prompted a local environmental group, the Maryland office of the Clean Water Action Project, to request results of monitoring done by the state. "They did an excellent surface cleanup," says Daryl Braithwaite, the group's program coordinator. "I just don't think they went far enough."

But in this working-class neighborhood, memories of the fumes and chemical spills are dissipating, and even the old dump looks benign. "It's real nice down there now," says Barbara Lake, whose two sons play baseball on the grass covered surface of what used to be the drum-filled dump.

Mr. Cragg, whose shoelaces were ruined, worried for a while after the cleanup about the contaminated soil that was left behind. But his fears have since faded, and now he is turning to more visible neighborhood problems. "I guess the old expression holds true," he says: "Out of sight, out of mind."

RECOGNITION FOR FATHER GLIMM

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, on December 8, the Reverend Francis X. Glimm, S.T.L., will celebrate the 50th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood. I would like to take this time to call this milestone to the attention of my colleagues and to comment on the life and times of Father Glimm.

A native of Brooklyn, Francis X. Glimm was born on November 17, 1912. He was educated in public and parochial schools, then attended both Cathedral College in Brooklyn and the Immaculate Conception Seminary in Huntington, Long Island, in what is now the Third Congressional District. He then traveled to the Gregorian University in Rome, where he received the degree of S.T.L. in 1936.

Following graduate studies at Columbia University in New York and the Catholic University of America in Washington, Father Glimm began a teaching career at the Immaculate Conception Seminary in 1943, a service which continues until this day. His main courses of instruction have included Latin, Italian, patrology, American church history and church history.

Through his years of teaching at Immaculate Conception Seminary, Father Glimm has enjoyed the broad and deep respect of generations of priests who have come under his tutelage. His peers recognize and respect his deep and abiding commitment to the work of the Catholic Church, to the priesthood and to the human quest for knowledge.

Yet, for all his talents and his vast knowledge, Father Glimm is respected most of all for his genuine modesty and humility. These qualities are held in special regard by all those who know him and who have learned from him.

Father Glimm's work as an educator and mentor for new generations of Catholic priests in the dioceses of Brooklyn and Rockville Centre goes on as he hears this special occasion. I salute the extraordinary contributions made by Father Glimm with a thought from historian Henry Brooks Adams, who once wrote that "a teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops."

CONGRATULATIONS TO J.C. "BUCKY" WILLIAMS AND WIFE, GERRY

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to J.C. "Bucky" Williams III, and his wife, Gerry, of Wilcox, PA, who recently received the American Pulpwood Associa-

tion's first ever Appalachian Regional Outstanding Logger Award. The Williamses, who own Jayfor Logging, won the 10-State regional competition over stiff competition from other State finalists. Jayfor Logging is a competent, well run, and successful logging operation that harvests approximately 1 million board feet of logs and 6,000 tons of pulpwood each year from private tree farms and Government forests. Bucky Williams is a past president of the Pennsylvania Logging Safety Council and has long been involved in safety programs for the logging community. The Williamses are deserving of this award and our congratulations go out to them.

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN P. RENNA

HON. DEAN A. GALLO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the dedication, commitment, and accomplishments of a personal friend, political leader, and public servant, John P. Renna.

For the past 4 years, Mr. Renna has served selflessly in the cabinet of Governor Thomas H. Kean, of New Jersey. Commissioner Renna has directed the policy and operations of New Jersey's Department of Community Affairs.

Commissioner Renna's department regulates and administers programs for housing, community development, local government operations, minority opportunities, and a host of others. It is a complicated department which serves the people of New Jersey well. It is a department that has been improved and expanded on a dramatic scale since John Renna took charge.

Improving things is a trademark of John Renna's.

His improvements to the quality of housing in New Jersey are beyond comparison. Both as a private developer and public figure, John Renna's involvement in a project has been, and will always remain to be, synonymous with excellence.

It is important to recognize that John's skill and vision do not just apply to housing and community development.

His political career has also been distinguished by his accomplishments. In a political life that has spanned more than three decades, John has served in many capacities, and he has served well.

John was Essex County Chairman from 1977 to 1982. He has also served as a local chairman and as a delegate to two National Republican Conventions.

The highest recognition, Mr. Speaker, is the recognition that comes from one's own peers. In that respect, John Renna has few equals. John has been active in numerous charitable and civic organizations. As a result of his service, John has been selected as the "Man of the Year" in no fewer than 10 times.

Commissioner Renna's public and business successes are of the highest magni-

tude. I think that this is obvious, and I think that this body should take note of his accomplishments.

As John prepares to leave his post as commissioner of the department of community affairs, it is right and fitting that we pause to take full stock of his accomplishments, and that we applaud him.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask that this body, the House of Representatives of the United States of America, recognize John Renna, congratulate John and his loving wife Grace, and that we wish them both the very best in the many years to come.

GALLAUDET COLLEGE

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for more than 120 years, Gallaudet College has offered exemplary instruction, research, and public service programs to deaf and hearing impaired individuals from the United States and abroad. Gallaudet is not just one institution, but several, clustered on an historic Kendall Green campus only 10 minutes from the U.S. Capitol, and now spreading out across the country.

Gallaudet is the world's only accredited 4-year liberal arts college for the deaf in the world, and as so, is looked to as a national and international resource on all deafness-related matters. Its Information Center on Deafness, for example, in fiscal year 1985 responded to nearly 6,000 requests and, by the end of this calendar year will have welcomed well over 7,000 visitors to campus.

At the precollege level, the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School and the Model Secondary School for the Deaf serve not only a sizable onsite population, but also disseminated in just 1 year more than 22,000 curricular materials to both mainstream and residential school programs throughout the country. In the past 4 years, KDES and MSSD personnel have served more than 11,000 deafness-related professionals through workshops, periodicals, and training programs.

ACADEMIC SUCCESS

A recent survey of Gallaudet alumni has unearthed some compelling statistics:

Of all the deaf college graduates in this country, two-thirds received their degree from Gallaudet.

Forty-two percent of Gallaudet's graduates have gone on to obtain a masters and doctoral degree. This compares favorably to a national norm of 18 percent.

Ninety-three percent of Gallaudet's most recently surveyed graduating seniors went on to employment or graduate training programs.

Despite their hearing impairment, Gallaudet male graduates' median personal income is \$23,500, just slightly below the national average. And Gallaudet female graduates' median income is \$17,500, somewhat higher than the national average.

Despite their hearing impairment, graduates' median family income is \$30,000 versus a national average of \$25,300.

A NATIONAL RESOURCE AND DEMONSTRATION CENTER

Gallaudet's multipurpose mission takes its programs far beyond the borders of Washington, DC. In this regard, the college assumes a broad commitment to research, public service, and outreach.

Through its research institute, and its elementary and secondary demonstration programs, Gallaudet touches the lives of all deaf Americans, not just the residential student population. The research institute uses a three-tiered approach focusing on preventive, restorative, and accommodative research and leads the way in research on accommodation to hearing loss with significant studies in linguistics and learning methods.

The demonstration programs at the elementary and secondary levels have been working for the past 15 years to raise the level of achievement among all deaf school-age children—developing, evaluating, and disseminating curricular-based products that are used by teachers of the hearing impaired through the country in mainstream as well as residential settings.

The college also extends its programs via a regional center network, with sites in Massachusetts, Kansas, California, Florida, and Texas. Through a cost-effective approach, Gallaudet has established joint relationships with fine institutions located strategically throughout the country in order to serve the greatest number of people possible.

These settings become the location for Gallaudet to distribute credit and noncredit offerings, training programs, and workshops to deaf people and individuals who work with deaf people in those regions. Last year, Gallaudet served more than 40,000 people through its public service programs.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to serve on the Gallaudet Board of Trustees since 1979. I can unequivocally state that the U.S. Congress can and must continue to support Gallaudet as it seeks to fulfill its vital mission of educating our hearing impaired constituents. Gallaudet's programs are fashioned by talented, dedicated people with two main objectives in mind: to make all of its offerings of exceptional quality, and to allow the impact of those offerings to be felt as widely as possible.

The consistency of the college's success in meeting those objectives over the past century-and-a-quarter serves only as an inspiration to Gallaudet's people—and to us here in the Congress—to aim higher, work harder, and be more imaginative still in pursuing the fulfillment of the mandate of this unique institution: to improve the quality of life for deaf people everywhere.

AFRICAN FAMINE RELIEF EFFORT

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share with my colleagues the recent accomplishments of a young man from Massachusetts, Douglas Rose. After seeing a news report detailing the ongoing African famine relief effort last May, Mr. Rose decided that he too, could help to alleviate the widespread starvation in Africa.

Having been a juvenile counselor for the past 13 years, Mr. Rose gave up his job to concentrate all his efforts on statewide African relief fund raising. He convinced youngsters from Northampton, MA, Tri-county Youth Program, where he was then working to organize a tag sale with the proceeds designated to African relief. He also enlisted the support of many of the businesses in the Northampton area, securing donations and organizing benefit shows with the proceeds going to Africa.

Mr. Rose's efforts have not been limited solely to the Northampton area. In recent months he has worked to secure the designation of November as "Massachusetts for Africa Month," and so far 42 organizations in the Commonwealth have agreed to initiate fund-raising activities this coming November including the Boston Fire Department, Massachusetts Bar Association, Boston Boys and Girls Club, and the MBTA Police.

The sacrifices that this young man made at his own expense are tremendous. Mr. Rose's dedication and commitment are a symbol for all the people in this country who have made sacrifices in order to improve the lot of others. I feel confident that the Members join me in saluting devotion and singlemindedness in attempting to reduce the plight of famine-stricken Africans.

CROATIAN AMERICAN RADIO CLUB GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues an organization that is in my district of which I am very proud, the Croatian American Radio Club. The Croatian American Radio Club is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year, 50 years of preserving and promoting the cultural heritage of the people of Croatia.

America has been known as the "melting pot of nations" for many years now, and yet it is becoming more and more important to second and third generation Americans to preserve for future generations the cultural heritage of their ethnic back-

grounds, diverse as they may be. It is these very differences that give American the ethnic richness which is so unique to our great country.

I applaud the Croatian American Radio Club on its vision and dedication to preserving the Croatian culture in southwest Chicago for these past 50 years through its programs in language, history, geography, music, and dance.

I am sure that my colleagues in the 99th Congress join with me in wishing the Croatian American Radio Club many more years of service to the people of the Chicago area.

LOLA MILLARD HUBER

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1985

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you and our distinguished colleagues to join me in saluting Lola Millard Huber in recognition of her 21 years of service to the Santa Clara Valley chapter of the American Institute of Architects in the capacity of executive secretary. Lola Huber will be honored at a special retirement dinner on November 30, 1985.

The Santa Clara Valley chapter has grown from a chapter of 109 members to a chapter of 353 members and has become one of the major AIA chapters in California and the Nation. It is clearly recognized that much of the success of the chapter is due to the contributions made and continu-

ity of purpose provided by Lola over the years. During this time, many programs involving improvement of the environment, energy conservation, and major restructuring of public programs have been undertaken by the chapter with major benefit to the community and our local, State, and Federal Government. In all these efforts, Lola has been the liaison between the architects and public officials. She has been the source of information and assistance to all who wish information, or to be associated with these programs.

Lola has set a high level and standard of performance for future executive secretaries, and she has contributed a personal warmth which has made those who have entered the AIA family feel special. Therefore, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and our colleagues to join with me in expressing our thanks and congratulations to Lola Millard Huber and to wish her the best for her health and future endeavors.