

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION ON BEHALF OF ARMANDO G. LEAL, JR.

**HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor and privilege of speaking at Veterans' Day services at Leal Middle School in San Antonio. The significance of this occasion is that this school is named after Armando G. Leal, Jr., who was killed in Vietnam in 1967. In his honor and for justice' sake, I am introducing legislation today that would waive the time limitations to authorize the President to award the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously to the family of this brave man.

At the time, Mr. Leal was serving as a corpsman with the First Marine Division in connection with Operation Swift against enemy aggressor forces in the Republic of Vietnam. The division came under heavy enemy attack and Mr. Leal ran through a fire-swept area to administer first aid to several casualties. Although exposed to heavy enemy fire and wounded himself, Mr. Leal rendered aid for 2 hours to wounded marines who were located between friendly and enemy lines. He refused to be evacuated in order to continue administering aid. While treating his comrades and moving them to safety, Mr. Leal was severely wounded for a second time but continued to administer aid. Since the second wound immobilized him, an attempt was made to move him to safety, but he was shot and mortally wounded by a North Vietnamese soldier firing at a close range from a machinegun.

I feel that we should not deny his memory or his family the recognition he so rightfully deserves, that is to be awarded the Medal of Honor. In fact, the Navy posthumously awarded him the Navy Cross for his courageous actions.

I feel this bill is especially timely since we as a nation have recognized the contributions made by Vietnam veterans to the struggle for freedom as represented by the dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. The costs of freedom are high, and Armando Leal, Jr., paid that price and more. He deserves to be called a hero, and we should see that he is recognized as such. His noble story will remain forever with us. He did not fail his comrades; let us not fail him.●

MAYOR JANET GRAY HAYES

**HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere pleasure that I join the citizens of the city of San Jose today in recognizing and honoring Mayor Janet Gray Hayes, one of the most highly regarded and outstanding public leaders to serve the city.

Janet Gray was the first woman in this country to be elected as the mayor of a major metropolitan city. For 8 years she has presided over the technological capital of the Nation while at the same time being a champion fighter for the rights of all citizens, an innovator of national urban policy, and a hard-working, honest politician.

Mayor Hayes is a grassroots activist who started out committed to making the city of San Jose a better place to live. She has used her organizational experience and expertise to help transform San Jose, a city once characterized by urban sprawl, into one of the top financial, cultural, transportation, and population centers of the region.

Janet Gray has tackled the No. 1 challenge of her political career like a tenacious fighter. Few could have succeeded as well as she in balancing the competing interests of growth, prosperity, and the natural inheritance of the Santa Clara Valley and end up with one of the most technically advanced, yet livable cities in the country. She has earned the respect needed to successfully encourage financial investment and industrial development. San Jose is the 14th largest city in the country, the fastest growing, and the 4th largest in California. The success of this great city is the result of a sensible growth plan which protected wilderness and agriculture. Mayor Hayes made sure there was backbone in that plan.

Janet Gray started her professional career as a psychiatric social worker for the Jewish Family Service Agency in Chicago. She also worked for the Denver Crippled Children's Service and the San Jose Adult and Child Guidance Clinic. She is a past president of the League of Women Voters of the San Francisco Bay Area and the Central Santa Clara Valley. She now serves as chair of the National League of Cities' Energy, Environmental Quality and Natural Resources Steering Committee and Public Technology

Inc. as board member and chair of the advisory council. I know firsthand that Janet Gray is especially respected and admired among her colleagues in San Jose, where her accomplishments have been directly felt. In 1975, she received the Woman of Achievement Award from the San Jose Mercury News and in 1975 and 1976 she was selected as the most admired elected official in Santa Clara Valley by two public opinion surveys. In 1980, she received the Santa Clara County Women of Achievement Award and the National Conference of Christians and Jews Community Service Award.

Janet Gray, however, was never content to be the only woman in San Jose's political arena and through her persistent adherence to equal opportunity and human rights, she has led San Jose to the forefront of the women's movement; a city with the highest percentage of women in decisionmaking positions. Today, 3 out of 5 Santa Clara County supervisors, 7 out of 11 San Jose City council members, one superior court judge and the president of San Jose State University are women.

Mayor Hayes is a patron of the arts, an urban leader, an involved parent, and a tough politician. Her accomplishments demonstrate that a working mother who cares about the problems her community faces can make a difference. She is, quite simply, a remarkable woman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all the members of the House to join me in paying tribute to Janet Gray Hayes. She is a woman who has made an unforgettable impact on our community. Her career gives everyone a great deal of inspiration. Mayor Janet Gray Hayes is an outstanding woman of our time.

Thank you.●

LET US TAKE A VOTE: STUDENT EDITORIAL

**HON. CARL D. PURSELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by 16-year-old Dane Peterson of Jackson, Mich. Dane's editorial, which appeared last month in the Lumen Christi High School paper, the Titan Times, reminds all of us that we do have more than just a responsibility to vote. I find it refreshing to see that someone so young is already ac-

tively looking for more ways to get his fellow students involved in such an important democratic practice. I proudly present the following editorial to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a tribute to Dane and his fellow students:

The article follows:

LET'S TAKE A VOTE  
(By Dane Peterson)

Is voting a moral obligation?  
I believe it is. My own interest in politics comes from a heritage handed down in my family. This heritage states that one cannot be a good Christian without being a good citizen. In order to be a good citizen, one must take an active role in the political picture with it being a responsibility to be informed on the issues and the candidates.

Main reason why it is so important is that the government touches the lives of all people and since God has put us in a social structure, in order to be responsible for others and to help others we must do as much as possible to make the government responsive to all people. We can do this by voting and by helping others in any way we can to become more and better informed.

An old proverb says "as the twig bends, so grows the tree." Which means people do as adults what they practice as young people.

We may be a part of the generation who is shying away from our moral obligation of voting. In the recent Homecoming King and Queen election, of the 1,083 students at Lumen Christi only 387 voted, or 36 percent. Voting statistics are based on voting records kept by Student Council.

Senior class led the voting with 56 percent. This is to be expected because they had the privilege of voting for their peers.

One of the problems with not having an underclassman court for Homecoming is that the underclassmen have little interest in the election of the king and queen. One way to get these students involved in the election and voting procedure would be to have an underclassman court involved in the Homecoming festivities.

Many of the reasons students gave for not voting were that it didn't make a difference in their lives, they forgot or they thought of the election as just a popularity contest.

Another aspect of the lack of involvement of the students can be found in the low level of enthusiasm at the Pep Rally and non-participation during Titan Week.

Now we don't pretend to have all the answers to these problems. Perhaps a letter to the editor or a suggestion column might be in order. Let us know what you are thinking.

If our experiences at Lumen Christi are to do a complete job of preparing us for the future, we must be more in tune with our world.●

ROBERT BOUCHARD—  
DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Robert Bouchard, who is retiring from his post as San Benito County Superintendent of Schools after long and distinguished service in the field of education.

A graduate of Boston University and the University of Arizona, Mr. Bouchard has devoted his entire career to education. He spent many years as a teacher of music, and his perspective was further broadened by his activities as music supervisor and general consultant for the San Benito County Office of Education and as an officer in various State organizations dealing with teaching, education, administration, and curriculum development.

This unique and varied experience enabled Mr. Bouchard to establish an impressive record as county superintendent of schools. His accomplishments in that post have ranged from the construction of elementary school buildings and a community center, to the modernization of administration techniques in the county office of education, to the institution of a mobile library and a county-wide drug abuse prevention program. The dedication, imagination, and competence Mr. Bouchard has brought to his job will be missed not only by the students, parents, teachers, and residents of San Benito County, but also by those of us at all levels of government who have enjoyed the privilege of working with him.

Mr. Speaker, Robert Bouchard exemplifies the finest traditions of public service. I would like to extend my congratulations on his retirement, and wish him success in all his future endeavors.●

#### DAIRY SUPPLY MANAGEMENT ENDORSED

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, beginning today, dairy farmers across the United States will receive 50 cents less for every 100 pounds of milk they produce as the most recent solution to the problems of dairy overproduction is implemented.

The solution will not work.

It will only serve to make difficult economic times for most family dairy farmers even more difficult, forcing some out of business.

Many of us, in the last 2 years, have repeatedly said that the dairy problems would not be solved by simply lowering the support price farmers receive. Facts now prove our predictions true. Production has been increasing instead.

The assessment that goes into effect today is just another example of that same ineffective approach. Even the Department of Agriculture now admits the inability of the 50 cents assessment to address the real problem.

With this in mind, I have introduced legislation that would repeal the as-

essment and maintain the dairy price support level at \$13.10 per 100 pounds of milk for the current fiscal year.

It then becomes our responsibility as Members of Congress to work with dairy farmers, the dairy industry, and the Department of Agriculture to unite our efforts in seeking a real solution to the dairy overproduction problems.

Last April I introduced the Milk Marketing Improvement Act which was designed to eliminate the overproduction problems and reduce the cost to the taxpayers while still providing dairy farmers with an adequate price for their product. Although the plan was not approved by Congress, the supply management-base concept embodied in the plan won the approval of many dairy farmers and dairy organizations and still remains the most workable solution today.

In the coming weeks we will work with those concerned about the dairy problems in an effort to achieve a solution that is agreeable to all.

In my home State of Wisconsin that willingness to work together to solve the problem already exists as is reflected in the following editorials from the La Crosse Tribune, the Wisconsin State Journal, and the Capital Times of Madison, and WEAQ and WIAL Radio of Eau Claire:

[From the La Crosse Tribune, Nov. 30, 1982]

#### DAIRY PLAN MAY GET A COMEBACK

Congressman Steve Gunderson plans once again to take on the prevailing wisdom (such as it is) on dairy prices and production.

We wish him luck.

The first time Gunderson tried to change the administration's misguided dairy policy was with the introduction of a bill to encourage farmers to produce only at 90 percent of their capacity.

In exchange for that moderation, Gunderson's bill would have offered a better price support. Anyone going over 90 percent of capacity would get a lower price support. Overseeing all of this would be a National Dairy Board, made up of appointed farmers, processors, consumers and the secretary of agriculture.

But it was not to be. Gunderson's "Milk Marketing Improvement Act of 1982" was killed in committee. It may yet rise again.

Gunderson now plans to re-introduce the bill next session. In addition, he will sponsor, during the upcoming lame-duck session of Congress, a measure to eliminate the administration's controversial 50-cent tax for every hundred pounds of milk a farmer produces.

Farmers have objected strenuously to the tax, because it would effectively lower the price a farmer would get for milk. And, as Gunderson's staff members argue, every time a farmer gets a lower price he will try to produce more.

In one news story earlier this year a farm wife said she and her husband planned to milk anything that could limp into their barn. Any why not? Farm incomes are hardly grand, and anything that threatens to lower prices will be countered by in-



creases in productivity—in the attempt to keep the income up.

This is a natural economic response—a free-market response, really—that the free-market Reaganites choose to ignore in their dairy policies. By concentrating on what they say is an overly generous support price, Reagan administration officials totally ignore the basic structural problem of overproduction.

Gunderson's National Dairy Board may strike some as being a New Deal-style government intrusion into the marketplace. And it very clearly would introduce another degree of centralized planning to the farm economy—a factor that is only as good as those doing the planning.

But as problematic as central planning may be, there is ample reason to suspect that the current policies will be more harmful. They will hurt farmers by lowering their income and they will contribute to the long-term problems by encouraging the buildup of huge dairy surpluses.

The dairy board idea is clearly the better approach.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal, Nov. 19, 1982]

#### MILK PLAN SOURS

It's time for Wisconsin dairy farmers and the state's congressional delegation to dust off a plan introduced in Congress earlier this year by Rep. Steve Gunderson, R-Wis.

That plan, authored by Gunderson and Professor Robert Cropp, an agricultural economist at UW-Platteville, calls for price incentives for farmers who cut production during times of dairy surpluses and penalties for those who don't.

Gunderson introduced the plan in Congress last April, but it went nowhere. Instead, Congress voted to assess farmers 50 cents on each 100 pounds of milk they market.

The assessment goes into effect Dec. 1 and may be followed by a second 50-cent assessment on April 1. Wisconsin is expected to be hit harder than other states, with the assessments taking \$200 million from the state economy.

Dairy farmers contend the assessment will force them to increase milk production, not decrease it, to pay their bills.

Clearly something must be done to reduce the taxpayers' \$2.2 billion yearly expense of buying and storing dairy surpluses.

Part of the solution is more sophisticated marketing and promotion to increase domestic dairy sales. A trade program also should be developed for dairy exports.

The other essential is to decrease production. The 50-cent assessment is a punitive attempt that could backfire.

A worthy proposal being advanced within the National Milk Producers Federation is to ask Congress during its lame-duck session to provide that all assessments be returned to farmers who decrease milk production. That plan takes the incentive approach, and may be all that's immediately achievable.

The Gunderson-Cropp plan is more comprehensive; it can quickly get milk supply and demand into balance and allow a dairy farmer to use his resources most efficiently. It also would reduce support-program costs for taxpayers.

The dairy industry and Wisconsin's other congressmen should join Gunderson in an effort to have the next Congress give serious consideration to the plan.

[From the Capitol Times]

#### "MILK TAX" A BAD DEAL

Unless John Block suffers an attack of good sense before Dec. 1, the secretary of agriculture on that date will begin assessing dairy farmers 50 cents for every 100 pounds of milk they produce. The plan is designed to cover the costs of a ballooning dairy surplus and discourage the overproduction that caused the surplus.

Washington should forget about the "milk tax" because it will do more harm than good.

Dairy economists estimate the milk tax will cost the average Wisconsin dairy farm family \$2,500 a year. Statewide, Wisconsin stands to lose \$113 million. No wonder that Gov.-Elect Anthony Earl has commendably lent his voice to the cry against this plan.

There is no doubt but that dairying has an overproduction problem that needs to be resolved. The problem is costing the government a record \$2 billion a year. But the milk tax will be difficult to administer and will not get at overproduction.

University of Wisconsin-Extension dairy economists Truman Graf and Robert Cropp predict that dairy farmers will actually add cows to their herds in order to make up for lost income and to recover fixed operating costs.

The 50-cent reduction will not lower consumer prices, because the dairy plants that handle the surplus milk will continue to be paid the standard government support price.

A better measure would be a simple reduction in the support price itself. Although that would also reduce farm income it would lower consumer prices and thereby stimulate more expenditures for dairy products.

Better yet is the kind of supply-management program proposed by U.S. Rep. Steve Gunderson and others—one that rewards the farmers who reduce their production and penalizes those who do not.

The government already has such a program in place for corn growers, providing a direct payment to farmers who take 20 percent of their acreage out of production. Let's do the same thing for dairying.

[From WEAQ and WIAL Radio, Nov. 24, 1982]

Wisconsin dairy farmers are being given a raw deal by Congress. Unless there is a last-minute change of heart, the federal lawmakers will begin assessing farmers fifty cents on each one hundred pounds of milk they put into the market. This is supposed to curtail production and reduce the mounting surplus of dairy products in the country. But many farmers argue that it will do just the opposite. They'll have to increase production to pay the assessment.

Instead of an incentive to cut back on the amount of milk they produce, farmers have to sell more and that means more dairy products will be added to the already huge stockpile being subsidized by the taxpayers.

Earlier this year, third district congressman, Steve Gunderson, had proposed a plan which would have given farmers who voluntarily cut back on production, a better price for their products.

And it would penalize farmers who don't reduce production. Professor Robert Cropp, who is an agricultural economist at the UW-Platteville helped Gunderson develop the plan. He believes once such a system is in place, it will prevent the roller coaster like rise and fall in milk prices.

Of course, there is no simple solution to the dairy surplus problem. Government sub-

sidies, well intended or not, have prevented dairy farmers from achieving a balance between demand and supply for dairy products. We think Gunderson's plan will get the job done.

So far, there aren't enough people in Congress who agree with us. And, until there are, dairy product surpluses will continue to pile up in warehouses all over the country. ●

#### TOM RAILSBACK—A VOTE FOR REASON

#### HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1982

● Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, Tom RAILSBACK has been a voice for reason and moderation throughout his 16 years in the Congress.

He was a respected young lawyer in his hometown of Moline when first elected to the Illinois General Assembly in 1962 and to Congress in 1966.

His service on the Judiciary Committee and as ranking Republican on its Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice have been exemplary.

During the trying days of 1974, when the Judiciary Committee's impeachment proceedings were carried on television, the entire Nation was impressed by TOM RAILSBACK's deep sincerity and probing mind.

His Republican colleagues in the Illinois delegation so admired TOM that we made him our chairman. I consider him one of my closest friends in the House. I have benefited many times by his wiser counsel and look forward to continuing our friendship as he begins his new career with the Motion Picture Association of America. ●

#### SEAGA SAYS JAMAICA ON "ROAD TO RECOVERY"

#### HON. THOMAS B. EVANS, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. EVANS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, early last month, the Washington Times published an important interview with Jamaica's Prime Minister Edward Seaga. Prime Minister Seaga's election in 1980 marked a vital turning point for the country of Jamaica, a country that is of extreme strategic importance to our own United States. Because I feel that this interview gives a good indication of the many critical economic, social, and cultural reforms undertaken by Prime Minister Seaga, I respectfully submit it for the RECORD.

[From the Washington Times, Nov. 9, 1982]  
**SEAGA SAYS JAMAICA ON "ROAD TO RECOVERY"**  
**INTERVIEW—JAMAICAN PRIME MINISTER**  
**EDWARD SEAGA ON THE CARIBBEAN'S ECONOMY**  
**AND POLITICS**

*Edward Phillip George Seaga became prime minister of Jamaica on Oct. 30, 1980, when the Jamaica Labor Party, which he has led since 1974, won a landslide election victory over the People's National Party and Prime Minister Michael Manley. The election was hailed as a turn away from socialism and close ties with Cuba's Fidel Castro and toward free enterprise and the United States.*

*Since assuming office, Seaga, 52, has worked to revitalize the depressed Jamaican economy. By securing loans, opening new trade avenues and initiating training and employment programs, he has managed to turn the corner on what has been described as the world's second-worst economy.*

*Seaga has been one of Jamaica's pioneers in economic, social and cultural reform. He has made "Change Without Chaos" the motto of his 21-year political vocation. An outstanding example of this creed is his work in transforming a Kingston slum known as "Back-O-Wall" into a vibrant community called "Tivoli Gardens," a model of total development planning.*

*While in Washington recently for an address at Howard University, Seaga visited with a group of senior editors at The Washington Times. Following is an edited transcript of that interview.*

**Q:** Prime Minister, why are you in Washington? What brings you here?

**A:** Principally, I came to deliver the Mordecai Johnson Memorial address at Howard University. But, having come for that purpose, I'm also taking advantage of the visit to wrap up some specials with the World Bank on our structural adjustment on the Jamaican economy. I've had the opportunity to see OPIC (Overseas Private Investment Corp.) and run through a number of programs with them.

**Q:** You've been in office now almost two years. At this juncture, what has pleased you and what has disappointed you in the way things have gone in Jamaica?

**A:** Well, I'll start with the disappointment. It's really one disappointment and that is the mining sector. It so happens to be the major foreign exchange earner, and therefore it hurts whenever that sector is weak.

Insofar as the recovery program goes, because that's the essential focus of attention, this year is a continuation of last year. There will be further growth. There will be a further surplus on the balance of payments account, which will be a further reduction in unemployment. It's been marginal, but, you know, if you take off one point per annum and you end up taking off five points, you have done something that no other government has ever done in the history of the country.

We have just introduced a new institution which is far-reaching in the extent to which it can pioneer in development strategy. It is aimed, in part, at investment in the informal sector by doing two things, both through training: training for employment and training for self-employment.

Training for employment—by converting, over five years, some 90,000 unskilled people, mostly to low-level skills which our projections for the economy show we will require—and training for self-employment because in the rural areas there isn't much employment because there aren't many em-

ployers, Everybody's his own employer. So we have to open new avenues and opportunities, and it's a very creative exercise in trying to find the things that you can do that isn't what your father has been doing for decades and others made a living at.

**Q:** What about tourism, sir? How did your "Come Back to Jamaica" program work for you?

**A:** Tourism has gone up by 20 percent. This year it will probably repeat and probably do a bit better, but it's on target in terms of a 60 percent growth over three years.

**Q:** Where will that put you compared with pre-Manley levels?

**A:** We have now just about exceeded the best year ever. We are now back to our previous best. When we set the target for 20 percent per annum for three years, we did it against a background of a number of uncertainties. It's a very delicate and fragile thing, and coming out of the problems that we had over the last few years any little thing could have triggered a bad reaction.

Fortunately, we've had real stability. Levels of violent crime are down to what you just find in ordinary circumstances, anywhere. The country is really concentrating on the future, and individuals on their own personal problems and making their own headway.

So we've had the right climate and we've had a very good marketing program through the ads, and the combination of that, plus the old PRing of Jamaica in the United States, which was helped by my being invited as the first official head of government to visit with the president. He has mentioned Jamaica several times in speeches, and we have really excellent press here.

**Q:** What is your level of unemployment right now?

**A:** It is now 25 percent. When we took over it was 27 percent. As I was indicating, we were targeted by the traditional strategy to drop it one point per annum, which would be unprecedented.

**Q:** Are those statistics meaningful? You have had a lot of underemployment also. Chaps are selling matches and pieces of soap.

**A:** Well that happens in all economies of that sort, so we have to compare like with like, so however it has been done over the years, we couldn't deviate from that now. But this new program that I am telling you about, by penetrating the informal economy, is expected at low investment cost—because these are low investment deals—to drop it another point per annum. If that works over five years, we will have reduced unemployment by 10 points, where, I can assure you, when we have an unemployment rate of 15 percent, means that as far as adult males are concerned you have no unemployment. Such unemployment as you have would be among females and some youth. We haven't seen that rate since the '50s, so that would be an achievement.

**Q:** Where are we now on the Caribbean Basin Initiative? I have the feeling it has run out of gas a little bit politically.

**A:** Well, if I may say so, the tendency here is when something hits the front burner it's everything. Right now it's Tylonon. CBI is on a back burner. That doesn't mean it won't get on the front burner. It's the major foreign policy thrust of a positive and constructive basis of the whole U.S. government. They can't afford to let it lie on the back burner. I think a critical thing is that it should be passed by this Congress because

if it's not, then it turns over to the new Congress, then we have to start again. Now the kind of work that we have to do in terms of lobbying, in terms of helping to frame much of the thoughts that went into working with the administration and with the people who put the packages together, it's really something I don't think we can duplicate again.

**Q:** Early on President Reagan decided to make Jamaica the showcase of our Caribbean policy, but the world has changed a great deal. Now, we have problems in Mexico and so forth, and other priorities have intruded themselves. Do you think President Reagan remains as devoted personally to the notion as...

**A:** I think he remains as personally devoted to the situation. I would think that is all the more reason Jamaica has to be that showcase. Over the last 10 years, Jamaica had the world's second-worst economy. That's where we are coming from. Now if we can come from there, and in one year turn it around and in years two and three take off in the sense of moving in a forward direction with continuing growth and all indicators pointing in the right direction, this is what causes you to take heart again against the background of Mexico and the others that are collapsing.

We virtually had a civil war. We had eight years of negative growth. We lost all our reserves, they were wiped out, replaced by a mountain of debt. We saw unemployment soar by 50 percent. We saw standards of living fall by 57 percent. We had eight successive devaluations during that period of time. We went through all that and in one year we've turned around and have prospects for continuing that, so that's all the more reason that we need to be made that example, or we need to be given a chance to be that example.

**Q:** How do you feel about Castro's current position in the Caribbean? Is it stronger now than it was a year ago or weaker?

**A:** Castro has been weaker ever since the Jamaican elections. He became weaker yet after he severed diplomatic relations. The Caribbean is not responding to the Castro hype, not anymore, with the exception of Grenada, which is very firmly committed to that model, and which has the good fortune of getting assistance from both East and West, and therefore is being put in a position where it will show more advance and development than its small sister islands, who are only getting a measure of assistance from the West.

**Q:** Do you regard Michael Manley as an agent of Castro?

**A:** There's no question in my mind that Manley's position, both in terms of the ideological direction he was moving in and the very personal relations that he had struck up with Castro, that, whether he wants to consider himself or not, he was acting as an agent for Castro. Because, it was not just a matter of adopting ideology, or personal friendship, but Jamaica's presentation of Castro's Cuba was as one-sided as you would get in Cuba.

**Q:** I was going to ask about the Law of the Sea treaty and Jamaica's feelings about that.

**A:** Well, we're very unhappy that the U.S. administration has not gone along with the formulation on the law of the sea. We ourselves do not understand how the U.S. can benefit from staying out of an international jurisdiction. It would seem to me that the U.S. may very well be excluding itself from the benefits of a regulated use of the sea. There are far more than enough countries



who have already signified their intention to ratify it, to bring it into force. So, I have a feeling that U.S. strategy is going to change, because I don't see an alternative. I don't see a viable alternative.●

**PAUL FINDLEY—MAN OF PRINCIPLE**

**HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 30, 1982

● Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, PAUL FINDLEY has demonstrated by his work that political courage is alive in the 20th century.

Years before anyone thought it was a good idea PAUL FINDLEY called for the normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China. He was roundly criticized \* \* \* and then vindicated.

On numerous other occasions PAUL has had the courage to come out and say the unpopular, and not flinch in the ensuing crossfire.

This dedication to principle over politics makes PAUL FINDLEY a unique public servant, indeed, a unique person.

In our pursuit of good public policy we need to hear the unpopular, the out of step, the inconvenient. That is why PAUL FINDLEY is needed in Congress, and that is why he will be missed by all of his colleagues.●

**PRIVATE PENSION PLANS**

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit my Washington Report for Wednesday, December 1, 1982, for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

**PRIVATE PENSION PLANS**

Public attention today is focused on the ill health of social security, but I am impressed by the growing interest in the condition of private pension plans. Many Hoosiers are worried about their retirement and the soundness of these plans.

In 1974, Congress decided to insure the kind of pension on which most workers rely—the "defined-benefit" pension under which a company promises an employee a retirement income based on both pay and years of service. The "defined-contribution" pension—which gives the retiree an income much like that from a savings account—is not insured since it is, by definition, fully funded. The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC), a federal agency, now insures the pensions of 36.3 million workers in 92,000 plans. The PBGC is backed by corporate premiums—\$2.60 per insured pension plan participant per year—and has an unused \$100-million line of federal credit.

The PBGC insures pensions much the same way the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insures bank accounts. If a pen-

sion plan is terminated for any reason without sufficient assets to cover vested benefits, the PBGC takes over corporate assets totaling up to 30% of the company's net worth and uses those assets and the premiums it collects from other companies to pay the pensions. The maximum payment to a retiree is \$1,380 per month, a sum which is annually adjusted for inflation. As things now stand, the PBGC is protecting 71,200 workers and retirees in 659 failed plans. It is paying the retirees \$62.3 million per year. Were it not for the PBGC, these workers and retirees might have nothing.

But the PBGC and the private pension system it insures have many problems. Slow economic growth and general business distress have boosted claims against the PBGC by 250% since 1977. It has picked up 130 failed plans in the last eleven months, and it must consider its \$3.1-billion liability in the 30 major plans it thinks are candidates for early termination. The sudden termination of two or three very large plans could overwhelm the PBGC and require the intervention of Congress. A second problem is the widespread dissatisfaction with the PBGC among companies whose plans are healthy. It arises in part because premiums are not related to risks. They are the same for all companies no matter how well or poorly their plans are funded. Moreover, abuses are cropping up more often. Businesses with low net worth and high pension liability are ending their plans because current law gives them an incentive to do so. Others are getting rid of subsidiaries with burdensome pension liabilities.

Companies have reacted to these problems in understandable ways. When they consider the needs of their retiring employees, more of them think of defined-contribution plans such as stock option plans, profit-sharing plans, and money purchase plans. Only 29% of the plans introduced last year were defined-benefit. The trend is toward the defined-contribution plan because it reduces costs, solves the problem of unfunded liability, increases the portability of pensions, and puts workers' funds beyond the reach of the employers' creditors. A drawback is that workers bear the risk that their investments will perform poorly.

The long-term health of a plan depends in part on the assets a company sets aside to cover its pension liability. Those assets earn interest which pays benefits far into the future. Thus, an accurate assumption about what interest rates will be is extraordinarily important, yet it is very hard to make when interest rates fluctuate as much as they have recently. Fluctuating interest rates also open up opportunities for abuse. A company can make a sick plan appear healthy by making an optimistic assumption about interest rates.

The other essential ingredient in the long-term health of a plan is an accurate projection of pension liability. This involves calculations about the changing character of the work force. For example, older workers may mean higher pension costs if businesses offer them early retirement to free up positions for younger workers. On the other hand, older workers may mean lower pension costs if they work beyond age 65. Future change in the social security system must be taken into account because nearly 30% of pension plan participants are in plans which are integrated in some way with social security benefits. Pensions would have to be more generous to make up for a cut in the rate of growth of benefits.

The problems of estimating interest rates and pension liabilities are ones which Con-

gress cannot do much to solve. However, Congress should take steps now to help meet the worst of the short-term problems. One step would be a general increase in the corporate premium paid by companies with plans. Such an increase would be quite unpopular, but it may be necessary. Another step would be enactment of a risk-related premium designed to force companies with poorly funded plans to pay more than companies with well funded plans. The chance that such a premium might cause some companies to terminate their plans could be minimized by phasing the new premium in over a period of time. Also needed is reform of the provision giving companies with low net worth and high pension liability an incentive to terminate their plans. Instead of permitting them to terminate by surrendering 30 % of their net worth, the PBGC might require that all pension liability be covered; it would pick up a plan only when the company was in liquidation. Yet another reform would demand that companies which got rid of plans by selling or spinning off subsidiaries be held potentially liable for the plans for 15 years.

I am impressed by the rising number of workers who expect to receive pensions from their employers. However, the complexity and variety of pension plans are causing great confusion among workers. Workers have to understand the benefits and risks of their plans and begin planning for retirement early. The choices that they make today will determine what resources are available to them 20 or 30 years from now. Also, workers should know that many employers, especially small ones, are terminating pension plans and are leaving their workers dependent on social security and personal savings for their retirement.●

**THE TRUTH WILL WIN OUT**

**HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, on November 18, 1982, the Associated Press—California—ran a story which I thought might be of interest to the Members of Congress.

The story can be called a case of misuse of media power, or the abuse of the justice system.

The printed article and letter attached are only part of the story; the other part is also interesting.

During the course of my 1978 campaign for reelection as Lieutenant Governor, State of California, I was accused by my opposition as "a criminal who was going to be indicted." As the attached letter and article explain, this false information was leaked to Bill Stout of KNXT-CBS-TV by Deputy Attorney General Michael Franchetti.

The then Attorney General Evelle Younger, Republican candidate for Governor, also predicted that a prominent elected constitutional officer was going to be indicted. When questioned by the editors of the San Diego Union, the attorney general identified that

constitutional officer as me. What was interesting about that statement is the fact that the same attorney general was saying privately to one of his colleagues—a former deputy district attorney and superior court judge—that he had no information of a criminal nature about me.

The upshot of these political accusations was to lead the U.S. Department of Justice and the FBI into an intensive and damaging investigation of me from August 1978 to January 1980 which led to my defeat, only to discover that I was innocent of any wrongdoing.

It should be noted that this episode was not without the involvement of Los Angeles Times Reporter Robert Fairbanks, who sought information about a false rumor from his source in the attorney general's office—Kenneth O'Farrell.

Mr. Franchetti, not satisfied with leaking wrong and damaging information about me, then ordered a raid on my lawyer's office for my files. When no information was forthcoming, he, with the approval of the new Republican Attorney General George Deukmejian, ordered the convening of a grand jury in San Diego County to have me indicted on false charges of accepting a bribe. So ridiculous were the charges that the grand jury refused to act.

To make the matter more comical, his Deputy Attorney General John H. Gordinier, who conducted the grand jury investigation, then volunteered to the San Diego media that I was never a target of his investigation.

Mr. Speaker, it has taken Mr. Hugh Pike 4 years, with full time counsel, to receive an apology from Mr. Franchetti. It took KNXT-CBS-TV 2½ years to apologize to Mr. Pike.

In my case no such apology was forthcoming. After 3 years, KNXT-CBS-TV finally agreed to give me 1-minute rebuttal time after I pointed out to the FCC that the wife of the commentator, Bill Stout, who aired the false charges, was an employee of the attorney general gubernatorial campaign committee, which was responsible also for the leak through Sheldon Lytton, also of the attorney general's office.

Mr. Franchetti's detailed, two-page apology, dated November 4, 1982, was sent to Mr. Pike 2 days after Mr. Franchetti's boss, Attorney General George Deukmejian was elected Governor of California—letter attached.

For this miscarriage of justice, Mr. Michael Franchetti has been rewarded with the highest appointive post in California—the director of finance—by his old and now new boss Governor-elect George Deukmejian.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this matter to the Members' attention to show how vulnerable and defenseless elected officials are to false and damaging

charges by the media and unscrupulous law enforcement officials.

Fortunately for me, Mr. Hugh Pike was blessed with the financial resources to retain full time counsel to expose this injustice.

I trust this statement and the attached article and letter will help to put an end to the abuse of power by those who hold responsible positions in the media and the criminal justice system.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

Los Angeles, Calif., November 4, 1982.

HUGH G. PIKE,  
Sherman Oaks, Calif.

DEAR MR. PIKE: In 1978, during former Attorney General Evelle Younger's last year in office, the department was involved in an investigation into possible instances of political corruption in California. In the course of that effort, a number of investigators in the department accumulated many evidentiary leads, intermingled with unverified rumors. As is customary, the resulting written memoranda became part of the permanent confidential files of the department.

On October 5, 1978, Special Agent Kenneth O'Farrell had an informal conversation with Robert Fairbanks, a Los Angeles Times reporter in Sacramento, who conveyed to O'Farrell a rumor that you and former Lieutenant Governor Mervyn Dymally were about to be indicted by a Federal grand jury. O'Farrell prepared a routine memorandum of that information. In the ordinary course of my duties I was present at a meeting at which that memorandum was discussed.

At that time Mr. Younger was a candidate for Governor, and his campaign organization employed Mr. Sheldon Lytton, who had previously been a special assistant to Mr. Younger in the department. I understood at the time that Mr. Younger needed to be kept abreast of developments within the department and that he used Mr. Lytton as a liaison for that purpose. In response to a routine inquiry from Mr. Lytton of his character, I told him of the rumor our investigator had received and the resulting memorandum.

Subsequent to my conversation with Mr. Lytton, Mr. Lytton contacted me and told me that Bill Stout of KNXT-TV, Los Angeles, had broadcast a news story stating that there was a State Department of Justice report which stated that you and others were about to be indicted by a federal grand jury. Mr. Lytton stated that Mr. Stout had indicated a desire to actually review the memorandum, and inquired as to whether or not I could obtain and forward to Mr. Lytton a copy of the memorandum. I was able to obtain a copy of the memorandum and did give it to Mr. Lytton. It now appears that the memorandum should not have been made available to Mr. Lytton.

With the single exception of the Fairbanks' rumor, this department has never possessed any information alleging criminal wrongdoing on your part. Furthermore, the department to my knowledge has never had any other information that you were a target of any federal, state or local criminal investigation. The passage of more than three years is a strong indication that the originator of the rumor acted out of misinformation.

Following an internal inquiry, Mr. Younger took steps to prevent the recurrence of unauthorized "leakage" of confidential de-

partment documents. When he succeeded to the office of Attorney General, Mr. Deukmejian reaffirmed and strengthened these salutary precautions. You may be interested to know that the O'Farrell memorandum of October 5, 1978, now bears the notation that it is not to be examined or circulated in whole or part, inside or outside the department, without the written approval of the Attorney General. A copy of this letter has been attached to that memorandum.

Permit me to express my sincere regret over this matter, and allow me to apologize on behalf of myself and my colleagues who were involved in it for any harm which may have been caused by our conduct.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL FRANCHETTI,  
Chief Deputy Attorney General.

[From the Torrance (Calif.) Daily Breeze,  
Nov. 18, 1982]

DEUKMEJIAN AIDE ADMITS LEAKING  
CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT ON DYMALLY

LOS ANGELES.—The man Gov.-elect George Deukmejian has selected as state finance director, Michael Franchetti, has admitted leaking a confidential state document in 1978 containing a false rumor that Lt. Gov. Mervyn Dymally was about to be indicted.

The document—which said on its face that it was based only on a rumor—had earlier been the subject of a Los Angeles television news broadcast predicting, a month before the 1978 election, that Dymally would be indicted.

Franchetti, who has been chief deputy attorney general under Deukmejian since 1979, disclosed his actions in a letter of apology to a former Dymally campaign aide, made public Wednesday.

In his letter, Franchetti stated his "sincere regret" for the leak and said he had been wrong to provide a copy of the document to one of Attorney General Evelle Younger's campaign aides, who gave it to a television reporter. He also said the office never had any evidence of wrongdoing by Dymally or his 1974 finance chairman, Hugh Pike.

In return for the apology, Franchetti was dismissed as a defendant in a libel suit by Pike, who was also described in the leaked document as facing indictment by a federal grand jury. No indictments were ever issued.

Calls to Deukmejian's office were returned by the attorney general's press secretary, Tony Cimarusti, who issued this statement for Deukmejian: "The case is settled and the matter was dismissed, and there isn't any further comment from this office."

But Pike said Wednesday that he wouldn't have agreed to drop Franchetti as a defendant had he known Deukmejian would appoint Franchetti on Nov. 4 as finance director, one of the most powerful positions in state government.

"The people of this state sought to know about the character of the man who was appointed to this job, taking private confidential documents and leaking them to the press for purely political gain," Pike, a Los Angeles businessman, said in an interview.

Franchetti's letter was dated Nov. 4, but Pike said the settlement was reached in August. He didn't explain the delay.

But the Los Angeles Times, quoting unnamed sources, said the letter was delayed so as not to embarrass Deukmejian before the Nov. 2 election, in which he defeated Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley.

Publicity about Dymally's supposed legal troubles apparently contributed to his



defeat in 1978 by Republican Mike Curb. Curb predicted shortly before the election that Dymally would be indicted and also said Dymally was guilty of "criminal offenses."

Curb said he based his information in part on a broadcast by Bill Stout, the Los Angeles television reporter who later was the recipient of the document Franchetti leaked.

The principal characters in the 1978 episode were Franchetti, then a legislative assistant to Younger, and Sheldon Lytton, who had left the Attorney General's Office to work in Younger's campaign for governor and later served briefly as Curb's chief of staff.

According to Franchetti's letter, about a month before the November 1978 election, Los Angeles Times reporter Robert Fairbanks called Kenneth O'Farrell, an investigator in Younger's Justice Department, and asked if he had heard a rumor that Dymally and Pike were about to be indicted over a business transaction.

O'Farrell said he hadn't heard of it but made a confidential memorandum about it, in which Fairbanks was described only as a "news source."

Pike's lawyer, Steven Smith, said the memo "said on its face that it was pure rumor or low-grade rumor."

Franchetti said he heard about the memo at a meeting and told Lytton about it soon afterward, "in response to a routine inquiry." He said Lytton kept Younger abreast of developments in the Attorney General's Office during the campaign.

About that time, Stout said on a KNXT news broadcast that the Justice Department had a report predicting indictments of Dymally and Pike. Smith said he doesn't know where Stout got the erroneous information. Pike immediately demanded a retraction.

According to the letter, it was after the broadcast that Lytton asked Franchetti if he could get a copy of the memo to give to Stout.

"I was able to obtain a copy and give it to Mr. Lytton," Franchetti wrote. "It now appears that the memorandum should not have been made available to Mr. Lytton."

Pike said sworn statements given to his lawyer by Franchetti, Lytton and a department investigator describe how Franchetti asked for a copy of the document for his own use, and then mailed it in a personal envelope to Lytton's home.

Smith, Pike's lawyer, said that after the memo was sent, the CBS network refused to retract Stout's statements. But Stout issued an on-the-air apology several years later, and he and CBS were dropped as defendants in Pike's suit.

The remaining defendants are Lytton, Fairbanks and the Times.

Pike quoted Lytton as saying in his sworn statement that he called Franchetti after Stout's broadcast because "if, for example, Yvonne Burke became attorney general, I felt it was in our (his and Franchetti's) interest to have a copy of that document." He also said he needed it before the election.

Mrs. Burke, then a congresswoman, was defeated by Deukmejian for attorney general.

Franchetti said in his letter to Pike that "with the single exception of the Fairbanks rumor, this department has never possessed any information alleging criminal wrongdoing on your part."

"Furthermore, the department to my knowledge has never had any other information that you were a target of any federal, state or local criminal investigation. The

passage of more than three years is a strong indication that the originator of the rumor acted out of misinformation." ●

#### EXTEND LEGISLATION FOR OUR NATION'S HIGHWAYS

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter on November 3 from a good friend of mine and fellow Kentuckian, Harry J. Davis, of Eaton Asphalt Paving Co., Inc., in Covington, Ky. Mr. Davis has written me an excellent letter in which he stresses the urgent need for the Congress to pass a 1-year extension of the highway trust fund and Federal-aid highway program. Indeed, I agree that we cannot allow an abrupt discontinuation of the Federal-aid highway program which will adversely affect the highway construction industry, one that is suffering from an extremely high unemployment rate of 20 percent. I believe my colleagues will be interested in Mr. Davis' comments. His letter follows:

EATON ASPHALT PAVING CO., INC.,  
Covington, Ky., October 29, 1982.

Rep. CARROLL HUBBARD,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUBBARD: Congress passed a highway bill on October 1, 1982 extending non-Interstate federal-aid highway programs for only 78 days, through December 17, and authorizing \$3.225 billion in Interstate construction for the entire new fiscal year, which began on October 1. As soon as the President signs the bill into law, those funds will be apportioned among the states, and will be available for obligation along with \$800 million in Interstate 4R funds apportioned previously.

As has been reported, this year it was necessary to extend the Highway Trust Fund as well as pass a one year extension of the Federal-aid Highway Program. The highway bill that Congress passed on October 1 did not contain a trust fund extension because the leadership of the House Public Works Committee refused to go along with the trust fund extension language developed by Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dan Rostenkowski, which would place the Highway Trust Fund in the Internal Revenue Code and would permit Ways and Means to review all future highway legislation before allowing trust fund monies to be released to support programs contained in the legislation.

With no extension of the Highway Trust Fund, the House and Senate Public Works Committees decided to go forward with a "shortened" bill in an effort to at least keep the Federal-aid Highway Program from grinding to a halt on October 1. The result was a bill providing approximately \$5 billion in new contract authority with non-Interstate programs authorized only December 17.

We need your aid in seeing to it that Congress passes a simple one year extension of the Highway Trust Fund and Federal-aid Highway Program in the lame-duck session scheduled to begin on November 29.

The following points are pertinent:

One. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1982, passed by Congress on October 1, 1982, only extended non-Interstate Federal-aid Highway programs through Dec. 17.

Two. Unless Congress passes a simple one year extension of the Highway Trust Fund in the lame duck session, the only federal aid available after Dec. 17, 1982 for repairing our nations highways will be for the Interstate System. This is not fair to highway users who are paying dollars into the Highway Trust Fund and are conducting 80 percent of their travel off the Interstate System.

Three. An abrupt discontinuation of the Federal-aid Highway Program, which will occur without an extension of the Highway Trust Fund, will disastrously affect the highway construction industry, already suffering a 20 percent unemployment rate, more than twice the national average.

Four. The House Ways and Means and House Public Works and Transportation Committees must be urged to reach agreement on the Highway Trust Fund Extension.

We are all reading the constant flow of articles, editorials, etc., regarding the deteriorating condition of the nations roads and bridges, including the Interstate Highway System which was designed and built as a Defense Transportation Network. Our nation can ill afford to see this system disintegrate as have the railroads.

H.R. 5470 is now ready for a quick conference between Senate Finance Committee members and House Ways and Means Committee members, and final passage by both houses which has to take place in the 15 day lame-duck session.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY J. DAVIS,  
Sales Manager. ●

#### DANGEROUS MYTHS ABOUT NUCLEAR ARMS

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in the debate over the so-called nuclear freeze, there are many myths circulating relative to nuclear war. They concern whether or not there is a parity in nuclear arms between the United States and the U.S.S.R.; whether we would really destroy each other in a nuclear war; whether stopping U.S. research and development on nuclear weapons would make the world safer; whether or not a nuclear war would make the planet Earth uninhabitable; whether or not a nuclear war would destroy the ozone layer over the Earth; and lastly, whether having a good civil defense system would help? As a scientist of renown, Dr. Edward Teller, the father of our H-bomb, and the author of this article, has destroyed each myth in a very concise manner. The article from the Reader's Digest of November 1982, follows:

**DANGEROUS MYTHS ABOUT NUCLEAR ARMS**  
(By Edward Teller)

Educating people about the nature and actual perils of nuclear weapons would not be easy under any circumstances. It is almost impossible when elementary facts are guarded by strict regulations of secrecy. Given such conditions, dangerous myths develop and proliferate.

The reality of nuclear weapons is grim enough. Exaggerations about them are apt only to paralyze us. Some of the current myths have grown from misinterpreted scientific studies; others seem to be based on simple wishful thinking. They all have one common characteristic; so long as they are believed, they obstruct an accurate assessment of our problems and will prevent the development of workable plans to preserve peace.

**Myth 1:** The Soviet and American nuclear stockpiles are close to identical. A nuclear freeze would stop the arms race and offer improved mutual protection.

Neither the United States nor the Soviet Union publishes information on its current arsenals, and secrecy laws prevent me from discussing even the available estimates. There is, however, an officially released fact: between 1966 and 1981 the total megatonnage of the American nuclear arsenal was reduced to less than one-half its former size. The Soviet arsenal has rapidly increased in yield, accuracy and diversity during the same period and currently includes a total nuclear explosive power in excess of what the United States ever had.

The Soviets have built the most powerful single weapons ever constructed. Militarily such weapons have very limited value, but as a blackmail threat against free-world cities, they seem to be quite effective. Weapons of such immense size are the most likely to cause damage to the earth's ozone layer (which acts as a shield against lethal amounts of ultraviolet radiation) and lower the global temperature. A movement that says "freeze the current arsenals as they are" grants acceptability to these extraordinarily destructive Soviet weapons when they should be vigorously opposed.

By comparison with the Soviet Union, we have but a small fraction of the world's existing nuclear megatonnage. We do have sufficient power to create great damage, particularly to the Soviet industrial plant, if our retaliatory forces are safe from a first strike. They are not safe, however, and their deterrent effect has become doubtful.

**Myth 2:** Each nation has the power to destroy the other totally. Mutual destruction can most surely be avoided by disarming.

Our nuclear defense strategy, Mutually Assured Destruction, has the most appropriate acronym of MAD. The theory: if the Soviet Union and the United States have their urban populations at risk, then neither will attempt a first strike.

The Soviets have never agreed to the ideas on which MAD is based. The landmass of the U.S.S.R. is more than twice that of the United States; its urban concentration proportionately much lower. The Soviets' civil-defense planning may well enable them to lose fewer people in a nuclear conflict than the 20 million or more casualties they suffered in World War II.

Disarmament (as opposed to simple surrender) must be based on openness or trust. The extreme reticence of the Soviets to allow on-site inspections has been a continuing problem since 1958. Our basis for trust has not grown since. Recently declassified information offers an example of our prob-

lems. Since silos but not missiles can be counted by aerial surveillance, the SALT treaty limited silos. The obvious objective was to limit the number of deliverable missiles. The American silos are not reloadable. The Soviet silos are. This is not a breach of the treaty. American negotiators, neglecting the possibility that the Soviets might not have an equal urge to disarm, failed to insert an essential clause.

We have negotiated for 25 years, and the results are readily visible. Why would a totalitarian empire that depends on military force to maintain its power voluntarily disarm itself?

**Myth 3:** Stopping U.S. weapons research and development will help make the world safer from the destructive effects of nuclear weapons.

For more than 25 years the primary purpose of U.S. weapons laboratories has been to make nuclear weapons less indiscriminately destructive. Cleaner bombs (with less fallout), smaller, more military effective weapons, and neutron bombs useful for battlefield defense (with less civilian damage than that created by a conventional artillery barrage) are among the results.

Furthermore, extremely important research is being conducted on systems to defend against incoming nuclear missiles. For example, exploding a very small nuclear bomb near an attack missile as it enters the upper-to-middle atmosphere over our nation would have no effects on the ground and negligible effects on the atmosphere, but could totally disarm the incoming missile without detonating it. Such a system, used to protect our vulnerable missile silos, could be an important first step in improving both our current retaliatory position and directing our policy toward defense. The nuclear-freeze movement would end further work on what could be the best defense systems.

The Soviets have already deployed an antiballistic-missile system around Moscow. We have the right to deploy a similar system but have not done so. The Soviet-American antiballistic-missile treaty is now being reviewed. We should change our policy and emphasize defense rather than retaliation.

**Myth 4:** If a large number of nuclear weapons were exploded, fallout would pollute food and water supplies, making combatant countries uninhabitable. The spread of radioactive fallout throughout the world would end life on earth.

Fallout is part of many myths, and one of the common misunderstandings has to do with the durability and extent of its effects.

The radioactivity of fallout declines rapidly. For example, if 1000 rems per hour (a lethal dose) were released by a bomb, seven hours later the dose would be 100 rems per hour (far below lethal). In 49 hours radiation from this fallout would be reduced to 10 rems per hour. In 100 days the radiation would be 0.1 rems, comparable to the amount received from a chest X ray.

The amount of radioactivity produced by a bomb, contrary to myth, is finite. Radiation from fallout of the intensity described would be limited to the immediate vicinity of the explosion and the adjacent areas downwind. People in these areas could move to uncontaminated regions. (Decontamination is feasible if we prepare for it.)

Fallout in the vicinity of a nuclear explosion is a visible material, an ash. It can be wiped or washed off cans, wrappers, skin or any other surface. It can be easily filtered out of water. Food exposed to fallout is not harmed by the radiation. In fact, radiation

is used commercially for food preservation. The only risk connected with food is if the fallout itself is eaten in the food or through some part of the food chain.

Skin contact with fallout is not necessarily fatal—depending on the intensity of the radiation and the precautions taken. Injuries can be reduced simply by washing off the ash. Through tragic miscalculation, 23 Japanese fishermen were covered with fallout from the multi-megaton test at Bikini Atoll in 1954. The fallout reached their boat three hours after the explosion and continued for an additional 4½ hours. They made no effort to brush or wash off the ash. All suffered skin lesions, most had appetite loss, some experienced nausea and vomiting. One died shortly afterward, and two others died 20 years later of liver disorders that may have been associated with the fallout. The rest have survived. Simple knowledge on how to deal with fallout would practically have eliminated the effects.

There would be numerous dreadful real consequences if a nuclear exchange occurred. Preventing war—in particular, nuclear war—is our single most important task. Should nuclear war occur in spite of every good effort, the number of people killed would be truly terrifying, but many more would survive. Perhaps this is the most frightening thing about our current myths: the misconceptions that exist currently would intensify the fear and suffering of survivors needlessly.

**Myth 5:** The explosion of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere will bring an end to life on this planet by damaging the ozone layer.

This new doomsday myth is gaining popularity. What we know today about the ozone layer suggests that if weapons larger than half-megaton bombs—such as only the Soviets possess—were exploded in the atmosphere, they would generate considerable amounts of nitrogen oxides at high altitudes. These oxides continue to destroy ozone over a protracted period. If the ozone were depleted, more ultraviolet radiation would reach the earth.

Assuming a worst-case scenario—a nuclear attack in which 5000 weapons, all of 1- to 20-megaton size, were exploded in the atmosphere—there would probably be a 50-percent decrease in the ozone layer over the Northern Hemisphere during the following year. (In the next few years, the ozone layer would return to about 80 percent of normal.) If this occurred, people would suffer rapid sunburn and a significant increase in skin cancer. Some ultraviolet-sensitive species could be extinguished, and some serious ecological changes might follow. However, our survival can be considered certain.

More detailed scientific information about the ozone layer is needed and should be gathered on an international basis. In the meantime, limiting the explosive power of all individual nuclear weapons to 400 kilotons would effectively eliminate the possibility of any significant damage to the ozone layer. Such a limitation should become an important part of disarmament talks.

**Myth 6:** Civil defense is without value in saving lives and may actually increase the risk of war.

This is perhaps the most dangerous myth of all.

Today some Soviet nuclear missiles may carry an explosive force a thousand times greater than the 15-kiloton Hiroshima bomb. However, while the vertical force of the explosive increases a thousand times,



the horizontal distance over which such bombs produce equal damage increases much more slowly. For example, a one-megaton bomb, while almost 70 times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb, produces equal damage over only about four times the distance.

Few people realize the following facts about the effects of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings. Earth-covered conventional bomb shelters practically under the airburst atomic bombs were essentially undamaged even though blast and fire destroyed all other buildings in the area. In Nagasaki, people in caves survived one-third of a mile from ground zero. In Hiroshima, a well-built wood-frame house one mile away from ground zero was badly damaged but stood. The day after the blast, bridges were open to traffic; the second day, trains ran; the third day, streetcars were operating. The people of these cities were without any knowledge of how to protect themselves. Yet 1.6 to 3.1 miles from ground zero, 98 percent of the inhabitants—283,000 people—survived. Among this group in the past 33 years, about 500 more deaths from cancer have occurred than would be predicted in an unexposed similar group of people.

What about predictions of genetic damage? Detailed analyses have been made of about 35,000 children born to atomic-bomb survivors. So far no evidence of genetic damage has been found. This does not mean that none exists. However, genetic damage compared with the other horrors of nuclear war is practically negligible. Radiation during pregnancy—especially in the early stages—is very harmful to the fetus. More than one quarter of the infants born five to nine months after the bombing suffered from retarded growth, including mental retardation. About seven percent of those born in the four months following the bombing also suffered these defects. Yet the myth suggests that all fetuses tragically exposed by nuclear war will suffer developmental malformation. The actual effects of atomic weapons are ghastly enough. Exaggeration discourages reasonable measures to protect those most vulnerable.

Under Soviet civil-defense plans, nonessential city workers would be evacuated if the immediate danger of war (or intent for a Soviet first strike) arose. The evacuees would build crude but effective shelters in the countryside according to well-prepared instructions. (Tests of the Soviet shelter plans at Oak Ridge National Laboratory show them to be excellent). With optimum conditions, these plans would allow the Soviet Union to protect all but about 5 to 10 percent of its people from a full retaliatory strike. Well over 50 percent of the unprepared U.S. population would die, in a nuclear attack. This need not be so. Comparable civil-defense planning in the United States could save 100 million more lives.

War has always been more terrible than words can describe. Nuclear war would create immense suffering. Surely taking out some insurance against increased suffering is neither wasteful nor inhumane. We could accomplish so much for so little were we to spend only one percent of our defense budget on civil defense.

Planning the evacuation of urban residents and stockpiling food already owned by the government in the corresponding evacuation areas is a most important cheap insurance policy. Were the Soviets aware that the American people are able to survive an attack, they would be much less likely to take the risk of initiating a conflict. And can

you really believe that civil defense will make the American people or our government more likely to risk nuclear war?

Our first step toward stability, toward improving the prospects for peace and for the security of all people, must be the replacement of myths with knowledge. Only then can we approach the best possible solutions. They will not be perfect. But they will offer the chance for improvement—of changing mutually assured destruction into a decent chance of survival, of maintaining sufficient military strength to coax Soviet leaders toward real détente. If our salvation is to be real, it must be based on fact, not fantasy. ●

**ED DERWINSKI—MY GOOD FRIEND**

**HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 30, 1982*

● Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress 10 years ago Ed DERWINSKI introduced me to his friends and offered his counsel any time I needed it. I availed myself of that offer many times and, over the years, we grew to be friends.

Fate then played a cruel trick on us. We were placed in the same district by reapportionment. Neither of us wanted the other to leave Congress, and neither of us wanted to leave ourselves. So with the greatest reluctance, we began a campaign against each other.

Now that campaign is well into the past. It is time to look ahead. In doing so, one must credit the Reagan administration for asking Ed to come aboard with a high ranking job at the State Department. As Counselor he will influence foreign policy in a totally new way from that of his seat in the House. Also, his familiarity with the workings of Congress will be at the disposal of the Secretary.

No one is more disappointed than I that Ed DERWINSKI must leave the House. But all of us can be thankful that his involvement in Government is long from over. ●

**INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION OF MURDERS IN EL SALVADOR**

**HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, December 1, 1982*

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the second anniversary of the murders of the American missionaries Ita Ford, Jean Donovan, Dorothy Kazel, and Maura Clarke, in El Salvador. Two years have passed during which the families, friends, and religious communities of these four women of peace have passed and pleaded for information and action in

the investigation and prosecution of these murders. My efforts, and the good offices of many Members of Congress, have been unrelenting in their support for the families of the churchwomen, and in calling our own Government as well as that of El Salvador to accountability in pursuit of the justice this atrocity deserves.

The accused murderers have been in custody since April 1981. It is now December 1982, and still there has been no trial—more importantly, there has been no systematic and thorough investigation by authorities in El Salvador of others who may have had knowledge of, or may have ordered, condoned, or encouraged these murders.

For this reason, the families and friends of these four courageous women—indeed the American public, and we, their representatives—will mark the passing of two frustrating years tomorrow with a renewed resolve and continued determination to press and pursue this case to a just resolution.

Today I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent communication by the families through their attorneys on the Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights. The letter explains their reluctance to hire a private attorney in El Salvador to represent them as next of kin in the anticipated trial. As the letter clearly indicates, the families are reluctant to retain any of the candidates from El Salvador who have been interviewed thus far because of the obvious and explicit intention of these attorneys to exclude any further investigation or fixing of blame beyond the five accused guardsmen.

Moreover, the families of the murdered churchwomen are not satisfied with either the efforts of the government of El Salvador or those of the U.S. State Department and American Embassy in El Salvador. The resolution of this case should not be a legitimation of a corrupt and impotent justice system, nor should it be a white-wash of those who bear responsibility for actions by the security forces of El Salvador.

THE LAWYERS COMMITTEE FOR INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS,  
New York, N.Y., November 12, 1982.

Mr. L. CRAIG JOHNSTONE,  
Director, Office of Central American Affairs,  
U.S. Department of State, Washington,  
D.C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSTONE: I am writing to inform you about the decision the families have now reached regarding the effort to hire a Salvadoran lawyer to serve as accuser particular in the case involving the December 1980 murder of four U.S. churchwomen.

I write this letter under some constraint. As you know, during the last three months the Lawyers Committee, acting on behalf of the four families, has taken a number of steps to help secure the services of a Salva-

doran lawyer in this case. Starting with a meeting arranged by the Department of State and including Scott Greathead's visit to San Salvador in August, we have met with a number of Salvadoran lawyers in El Salvador and in the United States. Without exception, these lawyers, whether they were contacted independently by us or through the Department of State, have imposed stringent conditions of confidentiality on us because of the considerable risks to them in even discussing the case. It is our intention to respect these conditions. Accordingly, in this letter I am unable to go into as much detail as I would like about our search process or the various discussions that have led to our decision.

It is sufficient to say that during the past three months, we have made a concerted effort to gather as much information as possible about the judicial process and the prospects for utilizing effectively an acusador particular in this case. In so doing, we have sent a representative to El Salvador and Mexico, and invited Salvadoran lawyer(s) to the United States, all at the expense of the Lawyers Committee and the families.

On the basis of what we have been told, we have reached the following conclusions:

1. There is currently no serious investigation of the possible involvement of Salvadoran officers in ordering the killings or covering them up.

2. With regard to the case itself we have been told that an anticipated defense of the five guardsmen will be that they were only acting under orders from their superiors. Lawyers have warned us that the only way to guarantee a conviction of the five guardsmen is to refute their claims that others were involved. We reject this specious reasoning. The families insist on a thorough investigation of the case, no matter where that investigation leads.

3. All of the lawyers with whom we have spoken have expressed the fear that their lives may be jeopardized if they become involved in this case. Several have stated that elements in the Salvadoran armed forces do not want this or any case against members of the armed forces to be tried.

4. In part, because of the threat to their personal safety, lawyers have told us that it will cost between \$30,000 and \$100,000 to hire a Salvadoran lawyer as acusador particular.

5. A thorough investigation of the possible involvement of Salvadoran officers ordering the killings or covering them up and prosecution of all those responsible has not been and will not be possible without the full support of the United States Government.

6. Currently, we are unable to discover any lawyer in El Salvador willing to pursue a vigorous investigation of all leads in this case. This is, in part, because lawyers there do not believe that the United States Embassy is willing to support such an investigation.

After carefully weighing all of these factors, the families have decided that they are not, at this time, prepared to hire an acusador particular. While it has been their intention from the beginning to take whatever steps are possible and necessary to encourage a full and fair investigation of this case, they now believe that under the present circumstances, the effective involvement of any private lawyer has become virtually impossible. This, coupled with the potential danger to any lawyer who would aggressively pursue the case, makes the hiring of an acusador particular imprudent at this juncture.

In making this decision, we remain convinced that a major responsibility for the pursuit of all evidence in this case rests with the United States Department of State and its Embassy in San Salvador. Clearly the Embassy has played a key role in whatever progress has been made to date. For the case to be resolved properly, it is essential that a serious investigation be undertaken into the possible involvement of Salvadoran officers, both in ordering the killing and covering it up. The United States Government has a special responsibility in seeing to it that such an investigation takes place.

In the past two weeks we have become aware for the first time, of new evidence in the case suggesting that "superiors" ordered the killing. According to one account, on August 1 of this year, a former national guardsman named Julio Cesar Valle Espionza, testified that on December 2, 1980 subsergeant Colindres Aleman, the principal suspect in the current investigation, told him, "We are to pick these women up; we are under superior orders." In this instance, as on a number of occasions in the past, we have learned important information about this case as the result of a newspaper article.

Similarly, since April we have requested, but have never been given, the name and address of, or access to, a retired Salvadoran national guard sergeant who was Colindres Aleman's immediate superior officer. According to information attached to your letter of April 13, 1982, the FBI interviewed this man in the United States in February 1982 at which time he "admitted that Colindres had confessed to the murders." In your letter you go on to say that the sergeant "is still available for further interviewing if necessary."

We have just learned, again from sources other than the State Department, that a retired sergeant named Dagoberto Martinez Martinez has testified in this case, describing a similar admission by Colindres Aleman. According to one account, Sergeant Martinez urged Colindres Aleman to conceal his involvement to protect the honor of the Salvadoran National Guard. We are particularly interested in knowing if this is the same man, and if we can interview him.

After investing substantial time, money and effort over the past several months, the decision not to hire an acusador particular has been a very difficult one for the families. However, despite their deep interest in this case and strong desire to be involved, they do not believe that they can now obtain counsel in El Salvador who can independently pursue these and other evidentiary leads that are critical to the successful prosecution of all who were involved. What the families want, and what we will continue to pursue, is the opportunity to obtain a lawyer who can act effectively on their behalf, with undivided loyalty to them in the manner they choose. As you know, this is the essential interest any client has in dealing with his or her counsel.

This does not mean that the families are ruling out the possibility of future legal representation for them in El Salvador. Moreover, the families intend to remain actively involved in the case in whatever way possible. They would like, for example, to send observers to the public trial, when it occurs, and would appreciate sufficient prior notification to allow us to make appropriate arrangements.

We remain willing and eager to work with the State Department and Salvadoran authorities, in any way possible to assure that

a complete investigation takes place and that all of those who are responsible for the execution and cover-up of this heinous crime are brought to justice.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL H. POSNER,  
Executive Director.

THE LAWYERS COMMITTEE FOR  
INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS,  
New York, N.Y., November 30, 1982.

Mr. L. CRAIG JOHNSTONE,  
Director, Central American and Panamanian  
Affairs, U.S. Department of State,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSTONE: I am writing in response to your November 22 letter regarding the hiring of an acusador particular. I have circulated your letter to each of the four families and subsequently spoken with each of them. In the course of these discussions the families have asked that I respond.

On November 12, I wrote to inform you that the families were not prepared to hire an acusador particular. In your response you note that the State Department is considering "how we might be of help to the families in meeting the expenses of the acusador particular." While we appreciate this offer of assistance, expense is not the issue.

As we have explained previously, the decision not to hire an acusador particular is based principally on the families' inability to identify any lawyer in El Salvador who would be willing and able to pursue a thorough investigation of the case. As you know, during the past six months the Lawyers Committee and members of the four families have devoted substantial time and expense in an effort to identify independent Salvadoran counsel. After meeting with a number of Salvadoran lawyers in New York, Washington and San Salvador, we have concluded that:

1. Lawyers in El Salvador have grave, and probably justified fears that if they become involved in this case their lives may be jeopardized.

2. In part because of these fears, no lawyer appears willing to help conduct a thorough investigation of the possible involvement of higher authorities in ordering the killings or covering them up.

3. A number of these lawyers have stated to us that they do not believe that the U.S. Embassy in San Salvador supports a more thorough investigation of the case.

Until these conditions change, it does not seem possible that, in your words "the concerns and doubts of the family members can be thoroughly explored and, hopefully, put to rest."

Concerning the investigation itself, your letter raises several additional points. You write that the U.S. Government will "continue to pursue any leads, no matter where they will take us" but that "to date, no evidence has come to light which would give credibility to allegations of higher level involvement in the crime." Based on the record as we know it, this statement is simply not correct.

As you state, "Colindres Aleman's immediate superior was retired Sergeant Dagoberto Martinez Martinez to whom Colindres Aleman confessed his crime after the fact." According to Sgt. Martinez' statement, taken by the FBI in February of this year, Colindres Aleman confessed to him in December 1980 before Sgt. Martinez retired from the National Guard and left the country. At that time Sgt. Martinez urged Colindres Aleman to conceal the murders. Sgt.



Martinez' conduct was itself a crime, misprision of a felony, of which there has been no investigation and no prosecution.

A second testimony was provided to the court on August 9, 1982 by a national guardsman named Julio Cesar Valle Espinoza. Regarding this testimony, you say "Mr. Valle did state early in his declaration that the Sergeant [Sub-sergeant Colindres Aleman] had mentioned that the guardsmen were detaining the churchwomen's vehicle pursuant to high orders."

Six days after Mr. Valle testified in August, a New York lawyer and member of our Board of Directors, Scott Greathead, went to El Salvador on our behalf to assess the status of the investigation and to meet with lawyers. During his visit, Mr. Greathead met with Benjamin Cestoni, the Salvadoran prosecutor handling this case, and with a representative of the U.S. Embassy. In each meeting Mr. Greathead asked specifically if there was any evidence in the court record suggesting that the five guardsmen were acting under orders. Both the prosecutor and the Embassy representative stated unequivocally that no such evidence had been presented.

In your letter you seek to assure the families that "our government remains committed to seeing that all of those responsible for the murders are brought to justice." While we welcome that commitment, the families are not going to be satisfied until these and other leads are fully explored and a full and fair investigation takes place.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL H. POSNER.●

#### A MAN FOR ALL SEASONS

### HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a pleasure and a great privilege for me to have the opportunity to honor Fred Massimini. Fred's untiring service and selfless dedication to his community and to his church exemplify those shining qualities, seldom noted in our newspapers, that have made our country the most generous in the world. It is certainly no exaggeration to say that Fred's accomplishments read like a "Who's Who in America."

Following distinguished military service in the United States Marine Air Corps in the South Pacific during World War II—for which he received the Purple Heart—Fred returned to North Hollywood and established his own business doing custom cabinet-making for homes and fine offices. Fred's reputation for excellent work soon spread and his company became increasingly busier. Some of his excellent creations include cabinets for the rectory at St. Charles Catholic Church, which he donated. He and his lovely wife Dolly were active in the affairs of their church—Fred served on the St. Charles Parish Council and Dolly was president of the women's auxiliary in 1958.

As his children grew, Fred developed an interest in youth groups and became manager of the North Hollywood Cardinals Little League team from 1956 to 1961. He also became district chairman of Boy Scouts of America. In addition, Fred was special projects chairman for refurbished Colonia Guerrero Orphanage in Baja, Calif., through the North Hollywood Rotary Club from 1974 through 1977. He also served as major gifts chairman for East Valley YMCA from 1978 through 1981. Supporting educational endeavors, he contributed his time and financial support to the North Hollywood High School band and athletic groups. Fred is a past president of the Patron's Club of Notre Dame High School and chairman of the fund raising committee from 1963 to 1967. Fred was also a founding father of North Hollywood Boys Club in 1969.

Realizing the important role that health care plays in the communities of the San Fernando Valley, Fred served as a member of the executive committee of the advisory board of St. Joseph Medical Center as well as a member of the board of directors from 1976 to 1981. Fred donated \$10,000 to St. Joseph's which sponsored one complete private room, including furniture. He currently serves on the executive board of St. Elizabeth Convalescent Hospital of Toluca Lake. Fred is also a member of the fund raising committee for Villa Scalabrini Home for the Retired in Sun Valley and has devoted much time and financial help to the San Fernando Valley Association for the Retarded.

Recognizing the importance of community service organizations, Fred became an active member of the North Hollywood Rotary Club, climaxing in his service as president in 1977-78 and serving on the board of directors from 1967 to 1980. Fred is currently a member of the San Fernando Valley Business and Professional Association, Police Community Council, and Police Activity League. On the social and sports scene, he is a longtime member of the Lakeside Gold Club and on the political side is a member of the Lincoln Club.

Fred Massimini's most outstanding contribution to his community has been his enthusiastic support of the North Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, in particular, his unending participation on many of the chamber's committees such as redevelopment, antigraffiti, industrial, and ways and means. At one time or another, Fred served as either chairman or member of virtually every committee the chamber has had over his span of 33 years' membership.

It has been said that it is better to light one candle than to curse the darkness. Fred Massimini's candle has shown brightly and in the process given warmth and cheer to those

about him. Thank you, Fred, and congratulations. We're proud of you.●

#### BAHA'IS OF IRAN

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Baha'is in Iran have suffered tremendous pressure and persecution at the hands of the Moslem fundamentalist regime in that country. Recently, I joined with other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee in writing to the President to urge his support for maximum humanitarian assistance to those Baha'is fleeing as refugees from Iran and to direct our representatives to appropriate international fora to express our moral outrage over this situation. In addition, I feel that the United Nations should send special representatives to Iran to investigate the persecution of the Baha'is.

An article by Georgie Anne Geyer, which appeared in the November 16 Washington Times, reports on the tragic situation that exists in Iran and on the arrests, murders, and religious persecution that suggests a genocidal campaign by the Iranian regime against the members of the Bahai faith. I would like to insert this article as I believe that world attention should be directed to this tragedy:

#### BAHAIS IN IRAN: MASSACRES GO ON

(Georgie Anne Geyer)

While world attention has recently focused on the courageous Israeli investigation into the Beirut massacres, massacres continue unabated elsewhere. Little people pass unknown and often unmourned into history.

The Ayatollah Khomeini's maniacal Iran, for instance, has been trying, with all its skill at killing, to wipe out a small, tolerant, education-loving religious group, the Bahais. But the human spirit prevails in extraordinary ways.

"The massacres in Lebanon were not a surprise to the Bahais," Yale Professor Firuz Kazemzadeh told me recently. "There have always been massacres in the Middle East. There could be millions more (who will) die."

But he, unlike many Americans, knows why. "Khomeini is totalitarian," he said. "He feels that he is in control of all truth, that he will 'purify' the earth and stop the 'corruption.' If you grant that fundamentalist view, then you remove the leg to cure the body."

"But Americans are not prepared to believe that. How can it be? Something else must be operating."

The siege of the small Bahai faith over the last two years in Iran is classic persecution. First, the entire top leadership was taken away and murdered by Khomeini's people. The leaders who replaced them were then eliminated too. The third group boldly sent Khomeini a list of their names and addresses. So far they have not been touched.

It is eerie to see a picture of the leadership—tolerant, educated men and women, people who talked of love in the world—and to know that every single one has been killed. And the next group, too.

Several hundred Bahais are also still in jail. From 3,000 to 5,000 have been driven out of their homes, and over 10,000 have fled the country, going to "holding pens" in Pakistan and Turkey. Those who stay are deprived of jobs; their children are deprived of school. Perhaps eventually their lives will be forfeit too.

The world today seems to be returning to the period of the great "religious" wars. But one has to be careful about the language. As Kazemzadeh points out, whether "Christians" Phalangists kill "Moslem" Palestinians or "Shiite" Persians kill "Bahais," what these conflicts really amount to is a return to tribalism and clan—with all that means in terms of vengeance and the destruction of whole people and religions.

In Iran, he points out, the zealotry is a harnessing of extreme reactionaries and the exploiting of a mixed rhetoric of nationalism, xenophobia and fear of the unknown.

Ironically, what all of this "religious" fanaticism has brought about is the grouping of the entire intellectual life of the country (what is left of it) around the Tudeh or Communist Party.

The Tudeh, which cooperates strategically with Khomeini and his increasingly mendacious mullahs, now controls about a third of the foreign ministry. It is the only group allowed to publish scholarly articles, so even the non-communists intellectuals use the Tudeh to get their works published.

What is so arresting about this new travail of the Bahais, who believe in the consecutive revelations of God through many prophets, is that it is precisely the Bahais who personify tolerance. They believe in the acceptance of differences, the equality of the races and sexes, the harmony of religion in science, the establishment of a world federation, the maintenance of world peace through collective security and a universal auxiliary language.

It is not too extreme to say that the Bahais represent light in the world; and the Khomeini forces, darkness. But in our "rational" world, we have recently forgotten that darkness always tries to oppress light. As Kazemzadeh, one of the 100,000 American Bahais, put it:

"Tolerance was always present only at the edges of Europe when it became prosperous, or when there existed a stalemate of classes or religion. In the West, our memories are short."

He and the Bahais reluctantly have come to the conclusion that since there are no commissions in inquiry in Iran as there are in Israel, the Bahais' only choice is to publicize the massacres of their own people there. "No matter how much of a murderer you are," he says, "you don't want to do it in the sunlight." Meanwhile, "the Bahais stand on their principles and die." He paused and then added sadly, "And those principles of non-violence and tolerance . . . are the hardest ones to stand for."●

## IMMIGRATION REFORM AND CONTROL ACT OF 1982

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1982 is in my opinion very poor legislation. It, among other things, extends immediate legalization or amnesty to all illegal aliens who have been in the United States since January of 1978.

No one knows how many people this involves. The estimates range from a low of 3 million to a high of 12 million. One year is given to the Immigration Service to complete the adjudication on this matter. There are no systems prescribed for adjudication nor any appellate apparatus.

Supposing, for example, that 6 million illegal aliens come forward: Who is going to judge 6 million cases? The Immigration Service cannot handle its present obligation, let alone take on a task of such monumental proportions. And it is not just a question of checking documents. Some are going to say:

I was here illegally—I took all my pay in cash—I didn't have a social security number—I never put anything in my own name, but my friend here will testify that I was here on January 1 of 1978, because we had a beer together. And when he's finished I will then testify that he too was here based on the same beer.

Who is going to undertake the fantastic problem of trying to adjudicate these claims?

This is also then an open invitation for anyone not already here to quickly come and tell the same story with witnesses whom I am sure can be obtained.

In the meantime, nobody knows if this rather watered down employer sanction provision, which is supposed to be the solution to the illegal alien problem, is going to work. Failure to comply does not become a criminal offense until several violations have accrued. Nobody knows if it will work or if it will not. No additional resources are being allocated either to the border patrol, which presently has less officers than the Capitol Police Force, nor to the computerizing of the Immigration Service, which now keeps its visas in shoeboxes and has no idea who among those who come in with visas have in fact left and who are illegally staying here beyond their time as either students or whatever.

I recognize that the huge illegal alien problem has to be addressed. It is not a healthy situation to allow this subculture to go on existing and festering and being exploited. It seems to me, however, that we are going about it the wrong way.

In my opinion, the orderly way to a solution of this problem is as follows:

One. Put into effect employer sanctions and test them for a period of time to see how effectively they curtail the flow of immigrants.

Two. At the same time, devote sufficient assets and resources to greatly expanding the capability and adequacy of the border patrol, the Coast Guard, and the computerization of the Immigration Service.

Three. When satisfied that the border is reasonably secure and that the Immigration Service is in a position to control the coming and going of visaed visitors, we should then move up the registry date. The registry date is a date which is presently fixed at 1948. Any illegal alien under present law, who was here in 1948 can apply to the Attorney General for legalization. This is granted if there is no criminal record and the party is self-supporting. Now we should first move that date, say, to 1970, which makes it a realistic date and instruct the Attorney General to be liberal in his granting of legal status to those who apply and see how many come forward. We should at all times keep control of the situation. When we are then satisfied that we have exhausted that number, move the registry date again to say 1975 and go through the same process. Gradually bringing the date up to the relatively current date.

In this way, we will have tested the adequacy of our deterrence, both by way of employer sanction and Border Patrol, Coast Guard, and a computerized Immigration Service and we will have, in an orderly process, over a period of time, gradually eliminated, without ever losing control of it, the illegal alien problem.

To approach this matter any other way threatens to virtually bankrupt many States or the Federal Government which will be immediately blamed by the States for the drain on revenue available for welfare, Medicaid, education, and whatnot. We are literally under the proposed bill, opening Pandora's box, just as the Carter administration did in connection with the Cuban Marielito immigrants, when they suddenly opened the gates and were buried with 125,000 criminals, mentally disturbed people, and whatnot—far more than they were able to handle and far more than they bargained for. It just seems to me that that mistake should be still fresh in our minds and we should get into this situation, recognizing it has been addressed, but in a way that is designed to keep it under control. To get rid of the current reservoir of illegals without inviting all the others waiting to become illegals to come in and without ever losing control of an orderly process for adjudicating the cases involved.●



COMMENDATION FOR  
RESPONSIBLE STUDENT LOANS

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, in recent years I have expressed my disappointment with the growing rate of defaults of student loans. At the same time, I have also highlighted those institutions of higher learning that exhibited remarkable success in impressing upon their students the necessity in repaying their student loans in a timely and responsible fashion. Tuskegee Institute, located in Alabama's Third Congressional District, is one of the institutions which has repeatedly received high marks for loan repayment.

In today's Wall Street Journal, Tuskegee Institute is finally getting national attention for a job well done.

Not only is Tuskegee Institute's loan default percentage far below the national average, it is one of the lowest in Alabama and even lower than that of Harvard University.

At a time when many in Congress have been critical of the failures found in Federal loan programs, I am proud to represent a university in the Congress which believes that if a debt is incurred, a debt should be repaid.

For the reading of my House colleagues, I submit to the RECORD of this body the article "As Student-Loan Default Rules Tighten, Tuskegee's Success Gets a Lot of Attention." I believe the attention is rightfully deserved.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 1, 1982]

AS STUDENT-LOAN DEFAULT RULES TIGHTEN,  
TUSKEGEE'S SUCCESS GETS A LOT OF ATTENTION

(By Sonia L. Nazario)

TUSKEGEE, ALA.—Last summer, the Reagan administration announced it would stop making student loans to any college or university with a loan-default rate of more than 25%. The ruling fell heavily on the nation's historically black institutions, and 47% of them were cut off from new federal lending.

But at Tuskegee Institute, the country's biggest private black college, the ruling caused scarcely a ripple. When it comes to squeezing money out of its former students, the venerable institution, most of whose students are poor, has one of the best collections records anywhere. "We're bullish on collecting," says Napoleon Thomas, Tuskegee's staff loan collector.

About 97% of Tuskegee's students get financial aid of some sort. Two-thirds rely on the government's national Direct Student Loan program, in which default standards have tightened. But Tuskegee's NDSL default rate runs at only 5.7%, far lower than the average for black institutions, less than half the 13% for all federally aided institutions of higher learning and even below Harvard University's 7.5%.

ATTRACTING ATTENTION

That's not bad for a school whose students come from families with average earnings of less than \$12,000 a year, half the national average for families of college students. The low delinquency rate at Tuskegee is drawing considerable attention from other institutions with college troubles. Education Secretary Terrel Bell has even cited Tuskegee's collection success as an example of how things ought to work.

Pride and idealism help. So do Tuskegee's steady prodding of debtors and its no-nonsense approach to finance. "The loan collection process begins when you hand out the money," says Walter Sapp, who administers the NDSL loan program at Tuskegee. Mr. Thomas, the bill collector, has had his office moved next to the counter where students pick up their loan checks as a pointed reminder.

The real job starts once the student leaves Tuskegee. Repayments of federal loans are supposed to begin in six months. Deadbeats get personalized bills stamped in "the deepest purplish red I can get," Mr. Thomas says, with slogans as mild as "oops, did you forget?" or as ominous as "further action pending." Lest there arise any misunderstanding, each notice states, "This is a bill."

Mr. Thomas, a rotund, double-chinned man, doesn't shy from subterfuge. He varies the styles of envelopes in which bills get mailed to reduce the possibility that a debtor will spot the bill by the envelope and discard it unopened. He also uses letterheads of the college's attorney to shake up nonpayers. Accounts of the most persistent deadbeats get referred to collection agencies. "This is a job that if you want to be liked," he says, "you don't do."

It's a job done poorly at many other places. "The socioeconomic conditions of blacks are naturally going to make them a higher risk," says Christopher S. Edley, executive director of the United Negro College Fund. He asserts that 65 percent of black college students come from families whose income falls below the poverty level. "There is some correlation between unemployment and paying back these loans," says Elias Blake, president of Clark College in Atlanta. Nearly 22 percent of black college graduates between 20 and 24 are unemployed, almost five times the rate for non-minority graduates of the same age.

Educators say poor black students often lack the conditioning that encourages prompt repayment. "Many of our students come from families that have never had a checkbook," Mr. Edley says.

The pressure to reduce defaults nevertheless appears to have had an effect at some black colleges. "My college has gone down from 40 percent to a 20 percent default rate this year," Mr. Blake says. Although he foresees little additional decline, he says, "We've been talking to places like Tuskegee to see how they're doing it."

Mr. Thomas freely discloses his secrets. It's important to keep good track of debtors' addresses to make sure they get their bills, he says. Even the hometown minister is summoned to divine the whereabouts of a former student. When debtors say they never got their bills, he tells them, "Tuskegee hasn't moved since 1881." Mr. Thomas says he and his superiors have no fear of alienating graduates "by sending the collection agencies after them," but only about 16 percent of the defaulters do have to contend with the agencies. To those who repay, he says, "We send appreciation letters."

Tuskegee starts early inculcating the idea that taking out a loan requires paying it

back. "Future generations of students may or may not have an opportunity for educational development depending on how well you pay back your loans," Tuskegee president Benjamin F. Payton said at the commencement address. It means, says senior Melvin L. Bobo III, that repaying his loan will help another needy student, not just a faceless "federal government." He says, "If you don't pay back the loans, someone else may never get here."

"Students see this place as some sort of Mecca," says Julian E. Thomas, professor of biology, and there is a pride in the institute and the town itself, largely governed by blacks, that many wish to share.

HELPING WITH EMPLOYMENT

Recent cuts in federal student aid mean that Tuskegee can now provide only 65% of the financial assistance that students need. The college itself has begun making short-term loans for the remaining 35%. Those loans must be repaid before the beginning of the next semester, or the borrower cannot re-register. That helps condition students to repay loans.

Tuskegee also helps provide employment—the best guarantee of loan repayment of all. Since its founding by Booker T. Washington 100 years ago, the institute has stressed vocational education. And today, says Ruby Robinson, a junior, "Students have a really good chance of getting a job out of here."

Many students and former students seem grateful. "They couldn't have done it without Mother Tuskegee," Professor Thomas says. "If it weren't for Tuskegee helping me, I'd be at home waitressing right now," says Debbie Smith, a junior, both of whose parents were jobless all summer.

"I don't know how many times I ran out of money and packed my bags my freshman year," Dexter Campbell says. "But friends and Tuskegee pulled me through."

In economic terms, says Pearle Bailey, a freshman, "I guess students think they're getting their money's worth. Why would you try to rip them"—Tuskegee—"off?" ●

REFORMING PRISON  
STANDARDS IN TEXAS

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make my colleagues aware of the work of Charles and Pauline Sullivan who have devoted themselves to the reform of Texas prisons. An article which appeared in the Fort Worth Star Telegram describes their tireless dedication to the improvement of the penitentiary system and their emphasis on the need to humanize our approach to the institutionalization of these individuals.

The article follows:

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star Telegram, Sept. 19, 1982]

FORMER NUN, PRIEST DEDICATE LIVES TO  
REFORMING PRISON STANDARDS

(By BOB LLOYD)

AUSTIN, TEX.—As lobbyists go, Charles and Pauline Sullivan don't quite fit the mold.

The former Catholic priest and nun have spent the past decade—not in tailored business suits, but in cast-off clothes—fighting for prison reform. They have no car or phone. They live on \$350 a month, walk 3 miles to work and represent a group of people who can't even vote.

Yet the guest list to their organization's recent annual conference indicates that the Sullivans and Citizens United for Rehabilitation of Errants (CURE) have earned respect as the major citizen voice for prison reform in Texas.

"They are practically the only voice in prison reform in Texas in a legislative forum," said state Sen. Ray Farabee, D-Wichita Falls.

Although prison and state officials have spoken at CURE workshops before, the guest list had never been so distinguished.

Attorney General Mark White, the Democratic nominee for governor who has been on the opposing side of prison lawsuits, spoke and fielded questions from more than 100 CURE members.

George Strake, the tough law-and-order Republican candidate for lieutenant governor, braved the unfriendly climate and gave his stands about prison issues, some of which sharply conflict with CURE's goals.

John Byrd, executive director of the Board of Pardons and Paroles; S.O. Woods, director of prison records and classification; David Myers, warden of Jester Unit; and Chris Mealy, director of the governor's clemency division, sat through three hours of pointed questions from inmates' relatives about parole and furlough decisions.

"It shows we've come a long way," Sullivan said. "They cannot ignore us now. The issue is one of the top issues in the state."

During the last 10 years, criticism of the troubled Texas prison system has soared as much as the prison population. The Sullivans have been among the most critical.

Some officials believe the Sullivans have been in the right place at the right time and are successful simply because the issue has become heated.

Yet they agree that the Sullivans have made inroads in prison reform, chiefly on their own credibility and dedication.

They operate CURE, which has a membership of 2,000, on less than \$11,000 a year. They rent a duplex in one of Austin's poorer neighborhoods. Most of their clothes are donated, even from sympathetic legislators.

"I always say: 'Whatever Joe (Hernandez, D-San Antonio) is wearing this session, I'll be wearing the next,'" Sullivan said.

Even those who sometimes disagree with the Sullivans respect them.

"They exemplify one of the most dedicated couples I've seen in a lobbying or advocacy effort," Farabee said. "Tireless efforts. Intense moral commitment."

"They have no money. They don't have a large public following. But I've never heard anyone question their dedication. You don't hear criticism of them as much as the ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union). Even among people who sharply disagree with them, you don't hear slurs."

"I have grown over the past 3½ years to know them," said Harry Whittington, an Austin attorney and member of the prison board. "I would say they are on a different level from most people because of their budget. But they are sincere people and dedicated."

"They do their homework and do their job. . . . They must do a credible job. There are not too many people waiting to replace them because of their budget."

Mealy said: "Though they have a very little budget, those people are responsible almost single-handedly for lobbying efforts for reform."

The Sullivans' efforts are also respected by their friends.

"Charles and Pauline have accomplished more good with less money than any other lobbying group in the history of Texas. And they've done it with just hard work and perseverance," said John Duncan, director of the Texas Civil Liberties Union.

Sullivan says CURE's efforts helped establish two state agencies—the Texas Commission on Jail Standards, in 1975, and the Adult Probation Commission, in 1977.

Sullivan also claimed victory in helping establish the situational furlough program in 1979. The program allows the prison system to give inmates furloughs at any time. The Legislature gave money to halfway houses in 1981—a measure CURE supported—but the Sullivans say they played only a background role in that effort.

"You try to create an atmosphere," Sullivan said. "We've let the facts speak for themselves. The situation is bad enough. We don't need to exaggerate it."

Observers say the Sullivans' persistence has made legislators more aware of prison problems, adding that it is difficult, however, to assess their impact.

"As far as the board itself, we haven't had much opportunity to say this is being done or not being done because of CURE," Whittington said. "Some of the board members are agitated by the positions they take. Some of the board members feel they (board members) are being picked out or singled out."

"CURE does serve a purpose. They represent the viewpoint of people in the penitentiaries who are being treated one way or the other. The manner of their treatment is something they can comment upon."

The Sullivans teamed with inmate David Ruiz, who filed the federal court case that led to recent prison-reform mandates. They say CURE benefited from supporting Ruiz.

"That's symbiotic relationship," Sullivan said. "We kind of fed off of each other."

The Sullivans' interest in prison reform began about 11 years ago, after a friend was arrested in San Antonio.

Sullivan led a demonstration outside the jail, yelling to prisoners on the fifth floor to join a hunger strike.

He was arrested and spent five days in jail, but he and his wife did not begin their push for reform until after they were arrested in a 1972 Washington, D.C., peace demonstration.

They returned to San Antonio and became involved in efforts that would be long-term.

Sullivan ran for Bexar County sheriff in 1972 as a write-in candidate on a jail-reform platform.

They had been told that many families were unable to drive to prisons to see incarcerated relatives. Sullivan organized a trip from San Antonio to Huntsville, and within a week had filled five buses.

"We noticed how many people on the buses were older and retired," he said, "so we thought: 'Hey, let's go up to Austin during the week and lobby.'"

They moved to Austin in 1974 to begin their lobbying.

The Sullivans say that their devotion and ability to subsist on a small salary is because of religious training. They say their satisfaction is derived from helping people adjust to life in prison.

They remain close with several ex-inmates who are trying to stay free. Yet their chief functions are fighting for better conditions in Texas prisons.

Sullivan says he does not particularly respect some legislators with whom he must be friendly, but that to effect change, he has learned to play the lobbying game.

By most accounts, the Sullivans have learned the rules.

"You've got to be on the jury to hang the jury," Sullivan said. "You've got to keep asking yourself: 'Are you hanging the jury?'"

## WASTE IN NORTH DAKOTA

### HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support efforts to cut funding for the Garrison diversion unit when the energy and water appropriations bill comes up for a vote.

The controversy over this project has taken many twists and turns. I would like to bring my colleagues' attention to a new twist they may not be aware of—that of the suit brought by South Dakota landowners to enjoin construction until the impacts of the Garrison project on the James River are ascertained.

I think it is significant that Garrison has been fraught with problems at every turn, and that fact should be a red flag to each of us today. Once again, citizens have banded together to challenge the wisdom of this \$1 billion boondoggle. As this ill fated project threatens to enter their backdoor and contaminate their water, South Dakotans have taken action. Add their names to the citizens of Manitoba, Canada, concerned members of many conservation groups, and overburdened taxpayers.

The newest development in the Garrison case was brought about when the Department of the Interior modified the Garrison project, splitting construction into phases. Phase 1, underway now, will irrigate a small portion of the project in southeastern North Dakota. However, run off from phase 1 will enter the James River with unknown consequences. Because this action was never contemplated in the original environmental impact statement, the implications for this modification by the Department of the Interior are anybody's guess. The landowners of South Dakota do not think that is good enough and want some facts before construction continues. I think they have a point.

What unforeseen problems lie ahead? The Canadian issue has not been resolved, mitigation plans are woefully inadequate as they stand now. There is growing public opposi-



tion to Garrison within North Dakota itself. The South Dakotans have entered the fray. How can we in good conscience appropriate money for a project with so many bad turns?

I urge this Congress to cut funding for the Garrison diversion unit and pave the way for serious reconsideration of the project itself. Surely the taxpayers' money is scarce enough without throwing it down this rathole. Surely we owe it to our constituents to look this over carefully, meet these concerns and resolve them before any more financial resources are committed. I hope you will join me in opposing this problem-ridden North Dakota albatross. ●

#### ATTACK ON PEARL HARBOR TO BE REMEMBERED

### HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, December 7 will mark the 41st anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, an attack which catapulted the United States into World War II.

The "day of infamy" proclaimed by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt will long be remembered in the annals of world history. Two thousand four hundred Americans were killed in action on that day as a result of the sneak attack of the Japanese military machine.

Many men from the State of New Jersey were on military duty in Hawaii on that eventful day, with many casualties.

I am proud to report today that the Jersey City Pearl Harbor Memorial Committee will be holding its sixth annual observance of the anniversary on December 5 at Liberty State Park in Jersey City, in full view of our beloved Statue of Liberty. The annual event has become the biggest of its kind in the United States. The observance's success is strengthened by the dedication and drive of Richard T. Bozzone, Sr., who was recently reelected to head the Jersey City Pearl Harbor Committee, which will have representation from the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, Jewish War Veterans, Catholic War Veterans, Gold Star Mothers, Veterans of World War I, AMVETS, Navy Mothers, and other groups, including outstanding service organizations such as the Jersey City Elks Club.

This year Dick Bozzone has chosen as cochairmen of the event Edward Meehan, the Americanization chairman of the Jersey City-East District Elks; Stanley Stine, a U.S. Navy veteran who served aboard the battleship U.S.S. *Missouri*; Benjamin Fleisch-

man, a veteran of the attack; Dr. John Kopycinski, of the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry and a Polish-American community leader; and George Danko, a U.S. veteran who was at the attack.

It has been my pleasure to participate in this event each year, which has as one of its high points the placing of a commemorative wreath in the waters of the Hudson River as well as bringing a wreath to Bedloe Island, the home of the Statue of Liberty.

America has witnessed many changes since 1941, both at home and in the international arena. From the devastation and horror of World War II emerged technology which has ultimately aided peace and communication. The world is much smaller now due to the development and refinement of aircraft, which received a baptism of fire in this awesome conflict. We have seen in the past 41 years the development of the space age and nuclear weapons, whose production we hope and pray will help us avoid another world conflict. We have overcome the attack on Pearl Harbor and the ensuing 4 years of World War II to begin to develop better understanding among men and women throughout the world.

Although we have had severe problems with racism and human rights, we are working to overcome them, and the rapport which has resulted between the peace-loving people of Japan and our Nation is exemplary. It indeed proves that there is no place for bigotry and hatred. It was Daniel O'Connell who said:

Bigotry has no head and cannot think, no heart and cannot feel. When she moves it is in wrath; when she pauses it is amid ruin. Her prayers are curses, her God is a demon, her communion is death, her vengeance is eternity, her decalogue written in the blood of her victims, and if she stops for a moment in her infernal flight it is upon a kindred rock to whet her vulture fang for a more sanguinary desolation.

The economic and social adjustments made by both nations involved in the Pearl Harbor attack have become the great hope of mankind, showing that if men of good will join heart and hand, unhappy situations may be corrected.

It was Alan K. Paton who said:

The tragedy is not that things are broken. The tragedy is that they are not mended again.

I wish to commend Richard Bozzone and his group, and the Fort Hamilton Army unit which annually has sent military personnel and their band to attend the ceremonies.

A special tribute must be paid to the millions of men and women who served in our Armed Forces during World War II and the great sacrifices they made. Thousands upon thousands of them still are in veteran's hospitals throughout the country.

While we appreciate the courage with which men have died, we also must pay tribute to the courage with which many have lived since December 7, 1941.

In closing, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to thank all those in the group which will be at Liberty State Park on December 5, remembering that momentous day of 41 years ago, and especially remembering those who have died.

Ralph G. Ingersoll eloquently puts in proper perspective the tribute we pay to the dead of December 7, 1941, and, indeed, all who have made the supreme sacrifice for freedom in Korea and Vietnam:

These heroes are dead. They died for liberty—they died for us. They are at rest. They sleep in the land they made free, under the flag they rendered stainless, under the solemn pines, the sad hemlocks, the tearful willows, the embracing vines. They sleep beneath the shadow of the clouds, careless alike of sunshine or storm, each in the windowless palace of rest. Earth may run red with other wars—they are at peace. In the midst of conflicts, they found the serenity of death.

I am asking that Americans all please join me in my salute to the Jersey City Pearl Harbor Memorial Committee for their role in remembering this day. We must remember the past to awaken the future of our Nation, ever mindful that no nation can build its destiny alone. The age of worldwide interdependence is here and now. We must work and pray for a worldwide victory of peace and justice for humanity, for no people who have survived the trials and tribulations of hundreds and thousands of years should be compelled to surrender their traditions, values, aspirations, and cultures—and their existence—now. ●

#### SUPPORT ADEQUATE POSTAL APPROPRIATIONS

### HON. DONALD JOSEPH ALBOSTA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Speaker, I want to let it be known that I was unable to be here for the vote on the Treasury-Postal Appropriations bill Tuesday, November 30, but that if I had been here, I would have voted for the bill as a majority of my colleagues did in passing H.R. 7158.

One of the most important things that the Congress did in approving this bill was to approve an appropriation for the Postal Service that is large enough to prevent a drastic increase in postal rates for nonprofit mailers, newspaper and magazine publishers, shippers of books and records, and other mailers that perform public ser-

vices heavily dependent on affordable postage rates.

The bill contains \$708 million for the U.S. Postal Service which is \$208 more than the administration requested. Although that figure may be reduced somewhat before the bill is finally approved by both Houses, this greater support means direct assistance to the very groups that have been hit hardest by both past budget cuts and the depression we are now in. Churches and charities raise much of their budgets through the mail. Studies by the Urban Institute and others show that the private nonprofits cannot step in and replace all of the lost Government safety-net of services while absorbing skyrocketing mailing costs. In fact, their services have been cut back to meet unexpected rate increases that went far beyond the scheduled changes on which they had relied when making up their budgets. This same pressure is felt by publishers who are particularly important to rural areas such as the 10th district where people rely heavily on the mail.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I supported a budget, an authorization and an appropriation that would provide postage rates at least as reasonable as those anticipated in the schedule established originally in 1971. There is no reason to break our promise to these mailers and to the American people by forcing these rates up at an ever faster rate.

I expect to continue to support reasonable and reliable rates and oppose efforts to raise them at the expense of those who rely most heavily on America's information and service organizations. ●

#### SOVIET WATCH: SOME ANDROPOV SAYINGS

#### HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce this article on Yuri V. Andropov for the perusal of my colleagues.

(By Albert L. Weeks)

#### SOME ANDROPOV SAYINGS

Just weeks before the Soviet military invasion of Afghanistan, December 1979, the green-buck-ram volume of speeches and writings of Yuri V. Andropov appeared in Moscow bookstores. Few other top Soviet leaders had had their "works" published—Brezhnev, Kosygin, Suslov, Kirilenko, Ustinov. So, the appearance of *Izbranniye Rechi i Stat'i* (Selected Speeches and Articles) by Yu. V. Andropov clearly indicated the KGB chief's new-found status among his peers in the Politburo and Secretariat.

Andropov's writing contain some emphases and nuances as well as outright assertions that give some indication of the new

general secretary's political line. The following excerpts are arranged according to a few categories of Soviet concerns, foreign and domestic. A reading of the complete volumes reveals Andropov's positions on such question as civil rights, the Soviet military buildup, labor discipline, foreign policy, Red China, the United States, "national-liberation struggle," world revolution—positions that can scarcely be labeled "liberal."

Moreover, the stands he takes in his speeches and writings are often repeated in his successive writings—a hint that such stands may express themselves in Kremlin policy-making now under his guidance. On civil rights, labor discipline, foreign policy, and the U.S. Andropov is hard-line; on reconciliation with China he is rigid, unyielding; on "poletarian internationalism" (world revolution) he is militant.

United States: "The most reactionary circles in imperialist states, and above all in the United States, try in every way to stop the strengthening of detente (and to) sharpen international tensions. . . Such zigzags in Washington's policies with respect to detente demand that we take corresponding measures to cope with them."—*Ibid.*, p. 292.

"Strengthening mutual understanding and trust today is an important condition for success in securing a lasting peace, scaling down the arms race, disarmament, and improving the international situation. If the ruling circles of the U.S.A. and the other Western countries are ready, as they claim, to help in such efforts, they they should desist in their efforts to aggravate the atmosphere with hostility. This is an obvious truth, and it is important that it be understood quickly in the West."—*Ibid.*, p. 271.

"The ideological struggle (with capitalism) cannot, of course, be suppressed; it is an historical struggle on the merits of the socialist system as opposed to the capitalist, and about the road to be taken to reach the heights of progress. Such a struggle is inevitable and will continue to be in the future."—*Ibid.*, p. 270.

"Meanwhile, subversive centers abroad step up their activities through such means as Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. . . They demand of us, no less, that we place no obstacles in the way of such activity; . . . Such activity is nothing other than evidence of hostile intent violating the principles of detente and the Helsinki agreements."—*Ibid.*, p. 270-1.

World revolution: "Marxism-Leninism is the textbook for achieving socialist world revolution and the building of a new society in every country of the world."—*Ibid.*, p. 73.

"The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is in the vanguard of the world-revolutionary movement. It represents the very highest ideals of contemporary life and organically embodies the reason, honor, and conscience of our epoch."—*Ibid.*, p. 171.

Civil rights: "Our constitution clearly spells out the rights of Soviet citizens to criticize and make suggestions. . . . But among us are individuals who suffer from political and ideological confusion, or from religious fanaticism, nationalistic pride, or psychological instability. . . . With such persons it is necessary to undertake a process of reeducation (and) to apply penal sanctions to the fullest extent."—*Ibid.*, p. 269.

"We cannot shut our eyes to anti-state crimes, anti-Soviet activities and behavior which results from foreign influence. . . . The organs of state security, the KGB, merely carry out the wishes of the Soviet people, who severely condemn criminal activities by cast-offs from socialist society."—*Ibid.*, p. 311. ●

#### KARL MARX OR JESUS CHRIST—THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

#### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the World Council of Churches has compiled an unbroken record of supporting Communist and leftwing causes all over the world. Never does the World Council ever contribute to an anti-Communist organization or loudly criticize a Soviet action. This activity has embroiled the council in controversy, loss of membership, and money. Therefore, the howls of rage were predictable when the Reader's Digest published an article about this subject in its August 1982 issue. However, to the best of my knowledge, the World Council has not been able to disprove a single claim made in the article. As the saying goes, "If the shoe fits, wear it." The article follows:

[From the Reader's Digest, August 1982]

WHICH MASTER IS THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES SERVING—KARL MARX OR JESUS CHRIST?

(Joseph A. Harriss)

Bible-toting Masai tribeswomen, necks ringed with ceremonial beads, bearded Russian Orthodox bishops and sarigowned women from Sri Lanka were among the colorful throng of delegates attending the last Assembly of the World Council of Churches (WCC) in Nairobi, Kenya, in 1975.

Almost half of the delegates who gathered there were from Third World countries, and the speeches reflected a militant anti-Western mood. Michael Manley, then prime minister of Jamaica, was applauded when he called for peoples' democracies to replace capitalist states.

The 18-day conference heartily endorsed the WCC's Program to Combat Racism, which gives money to a variety of political organizations, including revolutionary guerrilla movements. It urged the creation of a program to challenge corporations accused of exploiting the Third World. And it denounced South Africa's intervention in Angola, overlooking the fact that the Soviet Union was engineering the arrival of thousands of Cuban troops in Angola.

All in all, the Geneva-based ecumenical organization made clear its preference for social concerns over purely religious ones. It showed that its approach to solving the world's ills owes almost as much to Marxism as to Christianity.

Still, countless World Council supporters were shocked in August 1978 when the WCC announced that its Program to Combat Racism had given \$85,000 to the Patriotic Front, a Marxist guerrilla organization then fighting the white-dominated regime in Rhodesia. At the time of the grant, the Patriotic Front had murdered 207 white civilians and 1712 blacks, and only weeks before had slaughtered nine white missionaries and their children. London's *Daily Express* headlined: "Bloody Money—Rhodesian mission killers get cash aid—courtesy of world's churches." The Salvation Army, a founding member of the WCC, suspended its member-



ship in protest, as did the Irish Presbyterian Church, which called the grant "racism in reverse."

#### HIGH HOPES

The World Council of Churches, today representing 400 million believers, was founded in 1948 in the hope of uniting the world's fragmented Christian churches. But its increasingly aggressive involvement in politics and its financial support of violence have made it a factor of division rather than unity.

The irony is tragic, for the organization is capable of much good. The World Council has helped millions of victims of wars and natural disasters. More than two million refugees have been resettled thanks to WCC funds.

But the council has been focusing its attention more and more on political matters. This change can be attributed to two main causes:

First, its initial goal of Christian unity withered over the years, as the doctrinal differences among the various churches proved to be unyielding, and the largest Christian church of all, the Roman Catholic, refused to join. The organization then shifted to "secular ecumenism." Church unity, the World Council's leaders argued, would be furthered by overcoming mankind's economic, racial, educational and other social ills and problems.

The second reason for the change is the WCC's altered composition. At the council's founding assembly in Amsterdam, churchmen from the Third World made up only a small percentage of the voting delegates; at Nairobi, they amounted to almost half. Of the 301 member churches, only 28 are American.

The Third World viewpoint is incarnate in General Secretary Philip Potter, a 61-year-old West Indian Methodist clergyman. Potter, who presides over a staff of nearly 300 from some 40 countries, makes no bones about his anti-Western, anti-capitalist attitude in his writings and speeches. He is fond of citing Marxist writers. He also admires black-power advocates like Stokeley Carmichael and Malcolm X.

Predictably, many WCC senior staff officers share Potter's views. Says Uruguayan Emilio Castro, head of the council's Commission on World Mission and Evangelism, "The philosophical basis of capitalism is evil, totally contrary to the Gospel."

A logical result of the WCC's evolution into high-profile social activism is the Program to Combat Racism (PCR), which had a budget of \$1 million last year. An official of the PCR is Prexy Nesbitt, an American who came to the WCC from Washington's Institute for Policy Studies, a leftist research organization dedicated to radically changing U.S. political and economic life.

Grants from the PCR's Special Fund, to which donors make specially earmarked contributions, are supposed to be used for humanitarian activities. And, since 1970, the PCR has officially given over \$5 million to more than 130 organizations that are ostensibly fighting racism in some 30 countries. But nearly half of that money has gone to guerrillas seeking the violent overthrow of white regimes in southern Africa. That has included the Soviet-backed MPLA of Angola (\$78,000), the Marxist FRELIMO in Mozambique (\$120,000), and SWAPO in Namibia (\$823,000), which is Russian-supplied and Cuban-trained.

#### BLIND EYE

Africa is not the only area favored with PCR manna to fuel organized social agita-

tion. Special Fund money has gone to Aborigines in Australia, Eskimos in Canada, Koreans in Japan, Moroccans in France, and to Haitians, Chicanos and farm workers in America.

The WCC seems to be making a special effort in the United States, where, PCR director Anwar Barkat says, "racism is the predominant reality." Nearly 40 American groups have received a total of \$572,500. Among the recipients:

The National Conference of Black Lawyers, an affiliate of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers—a group listed by the CIA as an international Soviet-front organization.

The American Indian Movement, which, according to a 1976 Senate Internal Security Subcommittee report, has ties with Cuba, China, the Irish Republican Army, the Palestine Liberation Organization and the U.S. Communist Party.

The Center for National Security Studies, a leftist organization that monitors the CIA and the FBI and advocates further restrictions on American intelligence operations.

Incredibly, not a cent of PCR money goes to dissident groups in the Soviet Union, where the government practices overt repression of ethnic and religious minorities such as Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Moslems and evangelical Christians. Marxist governments in general—and the Soviet Union in particular—get kid-glove treatment by the WCC.

Usually so articulate on human rights, the WCC turns a blind eye to the plight of Ethiopia, where the Marxist government has summarily executed over 10,000 persons for political reasons and closed more than 200 churches. When the WCC Executive Committee got around to mentioning the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, two months after the fact, it said merely that the move had "heightened tension"; in the same communiqué, it went out of its way to express "serious concern" over the NATO decision to deploy new missiles in Europe.

WCC officials justify the lack of public criticism of Soviet human-rights violations by arguing that, with the Kremlin, private approaches are best. In fact, the few polite inquiries the WCC has sent to Moscow—about trials of Russian religious dissidents, for example—have had no visible effect.

The council also contends that not criticizing the Russians ensures that the Russian Orthodox Church will not resign from the WCC in protest. But being gentle with the Kremlin is a high price to pay for the continuing membership of the Russian Orthodox delegation. As Bernard Smith, head of Britain's Christian Affirmation Campaign, asks, "Is this an admission that the WCC is being blackmailed into silence by the Russians? Or does it mean that the WCC is a willing partner to a private arrangement by which the Russian delegates agree to retain their seats provided there is no criticism of the Soviet Union?" Either way, Russian membership effectively neutralizes WCC criticism of socialist countries.

Even before the Russians were admitted to the WCC in 1961, Martin Niemöller, a leading West German theologian who was involved in the long negotiations, asked, "Is there really a church there or only a propaganda instrument? Is the Russian church a servant of Stalin first or of Christ first?"

After years of delay the Kremlin authorized the admission of the Russian church to the WCC at the height of Khrushchev's determined persecution of Russian Christians, one of the worst in the history of the Soviet

Union, when over 10,000 Orthodox churches were forcibly closed. Allowing the Russian church to join the WCC tended to camouflage that action and forestall outside protests. Judging by the results, it was a shrewd move.

#### SOUL-SEARCHING TIME

The WCC today faces a growing backlash. It began with Protestant laity, who have been voting with their feet and their pocket-books. The United Presbyterian Church, which gives more per capita than any other American WCC affiliate, has lost nearly one million members in the last decade. As one Presbyterian lay representative has observed, "We hear deep resentment about the World Council from many church members. They simply feel that the WCC is dominated by people with a leftist ideology." Financial support by U.S. congregations for activities like the WCC has dropped drastically, to less than half of what these activities received in the past.

The grass-roots backlash is now gaining the support of theologians and professional churchmen. Lutheran theologian Richard John Neuhaus, for instance, says, "The WCC has almost become an anti-ecumenical organization by using social and political criteria to distinguish good guys from bad guys. This creates much sharper divisions in the church than any of the old denominational and doctrinal problems did." Says West Germany's Peter Beyerhaus, head of the International Christian Network, "If we don't succeed in bringing the WCC back onto a course that represents its true calling, it would be far better to simply dissolve it."

Plans are now being made for the WCC's Sixth General Assembly, scheduled for July 1983, in Vancouver. This, say many church authorities, is the time for the council to search its soul and rediscover its ecumenical purpose. This time, instead of leaving the entrenched WCC bureaucracy free to determine the assembly's results beforehand, member churches need to take the initiative.

The world's Christians today generally agree that the church must be present with its unique witness on the troubled international scene. For the best example of how to do that, however, WCC officials need turn not to Karl Marx but to Jesus Christ. ●

#### ADDITIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS (EXPLANATION OF H.R. 7327)

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate is now 10.4 percent and rising. Over 11 million Americans are out of work. Areas of this country are experiencing what can only be described as a depression and no one can predict when the economy will begin to recover.

In response to this alarming rate of unemployment, and the terrible hardship faced by the millions of unemployed, in August the Congress passed a temporary Federal supplemental compensation (FSC) program. (This

program was included in the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982.)

Under the FSC program, which began on September 12 of this year, jobless workers who have exhausted all other State and Federal unemployment benefits may receive additional weeks of federally financed benefits. The number of weeks of FSC benefits that jobless workers may receive depends on (a) the number of weeks of regular State unemployment benefits received by each claimant, and (b) the State in which the claimant lives. Qualified claimants are entitled to receive FSC benefits for one-half of the number of weeks they received regular State unemployment benefits, up to a maximum of 10, 8, or 6 weeks. The maximum is 10 weeks of FSC benefits in States in which Federal/State extended benefits are being paid or have been paid at any time since June 1, 1982.

A maximum of 8 weeks is payable in States in which the insured unemployment rate equals or exceeds 3.5 percent; and up to 6 weeks of FSC can be

paid in all other States. As of November 13, the FSC maximum was 10 weeks in 38 States, 8 weeks in 3 States and 6 weeks in 12 States. (A copy of the most recent "FSC trigger status," which shows the number of weeks of FSC benefits payable in each State as of November 13, is included at the end of this statement.)

FSC is a 6-month program that will expire on March 31, 1983. When enacted, it was hoped that strong signs of economic recovery would emerge during the program's 6-month duration creating new employment opportunities. FSC was intended to bridge the gap for jobless workers until new employment became available. Unfortunately, recovery is not eminent and thousands of jobless workers are exhausting FSC benefits without finding new employment. The exhaustion rate will increase over the next few years.

Yesterday, I introduced legislation, H.R. 7327, that will provide additional weeks of FSC benefits. H.R. 7327 would make the following changes in the FSC program:

(1) For jobless workers who first received FSC benefits on or before December 1, 1982 (including those who have already exhausted their FSC benefits) the maximum number of FSC benefits payable in all States would be increased by 5 weeks. In other words, the 10 week States would be increased to 15, 8 week States would be increased to 13, and 6 week States would be increased to 11.

(2) For jobless workers who first receive FSC benefits after December 1, 1982, the maximum number of FSC benefits would be 13 weeks in all States.

The bill does not extend the FSC program beyond the current expiration date of March 31, 1983. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the additional benefits provided under H.R. 7327 will increase the cost of the FSC program by \$650 million.

To deny this help for our Nation's unemployed would be to turn our backs on the pain and suffering caused by this recession. I urge my colleagues to support this vital legislation.

## FSC TRIGGER STATUS AS OF NOVEMBER 5, 1982

State	10 Weeks	8 Weeks	5 Weeks	Effective date
Alabama	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Alaska	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Arizona	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Arkansas	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
California	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Colorado			x	B 6 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Connecticut			x	B 6 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Delaware	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
District of Columbia		x		B 8 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Florida			x	B 6 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Georgia			x	B 6 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Hawaii			x	B 6 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Idaho	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Illinois	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Indiana	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Iowa	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Kansas	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Kentucky	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Louisiana	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Maine	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Maryland	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Massachusetts	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Michigan	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Minnesota	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Mississippi	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Missouri	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Montana	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Nebraska			x	B 6 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Nevada	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
New Hampshire			x	B 6 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
New Jersey	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
New Mexico	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
New York			x	B 6 Week, Nov. 14, 1982.
North Carolina	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
North Dakota			x	B 6 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Ohio	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Oklahoma		x		B 8 Week, Nov. 7, 1982.
Oregon	x			B 10 Week, Oct. 3, 1982.
Pennsylvania	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Puerto Rico	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Rhode Island	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
South Carolina	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
South Dakota			x	B 6 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Tennessee	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Texas			x	B 6 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Utah	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Vermont	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Virginia			x	B 6 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Virgin Islands	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Washington	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
West Virginia	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Wisconsin	x			B 10 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Wyoming		x		B 8 Week, Sept. 12, 1982.
Total	38	3	12	

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, ETA, UIS, Division of Actuarial Services, November 22, 1982.●



TRIBUTE TO CHARLES L.  
KORYDA

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, Charles L. Koryda, principal at Hutchison Elementary School in Herndon since 1977 died of a heart attack this past summer. The community he served was deeply saddened by his death—he was a big man with a generous heart who really cared about the school, the employees in it, and his many friends in our area.

Mr. Koryda had an effect on each life he touched. He believed that we could truly effect changes in the lives of children and that working with children was just about the best thing we could ever do.

Charles Dickens once said that we change the world through small acts of generosity. Mr. Koryda felt that working with children involved daily acts of generosity—of spirit, effort, composure, trust, and caring—that reached each person in the school and ultimately had a ripple effect in the community. He encouraged this attitude in each of us and respected and encouraged the individuality of our methods used to create these changes.

Our lives have been truly blessed and enriched because he touched us.●

LEST WE FORGET

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker: During this past July at the annual meeting of the National League of Families, I had the privilege of hearing some very poignant lyrics in honor of our MIA's and POW's written by young Joseph Doyle, son of an MIA hero and president of Operation MIA/POW of Texas Tech University. The lyrics were so moving that I would like to submit them as a tribute to those 2,500 brave men still unaccounted for.

DADDY'S LITTLE PRINCESS

(Joey Doyle)

Daddy's little Princess

He's her favorite hero

Now he's gone to war

And the Princess watched him go

She's the apple of his eye

Daddy's little girl

Waiting for her hero to come home

When the war was ended

The soldier boys came home

But the princess could not find her hero

She asked everyone in a uniform

And watched each returning plane

Everyone remembered her pleading voice

She said, "have you seen my daddy, was my daddy on that plane

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

28597

Someone please tell me where did my hero go."

Years have past and days get longer

The Princess stands alone

Her tender sweetness bitter now with scorn

But her daddy's not forgotten by her and

she knows she's still his girl

It only hurts when she thinks of how he's

Forgotten by the world

What will it take to give back to her

The hero that she loves

To reunite the hero and the Princess

Her strength and courage can teach us all a lesson about love

Her tears and broken heart can teach us pain

I wish her determination could motivate our nation

To reunite the Princess with her missing soldier boy

To put her mind at ease about her daddy's unknown fate

Though he's been gone for years it's not too late

There's no ring on her finger

But there's a band around her wrist

That bear's the name of her hero

The father she has missed

It's an old one that has been rusted

By her hundred million tears

Her soldier boy is still missing

He's gone for now ten years.

WHERE DID DADDY GO?

(Joey Doyle)

For ten long years this New Years day

My woman's been alone

I left her with a baby, to raise while I was gone

I said I'd be home in a few short months

But I'm still not home today

And every night when I go to sleep

I can hear my little son say

Mommy what will happen when daddy comes back home

Will I be a big boy then, will I be full grown

Do you think he still loves me like he did so long ago

It's been so long since he's been home mommy,

Where did daddy go.

Was my daddy a brave man, will I ever see him again

Does Jesus love him too mommy and does God know where he's been

Did he have a puppy mommy, like the one that you gave me

I named my puppy Colonel mommy, cause that's what daddy used to be.

I'll bet that he was handsome and as nice as nice can be

Do I look like him mommy, does he look like me

And what if he's hurt or maybe he can't walk

Will you still love him then, and mommy tell me just once more,

Where has daddy gone.

Was my daddy a brave man, will I ever see him again

Does Jesus love him too mommy and does God know where he's been

Will he ride me on his shoulders and play with me in the park

And will he read me a story mommy, when I'm afraid of the dark

What if he don't like me, will he go away again

And what if he don't come home at all, what would happen then

When will I ever meet him mommy, when can I see my dad

Daddy please come home to us so mommy won't be sad.

For ten long years I've been away and lived in agony

Just thinking of my wife and child living without me

Won't someone tell my wife and son, where I'm at and how I am

I'm a missing soldier boy lost in Vietnam.

MY DAD'S AN M.I.A.

(Joey Doyle)

My dad has not come home yet, he's been gone for many years

I haven't seen his face as yet but I've seen mother's tears

I remember how he made me laugh, and made my mother smile

Now mother says he's gone away, he won't be back for awhile

My sister says he went to war, he hasn't come home yet

He fought in Laos and Vietnam but he'll be home I bet

My dad's an M.I.A. sir, my dad's an M.I.A.

He hasn't come home just as yet but I know he will some day

My dad's an M.I.A. sir, my dad's an M.I.A.

He hasn't come home just as yet but I know he will some day

A letter came the other day that said dad wasn't found

He's just like 25 hundred other men lost on foreign ground

The rest of my life will be spent in hope as I live from day to day

Wondering and hoping to hear from dad, a U.S. M.I.A.

DON'T LET THEM BE FORGOTTEN

(Joey Doyle)

Don't let them be forgotten, they never have a nice day

Whatever happened to my son, he's still not home today.

Let them know that we still care, send a letter over there

It's more than any man can bear, join us now and say a prayer.

My little girl asked me the other day, "tell me daddy what's an M.I.A.

I wiped a teardrop from my eye, not wanting her to see me cry

I propped her gently upon my knee, and then I begged her to listen to me.

A missing man in a far away land, fighting someone else's war

Years of praying that he's still alive, does anyone care anymore

They tell me all is over now, but this I can't believe

My boy called out to me today, and it wasn't just a dream.

Tell me sir, where is my son, he hasn't come home like you promised

Uncle Sam, sir, where is Sean and Bill and Dave and Greg and John.

I heard the news I saw the photographs, 2,000 men can't disappear

This Vietnam has got my boy, my only son, my pride and joy

A U.S. soldier's unaccounted for, it's up to you America

To open his door.

Don't let them be forgotten! ●

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

## HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 1, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, due to my required presence in Atlanta, Ga., earlier today, I regrettably missed a vote. Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to explain how I would have voted had I been present. "No" on rollcall No. 402, passage of H.R. 7204, Labor and Health and Human Services appropriations for fiscal year 1983.●

## SHOULD THE UNITED STATES ACT AGAINST ILLEGAL WHALING?

## HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, in the coming months the United States will face a crucial test of our longstanding commitment to whale protection: whether to act against countries which violate International Whaling Commission (IWC) regulations. The challenge will come from Japan, the Soviet Union, Brazil, Iceland, Korea, and Norway as they set out this winter to hunt minke whales with the cold—nonexplosive—harpoon, a weapon whose use the IWC has banned. As chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee that oversees the IWC, I believe we must respond strongly and unequivocally to countries that will ignore IWC rules.

The cold harpoon is a particularly cruel weapon. The time from strike to death takes from 3 to 50 minutes in the smaller minke whales—which average 27 feet in length—and can take several hours in larger whales. The nonwhaling states of the IWC have argued simply that the cold harpoon is an inhumane weapon; the whalers, led by Japan, have contended they must continue to use the cold harpoon to kill minke whales because explosive harpoons "damage too much meat."

The IWC first recognized the cold harpoon as an inhumane weapon in 1979. The following year, the annual IWC meeting overwhelmingly adopted an American proposal to ban the use of the cold harpoon for the taking of all whales but minke. In 1981, the Commission agreed by consensus to extend the ban to include the taking of minke whales. However, Brazil, Iceland, Japan, Norway, and the U.S.S.R. filed objections to this decision, making use of a loophole in the 1946 Whaling Convention to exempt themselves from the ban.

While the IWC itself has no authority to enforce its rules, the United

States does have sufficient clout to assure that the whaling nations abide by the cold harpoon ban. Under the 1971 Pelly amendment to the Fishermen's Protective Act and the 1979 Packwood-Magnuson amendment to the Fishery Conservation and Management Act, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of State, is required to certify to the President a country which is engaged in activities "in a manner or under circumstances which diminish the effectiveness of the IWC." Upon certification, the offending nation automatically loses 50 percent of its fisheries allocation in the U.S. 200-mile zone. The President then has the discretion to impose a partial or total ban on imports of fisheries products from that country.

Prior to the enactment of the Packwood-Magnuson amendment, the United States successfully used the threat of the Pelly amendment sanctions to persuade the U.S.S.R., Japan, Peru, Chile, Korea, Spain, and Taiwan to comply with various IWC regulations. Now, the United States must reaffirm its intent to invoke these amendments against any whaling nation which chooses to ignore the cold harpoon ban.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for the record the following excerpts from the IWC's 1980 workshop on humane killing techniques for whales. I hope this will broaden our understanding of the need to stand firmly behind the ban on the cold harpoon.

## REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP ON HUMANE KILLING TECHNIQUES FOR WHALES, CAMBRIDGE, NOVEMBER 10-14, 1980

The workshop considered the question of its terms of reference, which were defined only so far as indicated in the Introduction above. Discussion of the meaning of the word "humane" brought out the fact that there are a number of factors potentially or actually involved before or beyond any pain caused when the whale is killed. In the case of whales, these include the pursuit and in some cases selection of one individual from a group of whales, resulting in stress and possibly fear and panic both in the target whale and other whales nearby.

These components of the whaling activity need consideration to ensure the fullest possible interpretation of the humaneness of the whaling operations. However, the present group recognized the deficiency of accurate ethological knowledge of the whale. Realising it did not possess the required expertise to deal fully with this aspect of the subject, it confined its own observations to the direct components of the killing operation surrounding the activities whereby the whale is struck in such a way as to induce rapid unconsciousness and death.

It was suggested that this approach would also permit reference to be made to aboriginal whaling and the despatch of stranded cetaceans, in so far as any conclusions on humane and expeditious techniques for killing were relevant to these other subject areas.

As a working definition it was accepted that humane killing of an animal means

causing its death without pain, stress or distress perceptible to the animal. That is the ideal.

Any humane killing technique aims first to render an animal insensitive to pain as swiftly as is technically possible. In practice this cannot be instantaneous in the scientific sense.

The group noted that the development of a means of achieving a rapid, painless death would also and incidentally increase the efficiency of the whaling operations and improve the quality of the meat obtained (by reducing the stress caused to the whale). Thus the commercial whaling industry is interested in attaining the same objectives.

## SMALL WHALES

In both pelagic and small-type minke whaling, cold (i.e. non-explosive) grenades are used, since the explosive grenade used for larger whales destroys too much meat. The gunner again aims just behind the flipper along the horizontal midline, although in this case the gunner relies on shock waves rather than hemorrhaging to kill or render the animal unconscious. If the whale is not killed instantaneously in the Japanese operations, an electric lance is employed (see Section 3.2).

In 1979, legislation was introduced in Norway requiring each small-type whaling vessel to carry and use a large calibre rifle (minimum calibre 7mm, minimum impact energy 350 Kkgm at 100m) to kill the whale after it has been hit by a harpoon. Initial reports suggest that this method has proved successful in those instances where it has been used.

## ELECTRICAL METHODS

An electric lance is used in Japanese pelagic minke whaling when the first harpoon fails to kill the whale. The electrodes are inserted on either side of the heart and an electric shock is applied. Experiments have shown that a 110v AC 60-cycle power source is most effective, with death occurring 4-5 minutes after the shock is first applied.

Research into improving the design of the lances and the power supply is continuing.

## OTHER TECHNIQUES TRIED

(a) CO<sub>2</sub> injection.—This method of killing whales has three potential advantages:

(i) Death by embolism should be rapid and, as it is not essential to hit a vital organ, the effective target area is large;

(ii) The injection of gas should ensure that the whale floats when dead;

(iii) The meat should not become tainted as quickly as it does when air is injected for buoyancy, because the body temperature would be lowered and because CO<sub>2</sub> does not support oxidation.

However, several problems emerged when the method was tried circa 1959. Two approaches were developed, one involving a harpoon with a liquid CO<sub>2</sub> cylinder attached and the other employing a lance to inject CO<sub>2</sub> after the whale had been struck by conventional means. In the case of the harpoon/cylinder technique, it was found that the cylinder nozzle became blocked with frozen CO<sub>2</sub>, preventing complete release of the gas; that the meat around the cylinder was freeze-burned; and the interaction between blood and CO<sub>2</sub> blackened the meat rendering it unacceptable for human consumption.

It was noted that with respect to point (c) above, whales contain many anaerobic bacteria and that unless processing occurred soon after injection with CO<sub>2</sub>, then decom-



position by these bacteria might actually be promoted by CO<sub>2</sub>.

Diving animals such as whales are more tolerant to high levels of CO<sub>2</sub> in the blood and the effect of CO<sub>2</sub> injection might therefore be expected to be slower. However, the mechanism by which CO<sub>2</sub> injection would affect the brain is not by CO<sub>2</sub> narcosis but by gas embolism. The subject of gas embolism is further discussed in Section 4.

(b) Explosive bullets.—Explosive bullets (containing 10-15g of black powder) were first used experimentally by Japanese whalers in the Antarctic in 1973/74. However, it was found difficult to shoot accurately in field conditions. The use of explosive bullets was discontinued after the development of the electric lance (see Section 3.2).

(c) Drugs and poisons.—Whalers have experimented with drugs since the 1830s when prussic acid was tried but very quickly stopped due to the subsequent death of whalers who handled poisoned blubber. Other drugs tried included a mixture of strychnine and curare in the 1860s. More recently Japan has carried out ten experiments since 1964 using succinylcholine but has not continued the work for reasons of safety and practicality.

(d) Electrical harpoons.—Electrical harpoons have been tested intermittently since 1852. Generally the technique has been one involving the passing of a current through the whale line to the more or less standard harpoon fixed into the whale. It is reported that large numbers of whales (over 2,000) were killed by this method before World War II, but British, Norwegian and German experiments employing various conductors and currents all encountered technical problems associated with crew safety in the use of electricity at sea, stretchable conductors, and current leakage.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

The workshop was very appreciative of the technical expertise which has been brought together by the Japanese authorities in their national group to improve whale killing technology, and which was made available to this meeting. It strongly supports and encourages the research programme which is being pursued, especially the developments and field testing of penthrite explosive.

The workshop also encourages the proposals by the Norwegian authorities to investigate high velocity projectiles for use in its small-type whaling operations.

The workshop endorsed the following specific recommendations for future action:

1. Harpoons using penthrite.—Penthrite explosive harpoons are thought to have an excellent potential for producing rapid and humane death in struck whales. The penthrite produces an explosive force over six times more powerful than the presently used black powder, providing an initial explosion with great concussive force and potential for rupturing blood vessels. In addition, large amounts of CO<sub>2</sub> and other gases are produced by the explosion which could cause emboli preventing blood circulation to the brain.

A series of experiments should be conducted on some cetacean above the dolphin size (e.g. pilot whale or larger) that can be anaesthetised and properly instrumented for recording electroencephalogram, electrocardiogram and blood pressure. Such instrumented, anaesthetised animals could then be struck by penthrite harpoons of varying charge. Strikes should be made in the thorax (simulating an on-target shot), in the abdomen (simulating a slightly off

target shot), and in the dorsal musculature (simulating a further off-target shot).

If, for example, 20g of penthrite is effective for a pilot whale the charge could be scaled up for the minke and larger whales. It is believed that the expertise and capability to carry out these experiments are available.

2. High velocity projectiles.—Research into the use of high velocity projectiles in the Norwegian minke whale fishery should be pursued. Projectile size, construction and velocity, and target area need to be investigated.

3. Electrical methods.—Similar controlled studies to those outlined for the penthrite grenade should be undertaken to determine the effect of electrocution (both by a single harpoon and two electrodes) at various places in the body (particularly the brain and the heart) in consultation with electrical engineers. It is particularly important to determine the pathways taken by an electric current through the whole body in salt water.

4. Time to death or unconsciousness.—The Workshop recognized the practical difficulties in determining unconsciousness or death at sea. It recommends that observations on the behaviour of whales during the actual killing process be made. In particular the times taken for the mouth to slacken, the flipper to slacken and all movement to cease should be recorded along with information on the location of the harpoon and the damage caused to the animal.

The observations should also be made on the animals used in the controlled experiments described above in order to evaluate the criteria used to judge unconsciousness and death in the field.

5. Use of drugs.—The use of drugs such as etorphine hydrochloride should be further investigated with respect to stranded animals and animals killed for non-human consumption. In particular, safety problems associated with the use of powerful drugs in the field and the dose required, the action of the drug and any residues should be studied.

Research into the metabolism of carbohydrates is necessary to determine the effect of insulin on cetaceans.

6. Information on the failure of grenades to explode should be obtained. This should include the collection of data on failure rates in different operations, and the reasons for failure.

7. Possible improvements in techniques used to kill large and small whales in aboriginal/subsistence fisheries should be examined as a matter of urgency. This might be done in the context of the *ad hoc* Working Group on Management Principles for Subsistence Whaling to be held in July 1981.

8. Paralyzing drugs should not be used for catching or killing cetaceans, since they do not produce loss of consciousness.

9. The IWC should continue to evaluate humane killing methods and their adaptation to the humane killing of whales. It is the opinion of the workshop that an evaluation of the present field studies, research and other observations of killing methods should be carried out by appropriate experts.●

## SUPPORT FOR AIDS RESEARCH

### HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the issue of providing adequate Federal funding for research into the causes of Kaposi sarcoma and related immune-deficiency diseases is one which this Congress must address.

The appropriation which we are voting on today must be the beginning of a massive national effort to confront a major health problem.

Like legionnaire's disease and like toxic shock syndrome, the acquired immune deficiency diseases are a public health issue which is the responsibility of the Federal Government.

The medical struggle to understand, and ultimately to defeat, the acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) is likely not to benefit those who might contract the disease, but also to increase greatly our understanding of the nature of the immune system and of cancer itself.

The issue of adequate, long-term funding for AIDS research, then, is not simply a matter of fulfilling our public health responsibilities to the gay community, which has so far borne the brunt of this epidemic, or to the major metropolitan areas, where this epidemic is now centered—although these responsibilities alone more than justify the funding which we request. What is at stake here also is an opportunity to gain medical knowledge which could greatly enhance our ability to strike a blow at cancer—probably the major health problem of modern times.

This would be of enormous value not only to those who suffer during this epidemic, but to all the people of this country.

I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this appropriation and all future measures needed to respond adequately to the health crisis which we now face.●

## REMARKS DURING INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO BAR SOCIAL SECURITY CHECK DELIVERY ON FRIDAYS

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to assist the millions of elderly now receiving social security benefit checks from experiencing unnecessary delays in their delivery. It has been brought to my at-

tention that a number of elderly citizens now receive their checks on Friday, and thus, are often unable to go to the bank and cash them before Monday. Given the fact that social security remains the sole means of support for 26 percent of current recipients and the primary means of support for an added 40 percent, such a change would ease the lives of many of these dependent senior citizens.

Social security checks are now delivered on the third of every month. This date was chosen when the system was first put into place in 1940 at the request of the Post Office because it feared that delivery on the first day of every month would only worsen the normal load of mail that must be delivered on that day. The Social Security Amendments of 1977 went one step further and stipulated that when the third of the month falls on a weekend or holiday, the payment is due to be delivered the preceding, usually a Friday. Obviously, this exacerbates the problem of Friday check delivery.

My bill would address this problem by also prohibiting mail delivery on Fridays, so that recipients would have ample time to go to the bank and cash their checks. It is a simple solution, that could easily be achieved administratively by the Social Security Administration.

There are a number of proponents of the "direct deposit" method of delivering checks who claim that this type of delivery—directly to the recipient's bank—most quickly addresses the problem. Our experience has been that this method is highly unattractive to the same elderly who are frightened by the presence of their check in the home for the duration of the weekend. The direct deposit system could ultimately benefit all social security recipients but will not do so unless it is utilized by all recipients. Under my bill, the fears of all recipients could be allayed.

As an original member of the Select Committee on Aging, I feel that we must continue to seek ways in which to ease the many fears which continue to plague social security beneficiaries today. I am pleased that our distinguished chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee, Mr. PICKLE, will be considering technical amendments to the Social Security Act next week. It would be my hope that my legislation could be incorporated in this bill, H.R. 7326, which makes minor, technical changes in the Social Security Act and does not, in any way, seek to change benefits or address question of finance of the system. The following is the text of my bill:

A bill to amend the Social Security Act to include Fridays among the days on which social security and SSI benefit checks may not be delivered, so as to assure (without postponing the delivery date) that the recipient of any such check will have a reasonable opportunity to cash or deposit it without delay

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 708(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "Friday," before "Saturday," each place it appears.

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to benefits for months after the month in which this Act is enacted.●

#### STOP GSA FROM CONTRACTING OUT VETERANS' JOBS

**HON. MARVIN LEATH**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. LEATH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House approved the Edgar amendment to the Treasury-postal appropriations bill, H.R. 7158, which provides that funds available to the General Services Administration shall not be used to contract for jobs which are presently being performed by individuals as Federal civil service employees.

The Edgar amendment will stop the contracting out of some 13,000 jobs in the GSA during this fiscal year. I am told by representatives of the veterans' organizations and the American Federation of Government Employees that 80 percent of the jobs are held by veterans, under a provision of law which reserves these jobs for veterans so long as veterans are available. I am referring to section 3310 of title 5, United States Code, which was enacted in 1966, to help veterans of the Vietnam era make a successful readjustment to civilian life following their service.

It came as a shock to learn that the contracting out of these jobs has already begun in the GSA and, unless Congress acts promptly, it will be too late. Even more incredible is the fact that this was going on during the very week that the eyes of the Nation were riveted on Washington on Veterans' Day and the dedication of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in memory of the more than 57,000 individuals who died in Vietnam.

BOB EDGAR's amendment is in line with an amendment that I offered, which has now become law, Public Law 97-306, which prohibits contracting out within the Veterans' Administration's Department of Medicine and Surgery for services which are determined to be direct patient care or incident to direct patient care. The Office of Management and Budget has shown a zealotness to carry out its circular

A-76, which if successful, would have seriously impaired the capacity of the Veterans' Administration to provide the quality of medical care that veterans deserve and Congress intended.

In the same vein, BOB EDGAR's amendment will serve notice to the Office of Management and Budget that Congress does not tolerate contracting for civil service jobs which are reserved for veterans. I commend the House for promptly approving the Edgar amendment, and urge the Senate to do likewise. Time is of the essence and the Edgar amendment must be approved without delay.

Mr. Speaker, the message the House is giving the executive branch on the contracting issue is this, where veterans are concerned, there will be no contracting out for services—there will be no loss of jobs. In other words, the message is we are going to protect veterans and the programs that are designed to enhance the lives of those who served in defense of their country.●

#### U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN CENTRAL AMERICA

**HON. PAUL SIMON**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, Richard E. Feinberg, of the Overseas Development Council, had an article in the New York Times which calls for a reappraisal of U.S. foreign policy in Central America.

What he has to say makes eminent good sense, and I urge my colleagues to read it. And I urge the administration to read it and reflect on it.

The article follows:

FOR A NEW CENTRAL AMERICAN POLICY

(By Richard Feinberg)

WASHINGTON.—Why does the Reagan administration believe that its policies are working in Central America when many Central Americans perceive a deteriorating political environment? These different perceptions suggest we should reconsider U.S. interests in the region.

The administration's central objective is to reassert U.S. influence in our backyard. To achieve this, it is fostering friendly governments, and fighting to keep less pliant leftist forces from power.

Largely through increased economic and military aid, the administration has successfully nurtured client regimes in El Salvador, Honduras and Costa Rica, and has corralled them into a pact with a foreign policy that echoes ours.

The administration believes that the left has been checked. Dominoes have not fallen and the Sandinista regime is less steady.

Many Central Americans see quite a different picture: declining incomes, rising violence, political polarization and spiraling tensions between states.

Foreign and domestic investors have fled political instability. Violence is escalating in



Guatemala, Honduras and, to a lesser degree, even in Costa Rica. The death toll has passed 30,000 in El Salvador. Centrist political parties and liberal institutions are crumbling.

Washington should recast its interests to be more in line with the region's needs—to give more priority to reducing violence, maintaining regional peace and fostering economic development. These objectives are consistent with the global imperative of containing Soviet power. Yet, they do not require that the United States impose its direct influence or ideological preferences.

Violence will be reduced only when regional and civil conflicts are contained or resolved. An appropriately recast U.S. policy would stop dragging Honduras and Costa Rica into confrontation with neighboring Nicaragua. Last week, fortunately, Nicaragua and Honduras opened talks to avoid a full-scale war along their border. There have been continuing accusations that the Honduran military has been allowing right-wing guerrillas to stage raids into Nicaragua from Honduran territory.

Rather than obstructing such talks, the United States should have been working toward an agreement providing security guarantees to both countries. Washington should also pursue talks with all interested parties to end the Salvadoran civil war.

Only when regional tensions are relaxed will capital return to Central America and economic growth resume. Only then could the administration's proposals for a free-trade zone and investment incentives work.

A new definition of our interests would free the United States to settle for a mix of friendly and non-aligned governments in Central America. It would allow us to tolerate leftist forces, provided that they demonstrate independence from the Soviet Union. We would welcome diplomatic initiatives by Mexico, Venezuela and Western Europe, even when they lessen U.S. influence.

A more pragmatic policy would serve U.S. strategic objectives by driving a wedge between socialist-oriented movements and Moscow. For example, a Nicaragua enmeshed in treaties with its neighbors, subject to influence from regional and European powers, and engaged in regional economic projects would be more likely to distance itself from the Soviet Union.

The administration's politics of confrontation may have unleashed forces in Central America that will resist, momentarily, a more flexible policy. But a policy that is more congruent with local interests stands a better chance in the long run. ●

## TRUCKERS AND TAXES

### HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, while I support a 5-cent-a-gallon increase in the Federal fuel tax at the refinery, I am not so sure about some of the other parts of the overall highway package just presented to the Congress. We cannot simply accept the myth that heavy trucks are responsible for all our highway damage. We also cannot so simply accept stiffer taxes on big trucks to repair highway damage.

The weather, traffic conditions, construction procedures, and oversight all are factors in the deterioration of a highway. We cannot view this issue in a vacuum. Most of the goods in the Nation move by truck. Higher taxes beyond a fuel increase may well damage an already battered trucking industry and also damage our economy by fueling inflation. We all know these tax increases will be passed on to the American consumer.

It is our duty to closely investigate anything beyond a mere 5-cent-a-gallon fuel increase. Therefore, I recommend to all Members of the Congress the following statement submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee by an independent trucker's group.

MARYLAND INDEPENDENT TRUCKERS  
AND DRIVERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,  
Baltimore, Md., December 1, 1982.

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,  
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,  
House of Representatives, Washington,  
D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROSTENKOWSKI: The attached statement is submitted jointly by the Maryland Independent Truckers and Drivers Association, Inc., a group of owner-operators and drivers residing in Eastern Seaboard states, and the Truckers Action Conference, 1109 Plover Drive, Baltimore, Md. 21227, which is a small group of persons from around the country who are associated with the trucking industry either as owner-operators or small fleet owners.

We hope that the Committee will consider our statement along with others submitted orally today in the hearing concerning proposals to raise the highway use taxes.

We thank you for the opportunity to present our views.

Yours truly,

RITA BONTZ,  
President, Maryland Independent  
Truckers and Drivers Association.  
THEODORE E. BROOKS, Sr.,  
Director,  
Truckers Action Conference.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee on Ways and Means: The members of the Maryland Independent Truckers and Drivers Association and the Truckers Action Conference are stunned by the proposals to raise the highway use taxes.

These proposals come at a time when our expenses are at an all-time high—when freight rates are being cut far below our cost of operations—and when the amount of available freight is at a low.

We are fighting the most serious battle for survival that we have ever known. The trucking industry is in a tumultuous period as its components strive to adjust and survive the effects of deregulation initiatives that have already taken place.

We recognize that many of the Nation's highways and bridges are sorely in need of repair and replacement. We know that we, as do all highway users, contribute to the deterioration. We are willing to bear our fair share of the cost to repair and replace the highways and bridges.

But we believe that we have not only been paying our fair share over the years; we have been paying more than our share. And now we are being asked to pay astronomical increases in highway user fees and are being told that 20 percent of that money will be

parceled out in block grants to states and cities to update and repair urban mass-transit systems.

This nation needs a stable, safe, and efficient trucking industry. And it needs independent truck owner-operators who are such a vital part of that industry. For example, we haul most of the Nation's produce and meat, much of its processed foodstuffs, nearly all of its heavy equipment, steel, a large portion of its manufactured goods, and a significant portion of military shipments.

These proposals will drive many of us out of business—forever. Truckers who have for years provided reliable service at a reasonable cost will disappear. They will be replaced by the inexperienced—those who will be able to survive in the industry only long enough to cause problems.

We are not asking to be excluded from helping to pay for the repairs and replacement of highways and bridges. We are only asking that our payment be a reasonable share.

It is unreasonable, we believe, to expect one group of users to bear such a disproportionate share of the costs. The proposals are being touted as costing the average motorist \$30 a year. Not bad if it brings us road repairs and replacement. That's less than the cost of a pair of shock absorbers for the average automobile.

But let's look at what it will cost the average trucker. Most truckers will pay the \$2,700 fee—or close to it. If the trucker drives 100,000 miles a year—not an unusual amount—there's an extra \$1,000 for 20,000 gallon of fuel (at 5 miles per gallon). Increases in taxes on truck sales, parts, tires, tubes, and so on could add as much as \$1,500. How does that compare with the \$30 the average motorist pays? Is it in proportion?

This bill is being promoted as a measure to create new jobs. We see it in a different light. Our assessment of this bill can be summed up in three paragraphs.

First, the net gain in jobs will be minimal at best. We predict this bill, if enacted, will be a boondoggle in the truest sense of the word. There will be so many trucking industry people thrown out of work that their numbers may actually equal the projected number of created jobs.

Secondly, we truckers spend twenty, thirty, even forty years of our working lives on the highways. We watched the Interstate System being built. We see the repair work being done. We are out there every day and we can state in all sincerity that the major part of this work is not up to the standards which highway users have been paying for. One instance among hundreds comes immediately to mind. One of the writers of this statement traveled Interstate 80 across Pennsylvania the day it was opened. We saw hundreds of pavement cracks, concrete slabs rocking under the weight of vehicles and shooting muddy water 6 feet in the air, bridges so rough they threatened loss of vehicle control. All of this on the day the road was opened to the public. This is only one of many examples of poor design, poor workmanship, poor supervision, and waste of our money which are repeated over and over from coast to coast.

There is ten times more highway damage caused by poor construction and skimpy material than was ever caused by truck traffic. Truckers pay for this fraud in damage to their equipment, injury to their health, and damage to the goods they haul. Further taxation adds insult to literal injury.

Finally, passage of this bill in its present form would constitute an inflationary quick-fix for the sake of political expediency. It would place cost in varying degrees on those least responsible for the condition of our highway system and in large part on an industry which is least able to pay the grossly unfair and unrealistic share proposed by this measure.

We realize the fuel tax is unchanged over the last 23 years. We accept the 5 cent increase as reasonable and fair. To put this in perspective, the average truck will pay tax on 20,000 gallons of fuel per year, a rate of payment at least 40 times that paid by the average motorist.

We deem totally unacceptable the astronomical proposed increases in user and excise taxes. And we especially reject the concept of diversion of highway taxes into non-highway uses. We consider these sections of the bill to be unfair, unlawful, and confiscatory.

We sincerely hope that Congress will consider the potentially devastating long-term effect of this bill as it is now written. And finally, we hope the Congress will take the steps necessary to ensure that those who provide the funds for the Highway Trust Fund receive fair value for the taxes paid.

Thank you for considering our views. ●

### THE REAL LESSONS OF VIETNAM

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, in the 10 years (Jan. 27, 1983) since the last American soldiers began leaving Vietnam, our involvement in Southeast Asia has been tainted by criticism and remorse. As time rinses away the verbal scales from our eyes, we can begin to acknowledge the reasons for our involvement in Southeast Asia. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting a review by Mr. Jeremy Leggatt because I feel that it testifies to the nobility of the cause for which our young men and women fought.

#### THE REAL "LESSONS OF VIETNAM"

(A review by Jeremy Leggatt)

In the nearly eight years since South Vietnam collapsed under North Vietnamese invasion, food production in that once self-sufficient land has dropped so catastrophically that the population lives at malnutrition levels. Tens, perhaps hundreds, of thousands of South Vietnamese have been executed or have died in the communists' vast system of "re-education camps." There is no way of estimating the toll in the slave-labor camps established to tame South Vietnam's "new economic zones"—jungle areas notoriously incompatible with human life. Nor is there any way of counting the numbers who have fled, or attempted to flee, the repression.

Americans have shifted their sight from Vietnam to Central America, the Persian Gulf, and concern over the flagging national economy. Our 13-year war in Southeast Asia, and the crippling self-interrogation that accompanied it, are quickly fading in our memories.

One American who refuses to forget is Norman Podhoretz, editor of *Commentary*

magazine and a former critic of U.S. involvement in Vietnam. In *Why We Were in Vietnam*, Podhoretz recalls, "The United States sent half a million men to fight. . . . More than 50,000 of them lost their lives, and many thousands more were wounded. Billions of dollars were poured into the effort, damaging the American economy to such an extent that the country's competitive position was grievously undermined. Perhaps most destructive of all, millions of Americans growing to maturity during the war developed attitudes of such hostility toward their own country that their willingness to defend it in the future was left in doubt."

Just what was in it for America?

We are still split on the question of Vietnam. In May 1977 President Jimmy Carter spoke of "the intellectual and moral poverty" of the policies that took us into the war. Three years later Ronald Reagan called the war "a noble cause." Reagan's unfashionable contention set off—as Robert W. Kagan wrote in *The Wall Street Journal*—"titters throughout America's better-educated set." And yet, says Podhoretz, "the story shows that Reagan's remark was closer to the truth than Carter's denigration of an act of imprudent idealism whose moral soundness has been so overwhelmingly vindicated by the hideous consequences of our defeat."

In retelling the painful story of the Vietnam war, Podhoretz bulldozes the ramparts of myth that have obscured the realities and continue to cloud our foreign-policy attitudes today.

#### CONTAINMENT ON THE CHEAP

One of the most persistent myths is that President John F. Kennedy committed uniformed U.S. forces to South Vietnam against his better judgment. Not so, says Podhoretz. As a Senator, Kennedy stated his position plainly in 1956 (the year North and South Vietnam were scheduled, under the Geneva agreements that terminated French rule, to be unified under a "freely elected" government). "Neither the United States nor Free Vietnam," declared Kennedy, was "ever going to be party to an election obviously stacked and subverted in advance" by the communist North and its agents in the South. Free Vietnam, said Kennedy, was "a proving ground of democracy" and "the cornerstone of the Free World in Southeast Asia."

Kennedy's attitude was consistent with U.S. policy. The Truman Doctrine preached U.S. determination to "contain" totalitarian aggression worldwide. The United States had already demonstrated its military commitment to containment in divided Korea and divided Germany. Thus, when President Kennedy extended the Truman Doctrine to Vietnam, he enjoyed national support. Much of it came from people who would later spearhead the antiwar movement.

Kennedy's successors, Lyndon B. Johnson and (at least initially) Richard M. Nixon, were similarly committed to the containment principle. But all three Presidents, says Podhoretz, made the mistake of trying to meet their goals "on the cheap."

President Kennedy intervened in Vietnam on the military cheap. Ignoring his advisers, he hoped that "going in slow and small" with minimum military force would reduce the domestic political risks that a bigger show of force might trigger.

President Johnson sought to contain the Vietnamese communists on the political cheap. He readily assumed the burden of his predecessor's commitment, but either refused or neglected to build political support for the war within the United States.

Even after the Vietnam war had provoked protest marches and antiwar demonstrations, Johnson rejected advice, as author Guenter Lewy put it, to "provide the American people with a vivid foe." Instead, says Podhoretz, Johnson "confined himself to arguments about military tactics, leaving the moral question of American involvement to the radical opposition, whose wild arguments went almost unanswered." Trying to win on the political cheap lost Johnson not only the war but his office.

His successor, President Nixon, tried to win—or at least save face—on the strategic cheap. Nixon spoke only of how to get out of Vietnam; he saw no point in arguing about why we were there. The effect, once again, was to concede the moral and political arguments to the antiwar forces—who had become, in effect, the enemy within.

The rise of this adversary, says Podhoretz, is "one of the most amazing—and disquieting—aspects of the American experience in Vietnam." Opinion-makers clamoring for immediate American abandonment of an ally accused their own country of "war crimes" and "genocide."

#### REVERSED ROLES

What caused this turnaround? Partly to blame, says Podhoretz, was the "credibility gap." In the early years of the Vietnam conflict, reporters on the spot quickly noted discrepancies between gung-ho official reports and the reality of a struggle against a resourceful and determined enemy. But their realistic reports were edited back home to conform to the official we-are-winning line.

Exaggeration of battlefield data by the military soon caused all official reports on the war's progress and all government statements of our Vietnam policy to be discounted. By 1965 the unthinkable was commonplace: the President of the United States was being routinely charged with "lying."

Reporters alienated by inflated military claims now overreacted by inflating reports of communist successes. The most destructive example of this was coverage of the communist offensive launched during the 1968 Tet festivals. A coordinated attack by Viet Cong guerrillas on every major city in South Vietnam, it succeeded in places—briefly. As a whole, however, the Tet offensive was a shattering defeat for the Viet Cong. Their losses were huge, nearly 70 percent, according to one estimate: yet, says Podhoretz, Tet was reported as a crushing U.S. defeat. The antiwar movement fully exploited the Tet "disaster" as proof of the need for immediate U.S. withdrawal.

It was but a small step for much of the media to fall in line with those who held that America's mere presence in Vietnam constituted a crime. The notorious My Lai massacre, in which an American unit opened fire on defenseless villagers, was labeled routine. But no evidence ever surfaced to corroborate this. Similarly, reports of U.S. "terror bombing," of civilians butchered through pilot carelessness, of hospitals deliberately attacked, were rife. In reality, so stringent were the limitations placed on targets and attack approaches for American pilots that they were often sitting ducks for North Vietnamese gunners.

#### HISTORY'S WASTEBASKET

By the early '70's the national consensus was that, however bad communism might be, nothing could be worse than the genocidal war Uncle Sam had unleashed on Southeast Asia. This consensus guaranteed that any U.S. move to defeat the enemy would be



condemned in advance by U.S. public opinion. In the long negotiations between Henry Kissinger and the North Vietnamese, Kissinger's opposite numbers consistently countered his arguments and proposals with references to American public opinion.

Congress, responding to a nationwide mood of war weariness, gradually chipped away at our guarantees to South Vietnam. When North Vietnam finally invaded the South, Congress cut off our former allies without a bullet.

Within months of Hanoi's victory most of the arguments advanced by the American antiwar movement toppled into the wastebasket of history. First to go was the myth that the Vietnam war was a purely South Vietnamese struggle for self-determination. North Vietnamese personnel poured in to fill every top- and middle-rank position in the "liberated" South, while every southerner of leadership caliber was shipped off to "re-education" or worse. Regimentation and hardship became the rule.

The next myth to fall was that communism was preferable to the horrors of war. The most eloquent rebuttal of this came from hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese who sought to escape across jungle frontiers and by sea. That people traditionally bound to the soil where their ancestors are buried should rush to leave is revealing enough. That they should make the attempt by boat—knowing the heavy odds against surviving—is supreme proof that communism has indeed turned out to be worse than war.

#### RALLYING CALL

Podhoretz concedes that saving South Vietnam from communism was "not only beyond [America's] reasonable military, political and intellectual capabilities but ultimately beyond its moral capabilities as well." But he unequivocally asserts that the United States went into Vietnam "for the sake of an ideal"—in order to save an ally from what events have proved to be a dreadful fate. "One can characterize this impulse as naive or describe it in terms that give it a subtly self-interested flavor," Podhoretz writes. "But there is no way in which it can be called immoral."

That the ideal was unattainable, says Podhoretz, is a tragedy with disastrous ripple effects. Since our pullout from Vietnam, the communists have felt emboldened to probe weaknesses and destabilize institutions everywhere. Despite this spurt in communist expansion in Afghanistan, Africa and Central America, the veterans of the Vietnam antiwar front have not recanted or accepted the lessons of the past. Indeed, "lessons of Vietnam" has become a potent antiwar rallying call. As politically naive as any slogan concocted during the Vietnam war, its thrust is to prevent the United States from acting to counter communist aggression.

Podhoretz's essential point cannot be escaped: we were morally right to go in. Muddled, clumsy, ineffective—but right. The story he tells is one that must be heard and pondered—both to redeem the past and butress the future. ●

#### H.R. 6514—NOT A JOBS BILL

### HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I want to call my colleagues attention to an

article in today's New York Times about H.R. 6514, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1982. The article states that supporters of the bill have said that it will help reduce unemployment.

The only cure for unemployment is to get the economy moving. The primary cause of this problem is not immigration but the faulty economic policies of the present administration. Blaming immigrants is scapegoating. This is not only unfair, it is dangerous.

It is unfair because, as I said, it is scapegoating. It is dangerous because if we erroneously blame immigrants, documented or undocumented, for our excessive unemployment rate, then we are hiding from the real problem—that Reaganomics is not working.

There was another point made in the New York Times article that also disturbs me deeply; that is, that the legalization component of the bill may be eliminated.

I can assure you that the only reason anyone in the Hispanic community would be willing to even consider supporting this bill is because of the legalization program. I believe this program, as included in H.R. 6514, does not go nearly far enough. If it is eliminated, it would be a travesty for all Hispanics.

Legalization is more than a tradeoff to the Hispanic community. It is an opportunity for the United States to wipe its slate clean, and to begin handling its immigration problems from a fresh start. Without a legislation program the underclass of undocumented persons in the United States will continue to become more and more alienated from the mainstream of American society. We do not need to expand our Nation's underclass. We need all people living and working in this country to join together to build for the future.

America was built by immigrants. Let us not scapegoat or chastise the most recent wave of migrants to come to the United States. Let us incorporate their enthusiasm and labor for our benefit.

H.R. 6514 should not be considered during a lameduck session. It is much too important a piece of legislation to be rushed. But if it is considered, the legalization program must not only remain in the bill, it should be expanded.

I submit the article from today's New York Times for the edification of my colleagues.

#### DRIVE TO REVAMP IMMIGRATION LAW IS GAINING

(By Robert Pear)

WASHINGTON, December 1.—Members of Congress appear increasingly eager to pass a comprehensive immigration bill this year, but there is growing support for efforts to delete a proposed amnesty for illegal aliens.

Since Congress reconvened Monday, supporters of the bill have been telling colleagues that it would help reduce unemploy-

ment by making it unlawful for anyone to employ an illegal alien. Thus, they say, the bill would open hundreds of thousands of jobs to United States citizens. Discussions of the bill on Capitol Hill have increasingly emphasized its restrictionist features.

The Reagan Administration still supports legalization as a component of the bill. But Justice Department officials said today, for the first time, that they would be willing to consider deferring legalization until the Government's enforcement capabilities had been strengthened.

House Democrats said the bill could come to the floor for debate as early as next week. Eliminating the amnesty provisions would profoundly alter the nature of the bill, which, its supporters say, represents a delicate balance between tougher enforcement and humanitarian changes.

The Senate and the House Judiciary Committee have approved comprehensive immigration bills that would offer permanent resident status to several million illegal aliens who entered his country before Jan. 1, 1977, and lived here continuously since then. The precise number of people who would qualify is unknown. The bills would offer provisional amnesty to illegal aliens who arrived from Jan. 1, 1977, to Jan. 1, 1980. They could become permanent residents after a three-year waiting period. Permanent residents, in turn, can become citizens after five years.

David D. Hiller, a Justice Department official, said: "We were an early proponent of a realistic, properly limited legalization program. That is an appropriate part of an overall bill. However, there is a great deal of sentiment out there for deferring legalization until such time as we are convinced that enforcement measures are in place and effective."

If there was a strong push to delete the amnesty provisions, he said, "the enforcement parts of the bill should go ahead and the issue of legalization could be revisited later, when Congress felt more comfortable with it."

Deletion of the amnesty would cause great concern to Hispanic Americans, who see aggressive enforcement as a possible threat to their civil rights. But with more than 11.5 million Americans out of work, even some liberals in Congress have expressed reservations about granting amnesty.

Representative F. James Sensenbrenner Jr., Republican of Wisconsin, intends to offer an amendment to delete the amnesty provisions, which he described as "the most objectionable features" of the bill. "It seems ludicrous to be granting amnesty to millions of illegal aliens at a time when our country is suffering from such high unemployment," he said.

In a statement filed with the Judiciary Committee report, Mr. Sensenbrenner said that amnesty would set "a bad precedent" and encourage further illegal immigration. In addition, he said, it was "unfair to the hundreds of thousands of immigrant applicants, some of whom have been waiting as long as 10 years to come to this country legally."

Representative William J. Hughes, Democrat of New Jersey, said that Congress should not approve a "mass amnesty program" until it gave the Immigration and Naturalization Service more resources to enforce the law.

In September the House Judiciary Committee rejected, 16 to 12, a bid to delete the amnesty section of the bill.

Representative Romano L. Mazzoli, Democrat of Kentucky, and Senator Alan K. Simpson, Republican of Wyoming, the sponsor of the Senate bill, have repeatedly said that the legislation was "not nativist, not racist and not mean."●

**RUBY AND DOUG JACKSON,  
CAPITOL HILL NEIGHBORS**

**HON. ROBERT McCLORY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a virtual legend on Capitol Hill where my wife, Doris and I have resided during most of my years of service in the Congress is to be found in the home and in the lives of our close friends and neighbors, Ruby and Doug Jackson.

Ruby Jackson's account of her childhood years on Capitol Hill is a significant part of the history of the area and is a human interest story which I wish to share with my colleagues and with all who glean these pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Ruby and Doug Jackson's neat and well-groomed premises are located just around the corner from our home on Constitution Avenue. Our rear yards abut on the alley adjoining Frederick Douglass Court.

Ruby and Doug Jackson are respected, admired, and well liked in our neighborhood.

My wife, Doris, has transformed Ruby Jackson's account into a bit of Capitol Hill lore which I am attaching to these introductory remarks.

**RUBY JACKSON: A "HILL PROFILE"**

(By Doris Hibbard McClory)

This is the story of a Capitol Hill that once was—one we all might wish still existed—and one that may yet exist.

Ruby Rice was born in Lauren, South Carolina, population 450. She came to Washington, D.C. when she was two. She was one of nine children, including two sets of twins, of which Ruby was one. The only other living member of the Rice clan is a sister, one of the other set of twins.

Ruby's parents settled at 327 Constitution Avenue, Northeast—and the house is still there although somewhat changed.

Here's the way Ruby tells it: "Ma died when I was eight so my father and oldest sister raised us. Pop was a railroad worker and a strict disciplinarian.

When we were little we didn't even have to lock the doors. To keep cool, we'd leave the front door open—that's how safe we were. We'd sit out on the front porch and the only thing that bothered us was mosquitoes.

There was a grocery store at the corner of 4th and Constitution. The store owner lived upstairs and his name was Dapplebaum. On 4th Street between Maryland and Constitution was a blacksmith shop and nearby a seafood carryout which was really good!

There were frame houses all along Constitution Avenue except for 319 which was brick. At 3rd and A there was a Sanitary Grocery Store. That was a chain and they were all over the District. At 4th and Cap-

itol was a big A & P and another one at C and 3rd. And, at 3rd and Maryland was another grocery store and by the school at 4th and C was a laundromat; it was a restaurant before that. Yup, there was a grocery store at every corner. We didn't have to walk far to buy anything. And it was always safe. My father never had to worry about us.

"Things started changing some in 1950 (her father died in 1946 and she, her sisters and brothers stayed on at 327). We stopped sitting on the porch. We didn't even own porch furniture after that. One day a man walked by as I was coming out of the house and said to me 'I didn't know anyone lived here'."

The house at 327 Constitution was sold along with many others when the speculators came in—and the Hill changed.

Fortunately for Ruby, she met Douglas Jackson, a Navy man, who had relatives on 4th Street who introduced them. In 1956, Ruby and Douglas were married and she and he bought the house at 120 4th Street Northeast, around the corner from her old home. They both liked living on "The Hill" and even though Douglas was from rural Virginia, they both settled here happily.

Back to Ruby: We never had any desire to move away. Everything was right here. It was a good place to live and the people were nice.

I can still remember roller skating and sledding down Pennsylvania Avenue. There weren't too many cars so we were safe. We always played in Stanton Park. They had sand boxes. We used to climb all over Stanton's statue, but one day it fell over in the wind. Thank goodness, we weren't there that day!

I couldn't go to Peabody School because then it was all white. I went to Logan School at 4th and G Northeast—it's still there. We always walked even in bad weather. Then I transferred to Giddings at 4th and G Southeast. I went to Randall High School in Southwest.

When the speculators started coming in, the Hill started to be more transient. There were rooming houses all along East Capitol and Maryland Avenue. Tourist houses, too. Frederick Douglass Court was used for storing the carts the street cleaners used. The carts were lodged in a large garage. Up over the garage was an upholstery shop. Mr. Greathouse owned it and he lived on 3rd Street. Adjacent Millers' Court still has a lot of the original houses which have been renovated.

Frederick Douglass' nephew lived at 318 A Street, Northeast. We all liked him because he walked around and gave us candy—I can still remember him.

Capitol Hill Hospital—the only thing that's changed is the name. On one side was a stable and when I was 12, I had to have my appendix out. So, Pop and I walked to the hospital and they took me up over the stable and operated on me. Oh, it wasn't still a stable—they'd made it into a hospital by then!

We used to play some in Lincoln Park but then gangs started forming so my parents wouldn't let us play there. We mostly roller skated and rode our bicycles.

In those days, Capitol Hill was an area that extended from the Capitol to 4th Street—that was it!

Grubb's Drug Store (which happily still exists at East Capitol and 4th) was an ice cream parlor where we sat and had sodas. Of course, the granddaddy of them all is Sherrill's Bakery and Luncheonette and it's still there on Pennsylvania Avenue.

We always played ball on the Capitol grounds. We relaxed on the benches there and that's where the boys and girls met.

The 1968 riots really made the biggest change. I was on the 4th Street bus near Gallaudet College and I couldn't wait to get home. The ice cream store at 7th and Constitution was bombed. It was scary. For three days all we saw was smoke and fire. We traded groceries with our neighbors so we all had enough to eat because nothing was being delivered. Yes—the riots—they made the real change. It was like war. People stopped saying hello to each other—and the Good Humor man didn't come by anymore. People used to keep their front yards nice and clean—and the streets and sidewalks were always neat.

Yes, the Hill has changed. Maryland Avenue which once was a series of boarding houses is now called "millionaires row."

And that is the story of Capitol Hill according to Ruby Rice Jackson. But, would she and Douglas live anywhere else? "Nope!" says Ruby. It's still the best place to live. Where else can I have an organic garden in my backyard and meet my neighbors over the back fence—and still be right in the city? And Princess (the Douglas dog)—she likes it, too! So, that makes it fine by me."

We, her neighbors, all call her "Our Ruby." Why? Because she's a top Hill Booster—an involved and active citizen of the area: Secretary of the Stanton Park Neighborhood Association; and up until recently the sparkplug behind the annual SPNA annual picnic: purveyor of home made ice cream (strawberry) and Douglas' specialty freshly-roasted hot dogs.

The Hill: it's a great place to visit and a great place to live!●

**THE MANY WAYS MX IS  
HYSTERICAL**

**HON. PAUL SIMON**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues were not in Washington on Sunday, November 21, when Walter Pincus had an exceptionally fine article about the MX and the various deployment systems.

Before we vote \$26 billion for the President's latest proposal, Members ought to read this article.

**THE MANY WAYS MX IS HYSTERICAL**

(By Walter Pincus)

Wanted: An invulnerable, permanent home for at least 100 of the Air Force's gaint, 92-inch wide, 71-foot-tall, new MX intercontinental ballistic missiles. You know—the ones we must have to prevent the Soviet Union from attacking us.

Probably Monday, President Reagan will make his latest contribution to a saga that has now spanned 10 years and four administrations, a saga that would be simply hilarious if it weren't also serious. In each chapter of the saga, the administration of the day is searching for a safe place to put these missiles, whose 1,000 highly accurate warheads, each more than 10 times as powerful as the Hiroshima bomb, are supposed to be the needed answer to the Soviets' missile force.



Reagan's latest attempt to find a home for the MX come 13 months after the same Reagan announced on national television that "after one of the most complex, thorough and carefully conducted processes in memory" he had come up with a program for the MX.

The notions put forward that day in October 1981 for MX basing lasted well into the summer of 1982, but not much longer. The next chapter will unfold under the name of "Dense-Pack."

If there were not serious defense, diplomatic and domestic policy questions involved in this endless saga, the whole process could be seen as a bizarre satire on the Pentagon as a political and economic playground. The stars of the satire have changed with each change of administration, but the show has gone on year after year. The Reagan players don't seem to deserve any more ridicule than any of their predecessors, they just happen to be the current occupants of the major roles.

If you remember (and it would hardly be surprising if you don't), on Oct. 2, 1981, the president, with Secretary of Defense Caspar W. Weinberger by his side, went on national television to announce his plan "to revitalize our strategic forces and maintain America's ability to keep the peace well into the next century." It included building the B-1 bomber and developing a new Trident II submarine-launched missile. But the centerpiece of the program was the president's decision to go ahead with building 100 new MX missiles, placing the first 40 in existing missile silos that would be made much stronger—and thus less vulnerable to Soviet attack—by the addition of huge quantities of concrete and steel.

The administration would study three other schemes for deploying the other 60 MXs, announcing a decision later. So Reagan said last year.

The three options under study, Reagan said then, were deep underground basing, airborne basing or deceptive basing in silos, perhaps protected by a new antiballistic missile system.

What we didn't know at that moment but do know today, thanks to this newspaper's White House correspondent Lou Cannon, and his book "Reagan," is how the president reached that decision. According to Cannon's account, Weinberger had drafted the decision shortly before it was announced.

Weinberger made his decision at the last minute, after rejecting the advice of both his own expert panel and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, apparently in the hope that something better would turn up. The most embarrassing, but perhaps most illustrative, portion of Cannon's history of that moment is that Weinberger sold the nation's commander-in-chief on his proposal, not by explaining it in any detail, but rather by showing the president a cartoon from a newspaper which made fun of former President Jimmy Carter's plan for MX basing. That was the "shell game" idea—building 4,600 shelters for MXs, and shuttling 200 missiles from shelter to shelter to fool Soviet targeters.

The cartoon depicted a Carter-like figure showing three nutshells on a table to a Brezhnev-like figure, asking him to guess where the missiles were hidden. In the next panel the Brezhnev figure crushed all three. "Reagan chuckled," Cannon writes, after explaining that the president was tired that afternoon, "and approved the Weinberger plan" without any explanation of it.

This certainly was not the first time a president has blindly accepted a defense

plan from a trusted cabinet member. What's disturbing about this one is that Weinberger was, as one military man put it recently, "flying on his own." The defense secretary had ruled out the Carter plan and any other multiple basing scheme for political reasons, though he never expressed it just that way.

He clearly didn't want to appear to be adopting any idea with a Carter label on it. Moreover, Weinberger did not want to inflame the Nevada constituents of Reagan's close friend Sen. Paul Laxalt (R-Nev.), who would have to give up a large part of their state to accommodate the MX shelters envisaged in the shell-game scheme. Laxalt spoke for popular sentiment in Nevada when he came out against the shell-game idea.

As Cannon gracefully put it, Reagan's tough stand during the presidential campaign for strengthening the U.S. ICBM force "faded softly into the Nevada sunset."

Within four months of the October 1981 announcement, Reagan's MX decision was in shambles. It became clear there was no way you could satisfactorily "harden" existing silos with concrete and steel, and the three "promising" permanent basing ideas, all of which had been explored by earlier administrations, were found wanting again.

Sometime during the summer, the Air Force, with encouragement from the White House, resurrected the idea of packing MX silos close together on the theory that if the Russians tried to knock out all 100 silos, the radiation, debris, explosive pressure and heat from the first warheads that landed would do as much harm to the remaining incoming warheads as it did to the first few silos that would be hit. In the lingo of the nuclear weapons community, this theory was termed "fratricide"—in other words, the first H-bombs to explode would kill off their brothers raining down subsequently.

The new basing plan was given the name "Dense-Pack" and various studies were undertaken to see if it could be said to work. In the succeeding months, "Dense-Pack" gained a predictable following, led by the Air Force, whose overriding interest is to get the MX.

But Weinberger has had his doubts, as have many of the experts. It is now part of this saga that every new idea produces a new set of critics. Dr. Charles Townes, the chairman of Weinberger's panel of scientific experts, warned that the new plan offered no solution for the long run—if the Soviets build more warheads, "Dense-Pack" will become vulnerable.

One clever opponent came up with a study that showed that at best, "Dense-Pack" could only survive repeated Soviet attacks for four hours, if the Soviets timed their shots carefully. Thus you were spending \$20 billion or more for just four hours of security.

Perhaps the final beauty of Dense-Pack for its proponents is that no one can prove that it won't work. There is no way you can test what the "fratricide" effect will be when one nuclear warhead explodes on the surface of the earth as another comes down through the sky to explode.

This logic can be taken another step. The rational behind all our nuclear forces is "deterrence"—to make the Soviets believe they can't get away with attacking our missiles without theirs being attacked in return. So the purpose of any MX basing plan is to come up with something that we can tell the Russians will work. Naturally, then, an American government will say the system works. Whether it really will makes no difference.

Confused? Well, you are supposed to be if you are a normal individual and not a nuclear strategy expert. Simple logic has no obvious place in considerations of the MX problem.

More typical is last minute improvisation. In a delightful new book entitled, "Super Weapon, The Making of MX," author John Edwards provides exquisite detail on how the Carter administration decided to place 200 MX missiles among 4,600 horizontal shelters that looked like cement garages.

In 1978, according to Edwards' chronicle, Defense Secretary Harold Brown favored building an MX and basing it in a "shell-game" system. (Brown favored a "vertical shelters" shell game over the later "race-track" shell game, but that's another story.) Zbigniew Brzezinski proposed putting the missiles on mobile trucks. And President Carter toyed with idea of building no new missile while studying the idea of launching our force of Minuteman missiles when it was clear our force was under attack. (If we've launched them, the Soviets can't blow them up, according to this line of thinking.)

Eventually, all the key players in the Carter administration changed their minds.

Back in 1981, the Air Force put together a wall chart that illustrated 27 different basing ideas that had seriously been explored and rejected for the MX. Among the more original were basing it in mid-ocean, underwater (there was fear someone might steal it); and putting in on a large flying boat—a cousin of Howard Hughes's spruce goose.

Whatever President Reagan announces tomorrow, the MX saga won't end there. Congress retains the last word on the missile's future, and with any luck, Congress will move this debate from the arcane and often irrelevant world of the nuclear strategists into the realm of common sense.

Common sense will lead to the conclusion that we don't need an MX missile. A little history explains why.

Back in 1945, according to Manhattan project archives, when a distinguished group of government officials, scientists and military men (Henry Stimson, Gen. George C. Marshall, J. Robert Oppenheimer, James B. Conant and others) decided on the targets for the first atomic bombs, they selected two Japanese cities where military installations lay close to residential areas. Their reasoning was simple—and brutal.

They considered the atomic bomb a weapon of terror, designed to frighten a country into surrender with the threat of possible extermination. But because these were civilized men, they liked the idea of "targeting" the military installations at Hiroshima and Nagasaki to cloak their uncivilized aim of mass human destruction.

It is too easy to forget that just two small atomic bombs—less than one-tenth the size of each of those 10 hydrogen-bomb warheads on top of just one MX—killed 200,000 Japanese and injured another 130,000.

If we realize that mass destruction is the real mission of these weapons, then it becomes harder to explain why—when we already have 7,500 warheads on land- and sea-based missiles—we really need 1,000 more. The strategist reply that we need them to attack "military targets" like thousands of missile silos on U.S. and Soviet territory. But if "the balloon goes up," to use one of the many horror-disguising euphemisms of the strategists, the first wave of missiles may be aimed at missiles on the other side, but their principal effect will be to kill millions of people.

And if there is a real deterrent that would stop the Soviets from attacking, it is that their cities and people would face destruction, not that their remaining missiles would be threatened. This is the mutual assured destruction theory of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara that cutely and disparagingly has been nicknamed MAD.

That was the theory behind the first atomic bomb attacks and despite the strategists' euphemisms, it would be the theory of any other. Destruction must also be the main fear of any attacker.

Despite all the hundreds of thousands of pages that have been devoted over the past 37 years to describing tactics and strategies for basing and using nuclear weapons, any Russian or American leader who pushes the button will know that the first strike is also going to be the last. The strategists' contrary nonsense has given us thousands of missiles, bombs and other devices, but it has not given us any security.

Nuclear weapons remain what they were in 1945, when they were first used—weapons of terror. And that is how we should talk of them. ●

#### AMWAY CORP.'S TRUTH CAMPAIGN

#### HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, a recent editorial by the WZZM television station in Grand Rapids, Mich., was right on target when George Lyons, president and general manager of the station, opened the editorial comment on "Trade War" by stating:

The current problems between the Canadian Government, the Amway Corporation and its officers, point to one undeniable fact: The United States and Canada are in a trade war and have been for years. The protectionist policies of our friendliest neighbor are not friendly at all.

The U.S. Government has made some attempts to counter the "Canada-first" attitudes up North, but today free trade between the two countries remains little more than an illusion.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Trade of the House Committee on Ways and Means, I and many other Members get a very close look at the treatment U.S. companies doing business in Canada have been receiving from our neighbor. And, of course, we are all mindful in recent months of Canadian firms gaining U.S. business either for the Army's new light armored vehicle or the manufacturing of subway cars for New York City. Yes, these are difficult, highly strained times between our two countries.

And, now it hits home once again as a Canadian provincial prosecutor has filed a criminal information suit against two of my close personal friends, Jay Van Andel and Rich DeVos, chairman and president, respectively, of the Amway Corp. What is the suit about? Allegedly for underpayment by Amway of customs duties.

This is not a new issue really; it goes back for years and really, from everything I have read and heard, simply involves a misguided effort on the part of some Canadian officials to extract large sums of money from the Amway Corp. under the guise that custom duties were underpaid. Civil action is pending in Canadian courts, but now the Canadians have chosen to try to criminalize what is at most a civil tax dispute in an attempt to expedite the collection of very, very disputable duties and penalties.

I am told by Amway officials that after 2 years of trying to work out an agreement in a business-like manner, the Canadians have decided to use more embarrassing tactics. Amway, as you perhaps have seen from their special advertisement in today's Washington Post, has finally decided to tell its side of the story. I hope you will read that advertisement.

I have known Jay Van Andel and Rich DeVos for many years. Their integrity, their character, and their honesty are above reproach. But now, because of this harsh and unfounded action by the Canadian Government, they are engaged in having to prove their honesty, character, and integrity.

They will be vindicated. But, I am concerned about this new development by the Canadian Government impacting on personal and business relationships between individuals and companies of our two countries. This action presents another reason why our Congress and the present administration are on the brink of taking more direct and positive action relative to world trade arrangements and agreements. We have been for free trade—fair trade—and we do not seek a world trade war, but enough is enough. Amway does not intend to be a "fall guy" to the Canadian Government. I applaud them for sticking to their guns. The most sad commentary on the whole situation, however, is the time, the effort, and undoubtedly huge sums of money that now must be expended by Amway in its "truth campaign to prove its innocence and demonstrate the absurdity of the Canadian charges." ●

#### THERE IS HOPE FOR POLAND!

#### HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I know that many of my colleagues join me in hoping that the Polish Government will continue its recent efforts toward national reconciliation of which the release of Lech Walesa is an example. The authorities should reestablish Solidarity as the legitimate

union of Polish workers, and lift martial law. I am also encouraging the President to do everything possible to send this message to the Polish Government.

There are some positive signs that the martial law authorities are moving in the right direction. It is deplorable that the military Government of Poland made the ill-advised decision to ban Solidarity, the officially sanctioned and very effective workers organization. With nationwide support and millions of members, Solidarity played an important role in Polish society. It did much to improve the lot of Polish workers. As all of you know, Communist theory stresses the key role which the proletariat plays in society and the importance of organizing the workingman.

It seems ironic that in Poland the very organization which did so much to promote the common man was officially banned. Although martial law still forbids the conduct of union activity, Lech Walesa, Solidarity's former leader, is now free.

Walesa is a respected world figure who was recently mentioned for the coveted Nobel Peace Prize. The illegal incarceration of this brave union leader and ensuing separation from his family for nearly a year was inexcusable and counterproductive. It is gratifying to see that the martial law authorities saw the futility of continuing the illegal detention of the widely idolized Walesa, and finally freed him.

Although the Polish Government now claims that Walesa is powerless and no longer a threat, that Government undertook a smear campaign against Walesa accusing him of sexual indiscretions and of having made bitter comments regarding the Pope. Would any government take such measures to discredit a really powerless man? It is obvious that the martial law authorities took away Walesa's liberty but not his honor. Although Walesa is now taking his bearings after his long isolation, both he and Solidarity have an important role to play in the Poland of the future.

Let us hope that the Polish authorities keep their promise to lift martial law. It is in the best interest of all parties if the Government continues its dialog with the Roman Catholic Church of Poland, the nation and Lech Walesa. Polish Government sensitivity to the desires of the Polish people will help bring an end to civil unrest and the justified popular dissent in Poland. The continued detention of almost 5,000 Polish citizens under martial law is now ridiculous and purposeless. The recent release of some internees and the possible visit by the Pope to Poland are encouraging conciliatory gestures.

It would be most fitting if Poland's new spirit of reconciliation would be



manifested by the lifting of martial law on December 13, the anniversary of the imposition of that repressive law in Poland. ●

### GO SLOW ON GAS TAX

**HON. DAVID R. OBEY**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, Governor-elect Anthony S. Earl of Wisconsin has made some telling points against the administration's 5-cent gas tax program.

I urge Members to review his comments. A good many States will be significantly shortchanged unless that package is changed.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 2, 1982]

WHY THE GAS TAX HIKE IS A BAD IDEA

(By Anthony Earl)

As governor-elect of an economically distressed Midwestern state, I have spent the four weeks since the election in transition briefings learning in minute detail about the problems and the policy choices that will confront me in January. Not once so far in the search for answers has anyone jumped up on a briefing and said, "What this country needs is a good 5-cent gas tax increase."

So before Congress constructs a bona fide bandwagon for highway legislation during the lame-duck session, will somebody explain once again why this particular highway legislation is important and why those of us digging out of the economic rubble in the Midwest should be happy to see it?

It is not that the roads and bridges in Wisconsin and the Midwest do not need attention. On the contrary, the amount of investment needed for basic road preservation efforts is staggering, as it is in other parts of the country.

It is not that we feel that enough money is already being devoted to highway needs. Rather, stagnant highway revenues and repeated deferral of necessary revenue increases at all levels have contributed greatly to the current situation.

And it is not the jobs are not needed in the region. New jobs are in desperate demand, especially jobs related to a productive investment in our economic future, like highway jobs.

Yet, on balance, it appears that the legislation likely to be considered by Congress will do more harm than good for Wisconsin and much of the Midwest. Unless the highway legislation that is actually passed makes some significant changes in the traditional federal highway program, passage of highway legislation this session will be one more problem to be overcome by several distressed states.

First, the jobs issue: everyone agrees that the highway legislation being proposed is not a jobs bill, as such. But everyone recognizes that if there were not intense pressure for some federal action to stimulate job creation, this legislation would not have such a high priority.

What seems to be overlooked in the rush for legislation is that the existing federal highway program, with its dedicated user taxes and categorical distribution formulas, is highly redistributive. It taxes all highway

users equally, but sends far more back to some states in proportion to their contributions than to others. Thus a dollar of federal highway taxes will result in \$1.50 in federal aid in one state, but will produce only 65 cents of federal aid in another.

For the "loser" states, the federal highway program actually exports jobs to other states. A 5-cent federal gas tax increase would cost Wisconsin highway users about \$100 million annually, but we would expect to get back only about \$70 million under existing formulas. The \$30 million difference would be our contribution to highway construction employment in other states, most of which have lower unemployment than ours.

There are even bigger losers under the highway program who can afford their losses even less. Michigan (14.5 percent unemployment) would get back only 67 cents per dollar contributed, and would export about \$150 million in FY 83 under the highway legislation under consideration by the House; Ohio (12.3 percent unemployment) would get 76 cents back, and export about \$134 million; Indiana (11.4 percent unemployment) would get back only 68 cents, and export about \$125 million.

This inequity exists in the current highway program at current tax levels. If the federal gas tax is raised and highway funding increased without changing the pattern of spending, the percentage relationships will remain the same, but the absolute amount of dollar loss from these states will, of course, grow even larger.

Unless the highway legislation expressly recognizes unemployment as a factor for distributing funds, or some realistic minimum level of return on contributions is established, an expanded highway program could actually worsen the relative economic positions of some of the most severely affected states.

The other argument that is most often made in support of immediate action on an expanded federal highway program is that we can no longer ignore our decaying "infrastructure," especially the roads and bridges that serve as the basis arteries of mobility and commerce.

Again, this concern is valid. There is a need for greater resources to be devoted to highway system preservation at all levels.

Most often, rehabilitation of aging Interstate routes and repair or replacement of vital bridges are cited as examples of what increased emphasis on the highway program will accomplish.

But under last year's program, only 22 percent of the federal aid was directed at those two critically important needs. Under the bill to be considered by the House for an expanded program, in FY 83 the proportion of federal aid for these categories would rise only to 29 percent. By contrast, by conservative estimate, probably more than 40 percent of the expenditures from the Highway Trust Fund under the House bill would go for new construction. The remainder would probably be used for resurfacing, rehabilitation and reconstruction of routes not on the Interstate system.

Further, much of the work that is usually associated with road and highway repair is not done with federal aid: pothole repair, joint and shoulder repair, minor bridge repair and resurfacing of many older roads. These are specifically excluded from the federal program because they are defined as maintenance, which is a state or local responsibility, or because the most cost-effective repair or resurfacing alternative did not

allow for widening shoulders, grading new sightlines or leveling hills, which is necessary to qualify for federal aid.

Two other factors about a federal gas tax increase and an expanded federal highway program appear to raise red flags at the state level.

First, most states are currently facing a need for increased revenues to fund their own basic preservation efforts. If a federal gas tax is passed along with a federal aid program geared to upgrading and new construction, many states may find it difficult to raise their own taxes next year enough to fund basic state and local preservation programs.

Second is the broad consensus that is developing in favor of completely redefining and restructuring federal-state highway relationships.

There is agreement that essentially local needs should be met locally, and that the future federal responsibility should only involve highways of overriding national concern. There is not yet agreement on where the lines of local and national interest should be drawn, on whether responsibilities and fiscal capacity will be passed in tandem to states, or on what the size and scope of the remaining federal programs should be.

Further, as documented by a Congressional Budget Office Study this summer, there is increasing uncertainty regarding whether there exists either the fiscal capacity or the justification to continue blindly to pour money into a pot called "Interstate competition" since only one-quarter of the remaining cost actually represents unbuilt links in the intercity network, the rest being local segments primarily of benefit to commuters in various cities.

Considering the serious, informed questioning of the existing program that is going on, in contrast to the almost universal support that it has historically enjoyed, this does not appear to be the time for Congress routinely to authorize, and in fact to expand, the traditional program for four more years. If such authorization is enacted, it should come only after Congress has had time to examine the alternative approaches that have been proposed. The current session does not appear likely to offer an opportunity for realistic consideration of alternatives. ●

### I. HARRY CHECCHIO HONORED FOR OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVICE

**HON. CHARLES F. DOUGHERTY**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express sincere congratulations to I. Harry Checchio, Esq., upon whom the rank of knight commander by magisterial grace from the Sovereign Military and Hospitaller Order of St. George in Karinthia will be conferred on December 4, 1982.

The order was founded in 1273 and is dedicated to charitable work in aiding the needy throughout the world. The honor of knight commander is bestowed upon outstanding mem-

bers of the community who have distinguished themselves by their accomplishments in their total life experiences including family, profession, and faith.

Mr. Checchio has been a practicing attorney in Philadelphia County for approximately 33 years. Throughout this time, he has been a dedicated servant of the people in educational, political, civic, and health areas. Among his varied list of achievements, Mr. Checchio founded the Pennsylvania Medical-Legal Institute, was a member of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, and also serves as a member of the board of trustees of Nazareth Hospital. I, Harry Checchio is indeed well deserving of this honor and I would like you to join me in congratulating him for his many contributions which have served to better our community. ●

#### BEN BURROWS—CIVIC CITIZEN

### HON. RONALD M. MOTT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, a city is a way of organizing people for the betterment of their way of life. It is much more than a governmental structure; it is dynamic and reflects the views and mannerisms of its inhabitants.

The city of Parma is no exception. The ideas of the people are voiced through the various civic and local groups representing the citizens. At the forefront of many of these groups is Mr. Ben Burrows.

Ben, a leading merchant and the owner of Burrows' Wallpaper and Paint Supply Co., has a strong sense of civic duty and responsibility. His activities prove this. They have led him to devote himself to numerous organizations of widely different interests. In line with his business interests, Ben is president and director of the Parma Businessmen's Association, vice president and director of the Parma Chamber of Commerce, and was a full director of the American National Bank for 15 years.

Ben's concerns do not end here. He has also involved himself in several social and youth-welfare organizations. In addition to holding positions on the finance committees of the YMCA and the Boy Scouts, Ben had been a member of the Parma Kiwanis Club for 34 years; now he is a director. Other directorships include the Southwest Music Association, the Friends of the Library, and the Pine Hills Golf Club.

Ben was active on the original committee which provided financing for the Parma Community Hospital. He was also active in subsequent hospital extension drives.

The city of Parma has recognized Ben's accomplishments. In 1951 the mayor named him chairman of the Police Building Advisory Committee. This committee aided the city of Parma and the police department in selecting a building site for the Parma Police Station. Ben is one of only two people to be named "Honorary Police Chief of Parma," an honor he received in 1974.

Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, please join me in honoring a truly civic-minded individual, Mr. Ben Burrows. ●

#### ADMINISTRATION POLICIES WIDEN INCOME GAP

### HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, Treasury Department figures released by our colleague HENRY REUSS show that most tax breaks or loopholes are regressive and provide an overwhelming proportion of benefits to the most affluent. According to an analysis of the Treasury figures by the Joint Economic Committee, 71 percent of the revenues lost through 33 tax loopholes, totaling \$112 billion, go to the 4.4 percent of taxpayers earning more than \$50,000 a year.

The following article reports that the most regressive loophole is the tax-free preference given for interest earned on State and municipal bonds. Ninety-four percent of the exclusion of interest on State and local bonds, which costs the Treasury \$4.6 billion, goes to Americans earning \$50,000 or more. Stated another way, \$4.4 billion goes to taxpayers making more than \$50,000; \$265 million, or 5.6 percent, goes to taxpayers earning from \$20,000 to \$50,000; and only \$16 million, or 0.3 percent, goes to those making less than \$20,000.

The JEC study concludes that only 5 percent of Federal tax breaks provide proportional benefits to all taxpayers and less than a quarter of tax breaks can be described as progressive.

I believe that the Treasury Department figures support the conclusion being reached by an increasing number of Americans; that one of the central consequences of the administration's policies is that income differences between our Nation's rich and poor will increasingly enlarge. While reductions in Government spending will have little effect on persons in the top tax brackets, this group benefits enormously from the administration's tax policies. During the administration's 3-year tax cut program, Americans in the top fifth of the income spectrum will have their Federal income tax liability reduced by 49 per-

cent compared to the income and social security taxes these Americans paid in 1981. By contrast, taxpayers in the bottom fifth receive less than half of the percentage tax reduction enjoyed by all other income categories. While the administration's tax cuts will do little to help the poorest of American families, cutbacks in Government programs will actually leave them poorer and increase the number of Americans below the poverty line, according to studies by the Congressional Budget Office and others.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the following article with my colleagues.

[From the Newark Star Ledger,  
Nov. 21, 1982]

#### AFFLUENT REAP MOST FROM BOND "BREAKS"

WASHINGTON.—Americans with annual salaries greater than \$50,000 get more than 94 per cent of \$4.6 billion in federal tax breaks because interest on state and municipal bonds is not taxed, Treasury Department figures released yesterday said.

The break for holders of the tax-free bonds is just one of many tax credits that benefit the affluent under current tax laws, Rep. Henry Reuss (D-Wis.) suggested in releasing the Treasury study.

Reuss, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, called the analysis "an important contribution" to "the new drive for broad-based income taxation."

The study, Reuss said, shows that some revenue losses resulting from tax breaks provided under existing law "have exceedingly regressive impacts on our tax system."

The Treasury study ranked the exclusion of interest on state and local bonds as the most "regressive" revenue loss because taxpayers with income of over \$50,000 a year get 94.1 per cent of the benefits.

According to the study, high-income taxpayers also get more than 63 per cent of the \$13.2 billion in taxes lost to the Treasury due to a tax break on long-term capital gains on other than home sales.

While the study indicated that these and certain other tax credits benefit high-income taxpayers more than others, they do not result in the biggest tax losses to the federal government.

The biggest loss, about \$24.4 billion, comes from the exclusion of pension contributions and earnings from taxation. Only 26 per cent of the benefits from such tax savings go to high-income taxpayers.

The second biggest loss in tax revenues, \$19.6 billion, comes from the deductibility of mortgage interest on owner-occupied homes. The more affluent taxpayers get 30 per cent of the benefits from that tax break, according to the study.

Reuss said the study was the "most current and thorough" analysis of revenue losses resulting from 33 separate exclusions, exemptions, deductions and other tax credits provided for under existing tax law.

It shows, he said, that the "most progressive" tax breaks under current law include the earned income credit, exclusion of disability pay, exclusion of untaxed unemployment benefits and tax credit for the elderly go to those with incomes exceeding \$50,000 and that high income taxpayers get no benefits from the other three.

The study indicated that the Treasury loses a total of \$156.6 billion a year from all



the tax breaks for which figures are available and that more than 33 per cent of the total benefits go to high-income taxpayers.

Reuss noted, however, that taxpayers with income exceeding \$50,000 a year make up only 4.4 per cent of all taxpayers, but pay nearly 33 per cent of all taxes even after taking advantage of various tax credits.●

#### JOBLESSNESS IN OUR NATION

### HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to your attention, and that of my colleagues here today, testimony submitted to this past September's child welfare forum hosted by St. Joseph College in Connecticut. As you will readily remember, I was joined by my friends Representative GEORGE MILLER and Representative BARBARA KENNELLY in receiving testimony from service providers on the effects of the New Federalism on the children of Connecticut.

The statement that follows was submitted by a young woman named Gladys Santos. I first met Gladys at an informal hearing in Connecticut on the juvenile justice program and its benefits to the community. I was greatly impressed by Gladys' candor, her insightfulness, and her deep concern for fellow urban teenagers striving for "an alternative to hanging out in the streets looking for something to do," to use her own words. What young people need most, says Gladys, is a sense of belonging, of worth, and of dignity. As this lameduck Congress works to fashion a meaningful jobs program to remedy the tragedy of joblessness in our Nation, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will heed the call of Gladys Santos to promote training for jobless youth. This effort, on our part, would demonstrate to Gladys and her generation that we are sincere in our commitment to creating for them a better future.

#### STATEMENT OF GLADYS SANTOS

My name is Gladys Santos and I would like to give my testimony based on a teenage perspective of how I feel youth counseling centers can help the teenagers of New Britain.

First of all I would like to say the city of New Britain, Connecticut, doesn't offer much to its youth. Young people need a place to go, a place where they can meet with their friends to do things together like take part in different activities or participate in different sports. Most important, they need to get involved in something they can put their energy into. We have to give them something positive to do, an alternative to hanging out in the streets looking for something to do.

During the summer, CETA runs a two month program for teens that offers them jobs where they could learn new job skills and gives them something to do for the

summer. But unfortunately, this program is only for two months. So for the next ten months, teenagers have trouble looking for jobs or don't know how to go about finding one. The high unemployment rate isn't making it easier. This only pushes them more and more to drugs and crime. Some teenagers have trouble looking for employment because they have no job skills or they have no diploma. They start to feel rejected when no one will hire them. One way of releasing their anger is to steal what they need. No one will help them get what they need so they take it.

If we could have a youth service that will teach teenagers different job skills then they could feel that they have something to back them up when they go look for a job. Also, if we could have trained staff that could guide these kids and help them decide what they want to do with their lives, what kind of job they would like to have and learn more about themselves.

Teenagers need to learn more about drugs, crime, and peer pressure at a young age. So when they encounter drugs or decide to steal or do something that could hurt themselves they will have the knowledge about these things and can decide for themselves whether or not they want to get into trouble. Or if they have friends that are into drugs they could tell them what they learned. And if their friends want to steal or start trouble, they could tell them what could happen to them. Teenagers can help each other to think about what they are getting themselves into. Just getting teens to stop and think is a step in the right direction.

I know people that are into drugs, gangs, stealing, and I've seen a lot of my friends getting pregnant at thirteen, fourteen, fifteen. And, as I watch these things happen, I see that they have little knowledge of what they are getting into. They want to belong, to feel wanted. Part of something. If they have no one there to educate them, and drugs and sex is where it's at, they will turn in that direction. Why? Because when they are in their groups, they belong.

I know youth counseling centers can help teenagers because I have had some experience.

For the past two summers, I've worked in Sheldon Community Guidance Clinic in New Britain. I've seen from my own personal experience how Sheldon clinic has helped teenagers. Part of Sheldon is the Station Youth Counseling Center that runs a variety of counseling programs for teens. I worked in the peer outreach drama program. Through this program the peer outreach workers learned theatrical skills, and counseling skills. Also, we learned about many teen issues like dating, family relationships, drugs, alcohol, etc. And, we did our performances based on small skits taken from these issues.

Throughout both summers, I have made new friends and seen the changes in these teenagers. They become more open, relaxed, and become more and more interested in learning. One teenager even quit smoking marijuana and quit his gang.

I would also like to mention the two women I worked with. Juliann Wolfarth was the drama director and Marilyn O'Neil was the counseling coordinator. These two women really cared about the kids they worked with. They were not there because it was their profession, but because they cared. They really wanted to help and it showed in the way they worked with us.

Sheldon offers other programs for teens that can help them in many ways. This fall,

Marilyn and Julie are helping me decide what I want to do with myself and if I choose to go to college, they will help me to do the best I can. I feel lucky because I've been able to see the help offered and experience it. But there are still so many teenagers that must be reached. The more programs we offer, the better our chances of reaching them. And, that is a definite set in the right direction.●

#### CIVIL AIR PATROL

### HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, one of the particularly outstanding service organizations in our country is the Civil Air Patrol, which this week celebrates the 41st anniversary of its founding.

A nonprofit, volunteer association committed to humanitarian work, the Civil Air Patrol is also an auxiliary of the U.S. Air Force.

CAP was originally established to offer private aviators a means to utilize their skills in the defense of the Nation. During World War II these volunteers played a key role in patrolling U.S. coastal areas, and performed so admirably that in 1946 the Congress authorized the official chartering of the organization.

The Civil Air Patrol continues to provide leadership in aerial search and rescue missions, and trains volunteers for that purpose.

I take a great deal of pleasure in paying tribute to the fine people of the Civil Air Patrol, and particular pride in acknowledging the service of Composite Squadron 102 in Butler County, Ohio.●

#### WE NEED A UNIFIED APPROACH TO THE DRINKING AGE

### HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, recently two Cabinet Secretaries testified before the President's National Commission on Drunk Driving and endorsed a unified approach to the drinking age. Both Transportation Secretary Drew Lewis and Health and Human Services Secretary Richard S. Schweiker, who were speaking on behalf of their respective Departments said they would favor having the States raise the legal drinking age to 21.

I applaud Secretaries Lewis and Schweiker for having taken this stand on what can only be termed a national epidemic—the rise of alcoholism and

highway fatalities among our Nation's youth.

All of us in Congress and in statehouses across the country lately have been forced to take significant steps to increase penalties for driving under the influence of alcohol. This was due in part to the intense lobbying efforts of groups such as Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD), Students Against Drunk Driving (SADD), and Remove Intoxicated Drivers (RID).

But, a related and equally serious matter that has received less attention is the need to raise the legal drinking age in the States that still allow persons under the age of 21 to purchase and consume alcoholic beverages.

The National Transportation Safety Board recognizes this problem, and, on July 23 the Board urged that the legal minimum drinking age for drinking and purchasing alcohol be raised to 21 nationwide in an effort to cut the highway death toll from drunken driving. The Board's recommendation of raising the minimum drinking-purchasing age to 21 was sent to the Governors and State legislatures of the 35 States and to the Mayor and City Council of the District of Columbia where the drinking age is now less than 21. And this idea is also under study as a possible recommendation by the President's Commission on Drunk Driving, which makes its report next April.

Just before we recessed, Congress passed legislation which will reward the States with funds from the Highway Trust Fund to encourage and facilitate the implementation of comprehensive, coordinated, and community-based drunk driving programs. That measure was signed by the President as is now public law.

But this is just one step along the road to addressing the most frequently committed violent crime in the United States today, drunk driving, and specifically, drunk driving among teenage Americans.

National Transportation Safety Board President Jim Burnett recently spoke on this subject before the 70th Annual National Safety Congress and Exposition. Mr. Speaker, I have read his remarks, and was astonished by the Board's findings. I think my fellow Members need to hear them.

Did you know, that, of the 25,000 persons who die each year in drunk driving accidents, 5,000 are teenagers?

Did you know that almost 60 percent of fatally injured teenage drivers had alcohol in their blood?

Did you know that the life expectancy in America has improved over the past 75 years for every age group except one—15- to 24-year-olds—and did you know that the leading single cause of death for this age group was drunk driving?

We in Congress should make our voices heard about this national dis-

grace. I fell very strongly about the drunk driving problem, and I know that others in this Chamber do as well. That is why I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 429 expressing the sense of Congress that the age for drinking and purchasing all alcoholic beverages should be raised to 21 in those 35 States and the District of Columbia where the drinking age is now less than 21.

Senator ARLEN SPECTER has introduced the companion legislation, Senate Concurrent Resolution 129. National Transportation Safety Board Chairman Jim Burnett has called this resolution a key example of the kind of support needed to end the epidemic of drunken driving accidents which have claimed the lives of 250,000 Americans over the last 10 years. Burnett has said, "I hope Congressman GOODLING's resolution is a first step that will lead to Congress giving its full support to the concept of raising the drinking age to 21 as an effective way to cut the Nation's highway death toll."

We all know that in the early seventies, many States lowered the drinking age usually from 20 or 21 to 18 or 19 as part of a national trend toward lowering the age of majority.

Numerous empirical investigations were conducted during the debate in public policy and academic areas, and the results generally showed significant increases in alcohol-related motor vehicle crash involvement among young drivers after reductions in the drinking age. As reported in the winter 1981-82 issue of Alcohol Health and Research World an excellent overview of this subject, several studies also found indications of increased alcohol consumption and increased rates of admission to alcohol treatment programs after drinking ages were lowered.

As the result of emerging evidence, a number of States raised the drinking age in the late seventies and early eighties. Research on the effects of this return to higher drinking age has revealed alcohol-crash involvement among young drivers decreased significantly.

Michigan lowered the drinking age to 18 in January 1972 and raised it back to 21 in December 1978. In the first 12 months after the age limit was raised, a study showed a reduction of 31 percent in alcohol-related accidents among drivers aged 18 to 20. In Illinois, a study showed an 8.8-percent decline in single vehicle nighttime male driver accidents involving drivers 19 and 20 when the drinking age was raised in 1980.

But today, most State laws are a hodge-podge of jurisdictional incongruities. Unification of State laws under a nationwide drinking age would correct these incongruities, and we as U.S. Members of Congress should ac-

tively encourage the States to look at the problems associated with these differing drinking ages seriously.

I support the National Transportation Safety Board's recommendation for several reasons.

First, it would reduce the general availability of alcohol to teenagers. The Massachusetts Secondary School Administrator's Association found that, when the drinking age was lowered to 18, there were increases in vandalism and other disciplinary problems. As a former school superintendent and a ranking member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I can sympathize with concerns that the lowered drinking age provided opportunities for younger students—some as young as 13 or 14—to obtain liquor through friends who became 18 their senior year, and I recognize that this was one reason which prompted Massachusetts to bring its drinking age up again.

Second, a unified drinking age would correct an undesirable situation in which access to alcohol by teenagers is only a matter of motoring across the State line. Pennsylvania, which has always been a "21" State, is bordered by New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Ohio—all of which at one time had lower drinking ages. In the 10 New York counties that are contiguous to Pennsylvania, 10 percent of the alcohol-related accidents involving an 18- to 20-year-old driver involved a driver who was licensed in Pennsylvania, according to a 1981 Bureau of Alcohol and Highway Safety Research report.

There will, of course, be arguments that by unifying the drinking age at 21 we are denying a right to our young people. That, if someone is old enough to vote, to get married, to register for the selective service, then it is unfair to deny drinking rights.

I say that purchasing and drinking alcohol was never a constitutionally protected right, but rather, a privilege.

Our forefathers were concerned about the preservation of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Last year, 25,000 people died in alcohol-related highway accidents; 8,484, or about 35 percent, were between the ages of 16 and 24. As these National Transportation Safety Board figures indicate, the death toll among young Americans is grossly disproportionate. It is scandalous.

Let us end this national tragedy. Let us save these young lives.

I urge all of my colleagues to send a message to those States and the District of Columbia where the drinking age is under 21 to take the beginning steps to raise it.

Thank you.●



THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF  
THE MURDERS OF FOUR  
AMERICAN CHURCHWOMEN IN  
EL SALVADOR

**HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, today we remember and pay tribute to the memory of four women of peace who were brutally murdered in El Salvador on December 2, 1980. Ita Ford and Maura Clarke of Maryknoll; Dorothy Kazel, an Ursuline sister; and Jean Donovan, a lay missionary, were known to very few the night they were thrown in a ditch along a dark road in El Salvador. Today they are remembered by millions around the world. In December of 1980 they were simply four dedicated missionaries, sheltering and clothing the homeless, comforting wounded bodies and frightened souls. Today their names are symbols of the awakening of our national conscience.

In December of 1980, the United States and El Salvador pledged their respective Governments to do everything possible to bring those responsible for this atrocity to justice. The accused murderers have, in fact, been in custody since April of 1981. Some have confessed to their crime. Still, there has been no trial, no prosecution. More incredibly, there has been no serious and systematic investigation of the involvement of higher officers or others in encouraging, ordering, or condoning the murders.

Indeed, when the investigation of a similar case involving the American labor representatives revealed clear evidence of the participation of higher officers, the Salvadoran courts dismissed the case. Now, as the possibility of a trial in the churchwomen's case looms on the horizon, observers fear that it will be a "show trial," a legitimization of a corrupt and impotent justice system and a whitewash of those who bear responsibility for actions by the security forces of El Salvador.

Congress also bears a responsibility. Twice in this session of Congress the President of the United States was allowed to certify that "progress" has been made in reducing human rights violations and in promoting a political solution to the strife in El Salvador, in spite of overwhelming evidence to the contrary.

In recent weeks we have witnessed another betrayal of our national honor: the sad spectacle of a U.S. Ambassador, who finally spoke the hard truth to the Salvadoran elite, being publicly rebuked by his Government.

Today we should reflect on what the eclipse of our human rights policy in Latin America has really meant: a license for those who carry our guns, ammunition, and equipment—some of

whom have been trained on American soil or by American personnel—to arrest and kill at random, to label innocent people as "subversives," to obliterate all political opposition with bullets rather than the ballot or negotiation, even to undermine and sabotage legitimate governments.

Today is a day for renewing our dedication as public servants to shaping a foreign policy that will end the spreading violence and militarization throughout Central America that has claimed the lives of thousands. Let us remember that Ita and Maura and Dorothy and Jean were not killed with rifles and bullets made in El Salvador. Let us dedicate ourselves to eliminating arms traffic in this hemisphere, including our own. Let us dedicate ourselves to bringing the technologies and arts of peace rather than the engines and arts of war to the torn and ravaged countries of Central America.

The martyrs of El Salvador speak more eloquently, in their silence, of our responsibility than any words we will hear today. ●

MR. PARMA HEIGHTS, OHIO

**HON. RONALD M. MOTT**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, more than 25 years ago Paul W. Cassidy was elected mayor of the city of Parma Heights, Ohio, which I represent.

During that time, Mayor Cassidy has taken Parma Heights from a sleepy community to a city of some 23,000 industrious, hard-working residents. The growth and orderly development of Parma Heights has served as a model for other communities.

Mayor Cassidy and his administration have prided themselves—and rightly so—on instigating many public projects without outside help from the State or Washington.

In addition to his many years of public service, Mayor Cassidy has built an enviable record as a practicing attorney and is widely respected among his peers. Despite the demands on his time, Mayor Cassidy still finds time to serve on charitable and civic boards. His accessibility to his constituents is legend.

Mayor Cassidy has but three loves in his life—his wife, Elise, his family, and his city. ●

LIBASSI'S GOOD ADVICE ON THE  
AGED

**HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, most of my colleagues remember Peter Libassi for his service at the Department of Health and Human Services under Secretary Joe Califano. He was one of the Department's top advisers in his role as General Counsel.

More recently, Peter has embarked on a distinguished career as senior vice president of the Travelers Insurance Co. He used his Washington experience and political acumen, last summer, with his work on the 1982 tax bill.

During the recess, Peter contributed a fine article on the op-ed page of the Hartford Courant, in which he discussed a terribly important issue: The need to insure that there are ample places among the workforce for our elderly citizens. Peter argues persuasively that it is in our economic interest—as well as a measure of justice in our society—to make such slots available for seniors who are able and interested in employment.

I commend the article to the Members, and I commend Peter Libassi for continuing his efforts on behalf of our society.

[From the Hartford Courant, Nov. 15, 1982]

ALLOWING OLDER PEOPLE TO WORK WOULD  
HELP THEM AND THE ECONOMY

(By F. Peter Libassi)

The aging of America deeply affects all of us. Today, many of us live longer because of the triumphs of medical progress.

But, even as we acknowledge this progress, we must also recognize there is uncertainty about the future among older people. And we must ask a critical question: Will there be abundant opportunities in the future for older people to be active and productive? Can we assure older citizens that theirs can be a truly independent and good life?

I believe that expanded job opportunities is one important key to resolving this uncertainty about aging. Not only would it help older citizens economically and psychologically, it would be good for business and our national economy.

Today's older people are healthier and better educated than any previous generation. Not only can they work, increasingly they are saying they want to work. For millions, the opportunity to work beyond traditional retirement age or during retirement, means a chance to remain alert, useful, in touch with other people and to earn extra income.

A major expansion of economic opportunity for older citizens would help reassure millions that they need not be uncertain about old age: that, if they chose to supplement their incomes with earnings from employment, they could do so.

What's more, these older workers may be needed. It is projected that the number of new entrants into the labor force—workers age 18 to 24—will drop by 15 percent over

the next 20 years. At the same time, that part of our population over 65 will grow by nearly 30 percent.

It is common sense for business to look for employees where the potential supply is greatest: among older people. Fortunately, this growing cohort of older citizens represents a vast repository of knowledge, experience and potential productivity.

In 1981, a committee of the White House Conference on Aging studied the effects on our economy if older people, instead of continuing to leave the work force in ever-increasing numbers, should remain there at 1970 levels.

The economic analysis of this question showed that the gross national product would grow nearly 4 percent or more by the year 2005 because more people would be working and contributing to our economy. It also showed that this increased employment would create an increase in federal tax revenues of \$40 billion by 2005.

Given all these enormous potential benefits, we would expect a strong national trend toward expanded employment of older people. Yet, we have created a structure that severely limits older citizens' choices. We have created a system of economic barriers, public and private, which penalize older people seeking to earn extra income.

The most insidious barrier of all is ageism—ignorance about aging and older people. How often do we hear that older people are slow, inflexible, cranky, unproductive, unhealthy and easily distracted? While some old people certainly are sick and frail, these descriptions do not apply to vast numbers of people over 65.

In my judgment, we can enlist American business in an effort to expand job options for older workers.

Business should begin experimenting, on a much larger scale, with a range of work options for older people: part-time jobs; job-sharing; flextime; phased retirement; job transfers; retraining, and rehiring of retirees. Even working at home.

I'm convinced that, as employers expand job opportunities for older workers, they will find that older people are highly productive. They will discover that helping older workers continue working is profitable. They will find, in short, that it works.●

#### FIRMING UP SOCIAL SECURITY

**HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I can think of few issues as vital to the future and well-being of our older citizens as the condition of our social security system.

In this connection, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial that appeared in the Lincoln Journal on November 4, 1982.

#### FIRMING UP SOCIAL SECURITY

The incessantly-talked about crunch in Social Security funds becomes a reality Friday. That is when federal officials must for the first time in the system's history, begin borrowing money to provide checks to beneficiaries.

The first billion-dollar chunk is to be shifted from the system's Disability Insur-

ance Trust Fund to the Old Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund. Because revenues from payroll taxes are falling short of projections, and the outgo drain from the largest, basic Social Security fund is constant, as much as \$11 billion may be required in transfers before mid-1983.

There's no profit speculating about the soundness of the entire Social Security system if only the country's economy hadn't gone haywire. That doesn't solve the great problems affecting the nation today, or tomorrow.

Very shortly, a presidential commission is to make its recommendations on changes required for restoring the current health and future prospects of Social Security—which is our bedrock public retirement system. One need not be a member of the commission to know the remedial choices are not that extensive.

The Journal's advance judgment, which factors in political realities, is that virtually all proposals for changes in the system ought to be favorably considered for enactment. The exception would be those proposals which might tend to cancel each other out, and thus be counterproductive, wasting time, emotion and money.

Spreading the adjustments across the spectrum so that everybody involved is affected—those who benefit as well as those who finance the system—would seem the least that social justice demands.

What are some of the possible changes? Let's list just a few of them to get the juices flowing:

Gradually extend the age at which full Social Security retirement benefits will be paid, from the current 65 years to 68.

Make Social Security benefits subject to taxation, at least those where beneficiaries' total income exceeds agreed-upon low income minimums.

Revise the current indexing arrangement, at least to the extent that annual benefit adjustments do not exceed the nation's increase in productivity, or Gross National Product or the average level of higher wages paid.

Gradually end the separate federal retirement program for the military and federal officials and workers, bringing all of them into the Social Security system. Presently earned benefits should not be reduced or dropped, however.

Prohibit groups from opting out of the system.

Transfer support of the medical care aspects of Social Security to a dependency upon the nation's general revenues, being subject to congressional appropriations.●

#### NEW MONEY MARKET DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS

**HON. DOUG BARNARD, JR.**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation to perfect the new money market deposit account that most financial institutions will be offering to their customers as of December 14.

These accounts, which were specifically authorized by the Garn-St Germain Depository Institutions Act of 1982, will allow banks, thrifts, and

credit unions to directly compete with the money market mutual funds for the first time. They are, according to the enabling legislation, to be formulated in such a way so that they are "directly equivalent to and competitive with money market mutual funds," and the regulations issued by the Depository Institutions Deregulation Committee have gone a long way toward meeting that goal.

Unfortunately, there are many vital features that the money funds can offer that are still forbidden to depository institutions. As a result, the new account, while a major advance toward equality, will not meet the goal expressed by Congress in October.

Chief among these forbidden features is the ability to offer a competitively priced account that allows third party payments. This is a feature that is essential to attract funds now managed by professional cash managers. Deposits of professional managers make up about two-thirds of the total assets of money market mutual funds, and the ability to compete with them is vital if we are to meet our goal of competitive equality.

It is possible for depository institutions to offer this feature if they can afford to pay the cost of holding 12 percent of the deposits in the form of sterile, noninterest paying reserves with the Federal Reserve System. Unfortunately, this would significantly increase their costs. For example, at 10 percent annual interest, the 12-percent reserves would require the depository institutions to pay 1.36 percent less for personal deposits and 0.30 percent less for nonpersonal deposits. In an industry where profit margins are a few hundredths of a percent, realistically they could not compete.

My legislation would make this competition possible. It would authorize the Federal Reserve to pay interest on these reserves so that the depository institutions can be competitive.

There is a precedent for this. When the Monetary Control Act of 1980 was passed there was a real possibility that the Federal Reserve would be forced to require reserves at a higher rate than would normally be allowed by that legislation in order to control the money supply. In such cases, they are authorized to pay interest on those special reserves at the same rate as their portfolio yield.

Today also, there is a monetary policy consideration that complements the needs for competitive equality. For most of the last 2 years, the Federal Reserve has warned that the \$230 billion in money market mutual funds is outside their control and endangers monetary stability. Allowing banks, thrifts, and credit unions to compete for these funds will bring a significant portion of this uncontrolled money back into normal channels.



Finally, there is the question of meeting the financial needs of local communities.

In the last few years, literally billions of dollars that would have been deposited in local financial institutions to meet the needs of local borrowers have been sucked into the money market mutual funds. These funds then placed the money with major money center banks.

Some of this money was lent to local banks, thrifts, or credit unions at higher interest rates, but a great deal of it remained outside the local communities at any price. As a result, local financial needs remained unfilled.

If we allow local financial institutions the ability to compete for all the customers of the mutual funds, they will at least have the chance to keep this money in the community.

My legislation does not seek to give depository institutions any advantages over money market mutual funds, but it does seek to allow them the ability to match their features at a relatively competitive cost. The real beneficiaries will be the consumers who will have a choice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support my legislation, and I request that further information and the text of my bill follow these remarks.●

#### A TRIBUTE TO AMWAY AND ITS COMMITMENT TO THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

### HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleague, GUY VANDER JAGT, in his concern over the recent charges filed against Amway Corp. and its two owners by a Canadian provincial prosecutor. Like GUY, I have known Jay Van Andel and Rich DeVos ever since they started Amway 24 years ago. As a friend of theirs and as a Congressman whose district includes Ada, Mich., where their company is headquartered, I can assure you of their personal integrity and that of the company itself. Amway and its two owners are the embodiment of the free enterprise system.

As the former chairman of a corporation that had a distribution system somewhat similar to Amway's in that it went from manufacturer to retailer, I am fully aware of the problems relating to the fair and equitable valuation of goods for customs duties in Canada.

I would also like to call my colleagues' attention to the advertisement in this morning's Washington Post, and applaud Amway for its decision to explain and defend its position to the public. I believe the Congress should watch closely how the Canadian

authorities treat American citizens doing business in their country.●

#### HELP THE VASHCHENKOS

### HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's New York Times describes the agony of the Vashchenkos, a Russian Pentecostal family who have taken permanent refuge for 4 years inside the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. The Vashchenkos and their two daughters, both in their twenties, together with Mariya Chmykhalov and her 20-year-old son have lived in the Embassy basement after a futile campaign to emigrate to the United States.

The article tells of Avgustina Vashchenko seeing her two youngest children for the first time in 4½ years through her barred basement window in the Embassy. This emotional reunion witnessed by American reporters and diplomats has once again raised the question, "What can the United States do to assist the Vashchenkos?"

What we can do is outlined in H.R. 2873. This bill would allow the United States to grant a visa and admit the Vashchenko family as permanent residents. H.R. 2873 is now in the Subcommittee on Immigration in the House of Representatives. A parallel bill, S. 312, was passed in July by the Senate.

It has always been in the humanitarian tradition of the United States to assist those who suffer from religious persecution. Giving relief to the Vashchenko family would once more demonstrate to the world the principles upon which this country was founded and which it should continue to uphold.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 1, 1982]

#### THROUGH BARS, A TEARFUL REUNION OF PENTECOSTALS

(By Serge Schmemmann)

Moscow, November 30.—Kneeling on the sill of the barred basement window of the United States Embassy, Avgustina Vashchenko saw her two youngest children today for the first time in four and a half years.

Flanked by two grown daughters and backed by her husband, the Pentecostal struggled with tears and gazed on Avram, 8 years old, and Sarra, 12, who stood silently on the pavement outside with an older sister and a phalanx of American reporters and diplomats and Soviet police.

"Mama, don't cry, don't cry, we'll all be together soon," said Lidiya, the 32-year-old daughter who had accompanied the children.

She had been one of the Pentecostal refugees inside the embassy until she went on a hunger strike last year and was evacuated to a hospital, from which she went home to Siberia.

Mrs. Vashchenko tried to touch Avram through the thick screen and the ornamental ironwork.

#### LITTLE BOY SEEMS OVERWHELMED

"Avramushka," she said, "you're so big now, you're a man. Have all your teeth fallen out? Show me."

The boy seemed overwhelmed and struggled with a drippy nose. His anxious mother sent her husband, Pyotr, off for some pink tissues, which were stuffed through the grating. Then Mr. Vashchenko tried to catch the boy's interest by showing him the family cat, but the cat took fright and scrambled off.

The emotional rendezvous, which occurred while eight other Vashchenko children were waiting at the Yaroslavl railroad terminal, followed the sort of confused and troubled planning and negotiating that have characterized the life of the Pentecostal refugees ever since they burst into the embassy four years ago after a futile campaign to emigrate.

The Vashchenkos and their two daughters, both in their 20's and Mariya Chmykhalov and her 20-year-old son Timofel have lived ever since in the embassy basement, first in one and then in two rooms. Through the years they have grown bitter at the United States, feeling certain that the Government, if it wanted to, could arrange their departure from the Soviet Union.

#### RETURN TO HOMETOWN DEMANDED

The Soviet authorities have declined to consider applications for emigration unless the refugees first return to their hometown of Chernogorsk in Siberia, and the Pentecostals fear that this is simply an attempt to pry them out of the embassy.

An embassy spokesman said that originally all the Vashchenko children had wanted to visit their parents and sisters, but the embassy did not want more than two to enter the building at one time. The spokesman declined to explain the conditions, but it seemed intended to prevent more of the Pentecostals from taking permanent refuge.

The elder daughters—Lidiya on the outside and Lyubov inside, both of whom speak for the group—refused the condition, saying, "We want to discuss our future together as a family." After several hours of negotiations, only the two youngest children were brought to the window.

The daughters' rejection of the embassy's conditions was evidently meant in part to dramatize the family's plight. The family made no effort to clear reporters away, and Lidiya Vashchenko said at one point: "Let people see how we are separated."

Mrs. Vashchenko appeared dismayed that she could not meet with all the children from whom she has been separated for so long.

"I thought we would have an evening together," she said, "It would have been good if you had all come."

With the glare of television lights and the iron grate between them, the family members seemed at a loss what to say during their encounter. Mrs. Vashchenko fretted about whether Lidiya was warm and pushed cookies and small gifts past the edge of the grate, while Mr. Vashchenko tried to hand a stack of Christmas cards to the children.

At times the mother seemed to differ with her daughters and their bitter countenance.

"There is no room for us here, and no one wants us there," Lidiya said, alluding to the Soviet Union and to the United States.

"There are some very good American people, it's just some of the people here," Mrs. Vashchenko suggested. "We'll all be together soon."

"It would have been good if you had all had come," she continued. "Will you be all right?"

"Don't worry, mama," Lidiya answered. "If they take us away, they'll take us away. If the don't, we'll continue to wait."

The time came to separate, and 12-year-old Sarra politely said, "Thank you, papa and mama." As Lidiya walked off with the two children, the mother and her two daughters inside broke into sobs.

#### A NIGHT IN THE STATION

Lidiya Vashchenko said she and the 11 children would spend the night at the Yaroslavl station, and in the morning would decide what to do next.

The policemen who witnessed the scene made no attempt to interfere with the sidewalk meeting, although several cars drove up with uniformed and plainclothes reinforcements.

The Pentecostals have posed a continuing problem for the embassy, which has been helpless in arranging emigration and, at the same time, has been unable to convince the Siberians of its impotence.

The refugees have focused attention on efforts by Pentecostals to emigrate. In contrast to other organized religious denominations, the Pentecostals and other Protestant fundamentalist sects have not been officially accepted in the Soviet Union on the ground that their religious precepts and traditional interpretations of the Bible come into conflict with military service and other social obligations incumbent on citizens.●

### PEACE IN EL SALVADOR

#### HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, on the second anniversary of the murder of four American religious women in El Salvador, I think it is appropriate for us to pause and reflect on the current status of conditions in that war-torn country. Unfortunately, not only are these murder cases unresolved, but the murders of tens of thousands of Salvadorans have gone unpunished as well, while the abuse of human rights in that country continues. A recent editorial from the Boston Globe highlights several of the most essential elements of the current situation in El Salvador, and I would like to include a copy of this article in the RECORD at this time for the benefit of my colleagues. Among the most important points are the fact that dominant political control of the country continues to rest, not as it should with the civilian leadership, but in the hands of the military council headed by Gen. Jose Guillermo Garcia; that General Garcia does not, as some have claimed, constitute a moderate alternative to right-wing leader Roberto D'Aubuisson; and that U.S. policy is fatally flawed by our continuing refusal to support proposals for dialog to help put an end to the violence. On this special occasion, I think it is important to send a message to El Salvador that the people of

the United States stand firmly by our commitment to terminate future supplies of military assistance to El Salvador unless there is a genuine good-faith effort to fully investigate and bring to justice all of those responsible for murdering U.S. citizens in the country.

The editorial follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Nov. 21, 1982]

#### GRAVEYARD SPIRAL IN EL SALVADOR

A blistering speech delivered recently in El Salvador by US Ambassador Deane R. Hinton caused an uproar there. Hinton told a prominent Chamber of Commerce audience that powerful elements in the Salvadoran establishment are a "mafia. . . . The gorillas of this mafia, every bit as much as the guerrillas in Morazan and Chalatenango [provinces] are destroying El Salvador," he said.

The business leaders lashed back with a newspaper ad calling Hinton's warning an "act of arrogant imperiousness" worthy of "a delegate of ancient imperial Rome. . . ." That retort could be translated roughly as: "The shoe fits and we don't like it."

The White House didn't like the speech either. It was too blunt, too powerful, too true. Hinton may have given momentary cheer to Administration critics because his words suggested greater State Department willingness to acknowledge the grave mistakes inherent in current US policy toward El Salvador. But President Reagan, who prefers "quiet diplomacy" when dealing with those he considers friends, hastened to undercut the ambassador. And so the message to the Salvadoran regime was left as ambiguous and as permissive as ever.

Administration policy toward El Salvador consists of interwoven strands: shoring up the status quo, pretending for home consumption that civilian government holds sway, attaching no serious conditions to American aid, hoping for a military victory in the civil war, spurning repeated guerrilla offers for peace talks—and turning a blind eye to the consequences.

This policy is similar to that of the Carter Administration several years ago in Nicaragua. Carter moved too little and too late to distance the United States from the corrupt, discredited Somoza regime. This accelerated the alienation of the Nicaraguan left and steadily weakened the political center, so that by the time the Sandinistas finally won their military victory, the influence of moderates in their ranks was severely diminished.

Applied now to El Salvador, this dismal policy is equally shortsighted. But it is also deceptive. The pretense that we are dealing with a legitimate, democratic government masks the reality that the real center of power in El Salvador, which should be held accountable for all that happens there, is the military. Specifically, it is the military council headed by the minister of defense, Gen. Jose Guillermo Garcia.

For 50 years the power has been held by the military, who have exercised it for their own benefit and for that of the wealthy, narrow upper crust known as the oligarchy. The president and the constituent assembly, subject of so much attention at last March's election, provide only a facade of democracy. The court system, banks, budgets, death squads—all the instruments of government in El Salvador—are in one way or another controlled by military officers jockeying perpetually and warily for power.

Events such as the Hinton-speech flap or the recent announcement that some suspects in the 1980 killings of four American churchwomen may actually face trial should not obscure the fact that, beneath it all, very little has changed, either in Washington or San Salvador.

Much the same goes for the recent reports of a power struggle between Gen. Garcia and Roberto D'Aubuisson, the irrepressible former national guard intelligence officer who heads a rightwing party in the Constituent Assembly.

D'Aubuisson, who has many friends in the military, has been trying to engineer a coup to dump Garcia. Garcia seems to have thwarted the effort of shuffling several of his subordinates.

Watching such palace coups is good entertainment, but it's a mistake to read too much into them. D'Aubuisson, the designated bad guy, is indeed a dangerous, violent and ambitious man. But if Garcia is the good guy, his most evident attribute is merely that he knows how to hold onto power. Through four presidencies he has survived as minister of defense. Americans are told Garcia is furthering American interests. What results has he, in fact, produced?

The traditional career aim of many Salvadoran officers is to get rich through graft. To do that they must play the game while they rise through the ranks in a highly intricate system of cohorts. For years they cooperate in subordinate roles, knowing that when they get to be colonels, or thereabouts, the money will pour in.

As a result, many Salvadoran field commanders are not really soldiers. Their units fight like campfire girls. An offensive early last summer is reported to have thoroughly discredited Salvadoran troops in the eyes of Honduran counterparts deployed at the border in a "hammer and anvil" strategy to trap the guerrillas. Much had been expected of the troops and officers of the special brigades trained in the United States. But instead of demonstrating the bold new anti-guerrilla tactics they had been taught, small units and night patrols, they reverted to clumsy mass movements and the guerrillas ran circles around them. In image-conscious Central America, the United States was seen as backing a loser.

It's time for U.S. policy to get down to basics. The real source of power in El Salvador is the military. The minister of defense must be held responsible, not for purported good intentions, but for results.

One way or another, Gen. Garcia must stop the killing of the "little people," over 30,000 of whom have died in the past three years. He must punish the killers and their bosses—or drive them into exile if that's easier. And he must not be allowed to purchase a succession of temporary dispensations, for example by allowing a show trial to begin in the case of the slain American nuns. After all, it is the killing of a Salvadoran multitude that is destroying the country.

To pull El Salvador out of its graveyard spiral the Reagan Administration will have to do two things: First, give the military a short deadline for shaping up the country militarily, judicially, politically. And Second, reverse its position on peace talks. Both demands will have to be backed with the threat to end American aid.

Unless the United States insists on a political settlement in El Salvador as the price for continued assistance, the old corrupt system will continue.



With one leg already out of the country, with bank accounts pre-positioned in friendly havens like Miami, oligarchs and military chiefs alike will follow a course of accelerated graft, getting rich as fast as they can as long as they can, conceding nothing to lay the groundwork for a stable future.

The Reagan Administration has not shown the moral compass, political wits and diplomatic backbone to deal with this situation to date. So in January, at the next deadline for "certifying" progress in El Salvador, it will be time for Congress to step in. ●

#### DOMESTIC CONTENT: PUT ANOTHER AMERICAN OUT OF WORK

**HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● **Mr. DANNEMEYER.** Mr. Speaker, all of us are painfully aware of the tragic situation that exists today with respect to unemployment. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has reported that the unemployment rate in October was 10.4 percent, which translates into fully 11.6 million Americans out of work.

Under these circumstances, it is difficult to resist the temptation to resort to protectionist legislation, but resist it we must. Before the books are closed on the 97th Congress, we may very well be called upon to act on H.R. 5133, the Fair Practices in Automotive Products Act. This measure, commonly known as the domestic content bill, would require a progressively increasing percentage of domestic parts and labor in all vehicles sold in the United States. Proponents of the bill claim that it would save or create jobs in a job-hungry economy.

Unfortunately, nothing could be further from the truth. This is a jobs bill, alright. It is, however, a jobs transfer bill, not a jobs preservation or creation measure. If this bill is enacted into law, Americans whose jobs relate to auto imports, such as longshoremen and import auto dealership employees, will be lost. In its analysis of the direct employment effects of H.R. 5133 as amended by the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Congressional Budget Office stated that, by 1990, some 38,000 auto jobs would be created, but would be offset by the elimination of 104,000 nonauto jobs.

Specifically, those whose jobs are dependent upon exports will be placed in great jeopardy. We may reasonably expect that foreign nations will use our passage of domestic content legislation as grounds for retaliatory action against American exports. In fact, such a step is sanctioned by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). This retaliatory scenario is described as a "highly probable outcome" by the Congressional Budget

Office in its analysis of the original legislation which was prepared at the request of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade.

There are those who have challenged this export effect on the grounds that retaliation will simply not take place. While I strongly disagree with this assertion, I must further note that a negative impact on U.S. employment will occur even without formal or informal foreign retaliation against American exports. This loss of jobs will likely take place as a result of the impact of the legislation on currency exchange rates between the dollar and the foreign currency of the auto exporting nations, such as the yen in the case of Japan.

While we were away for the election period recess, an excellent analysis of this very point was carried on the op-ed pages of the Washington Post. Economics professor Robert M. Dunn, Jr., of the George Washington University, wrote a thought-provoking commentary that merits our further consideration. The article was printed under the appropriate headline of "Save an Auto Workers' Job, Put Another American Out of Work \* \* \*". Dunn argues that under the present system of floating exchange rates, job gains in Detroit will be offset by job losses in other cities.

Dunn does not stop with a negative approach to domestic content legislation. He goes on to point out that part of the auto import problem stems from the exchange rate between the dollar and other world currencies. The overvaluation of the dollar relative to other currencies has put U.S. firms in a difficult position to compete because U.S. exports are made more expensive while imports from other countries, such as autos, are made less expensive.

The answer, he argues, is not domestic content legislation. Rather, the Congress should look at the fact that a large part of the exchange rate problem stems from the high level of interest rates in the United States. He goes on to note:

Although interest rates are determined by a number of factors, predictions of huge federal deficits have been a dominant element in maintaining high U.S. yields since early 1981.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues are aware, I have been arguing for further restraint in Federal spending increases to combat record deficits and other borrowing-related activities for quite some time. If we are truly serious about dealing with the economic problem of unemployment, as opposed to the short-run perceptual problem of unemployment, we would be seeking to bring interest rates down, thus increasing job opportunities for all Americans. Instead, we are thinking about pursuing a protectionist path with the domestic content bill that will either shift unemployment from

one American to another on the basis of political leverage, or shift our unemployment problem to other world economies.

Mr. Speaker, as part of the continuing debate over domestic content legislation, I ask unanimous consent to insert the full text of the article by Professor Dunn at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 28, 1982]

#### SAVE AN AUTO WORKER'S JOB, PUT ANOTHER AMERICAN OUT OF WORK

(By Robert M. Dunn, Jr.)

People who support domestic-content (or "local-content") laws for imported automobiles argue that they would reduce unemployment in the United States. They are wrong.

As long as the United States maintains a floating exchange rate, the adoption of protectionist measures to help one industry will merely shift jobs from elsewhere in the economy to the favored sector, with no significant effect on total employment. Changes in the exchange rate for the dollar are the mechanism through which output and jobs are lost in the unprotected industries. Protectionism is never a sensible way to increase domestic employment, but it is wholly self-defeating for a country with a floating exchange rate.

Under fixed exchange rates, it might be possible to view the short-term effects of a tariff solely in terms of impact on the protected industry, because there would be no exchange rate movement to cause undesirable effects elsewhere in the economy. If foreign countries did not retaliate against U.S. restrictions on car imports, for example, employment would increase in Detroit without loss of jobs elsewhere in the United States.

But since the exchange rates began to float in 1973, this is no longer true. A decision to apply domestic-content rules to cars sold in the United States, for example, would greatly reduce imports from Japan, causing a parallel decline in the U.S. demand for yen to pay for those cars. The yen would then depreciate and the dollar would appreciate until the balance in international transactions was restored. As consumers in the United States and abroad responded to this change in relative prices by purchasing fewer U.S. goods and more foreign products, sales and employment would be lost in a range of U.S. industries. The U.S. car industry might gain from the imposition of domestic-content rules, but other domestic industries that must compete in world markets would lose. Total employment in the U.S. economy would not increase.

With fixed exchange rates among currencies, the worldwide employment effects of U.S. protectionism would be a "zero-sum game," in that job gains in the United States would be offset by job losses abroad. Under the existing system of floating exchange rates, the effects of protectionism on employment are a "zero-sum game" within the United States. Job gains in Detroit are matched by job losses in Boston and Seattle, with exchange rate changes imposing the losses on unprotected parts of the U.S. economy.

A statistical study has recently been completed in the Labor Department supporting this argument. It concludes that the original form of the domestic-content bill would

create about 300,000 jobs in automobile manufacturing and related industries, but that about the same number of jobs would be lost elsewhere in the U.S. economy as the exchange rate for the dollar rose. The study indicates that the apparel and electronic components industries would be particularly injured by the exchange rate change, and that computers and commercial aircraft would also be seriously affected. The study suggests that because the U.S. auto industry uses fewer workers per million dollars in sales than do many other affected industries, the adoption of the domestic-content bill for cars might actually cause a slight net loss of employment in the United States.

It is surprising that industries such as apparel and computers have not realized that protectionism for automobiles would hurt them, and entered the lobbying battle against the domestic content bill. The late Harry Johnson of the University of Chicago argued many years ago that floating exchange rates were a good idea precisely because they would destroy the traditional arguments for tariffs and encourage an era of free trade. He optimistically assumed that politicians and lobbyists would understand that protection for one industry was merely a tax on other domestic industries under floating exchange rates. But it doesn't seem to be working out that way. Walter Mondale's conversion to protectionism is a particularly unfortunate example.

If Washington wants to help U.S. industries compete against foreign firms, the first goal must be to reverse the sharp increase in the exchange rate for the dollar that has occurred during the last 18 months. A decline of the dollar to more realistic levels would be expensive for American tourists abroad, but it would greatly help U.S. industries that compete against imports, such as cars and apparel, and those that export, such as computers and aircraft.

Bringing down the exchange rate for the dollar requires a continuing decline in U.S. interest rates. Although interest rates are determined by a number of factors, predictions of huge federal deficits have been a dominant element in maintaining high U.S. yields since early 1981. Gaining permanent control over federal deficits requires decisions that are painful and politically risky. It is far easier for politicians to promise help for U.S. workers and industries through domestic content rules and other protectionist policies. Such an approach will actually produce no increase in employment or any other help for the economy, but that result would be apparent only in the long run. Election results are always in the short run.

#### IMPACT OF THE NEW FEDERALISM ON HEALTH SERVICES FOR CONNECTICUT CHILDREN

**HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY**  
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues some compelling testimony delivered at a forum in my district last September, held to discuss the impact of the New Federalism on children in Connecticut. The forum, hosted by St. Joseph College in West

Hartford, aired the views of State officials, nonprofit agency heads, and many others. I was very pleased to participate as a panelist along with my good friends Representative TOBY MOFFETT and Representative GEORGE MILLER.

Few among us would quarrel with the need to control Federal spending, yet most of us also would agree that budget cuts should not come at the expense of one of society's most precious—and most vulnerable—resources: our children. Among those offering testimony at September's hearing were Estelle Siker, director of the community health division of the State's department of health services, and Gene Bennion, social policy and human resources director for the League of Women Voters of Connecticut. In commenting on the New Federalism, Mr. Bennion and Ms. Siker voiced deep concern over the impact of budget cuts on programs that promote proper nutrition for low-income mothers, their infants, and young children. As Bennion points out:

Research indicates that without adequate nutrition during pregnancy and early childhood, physical and mental development is impaired.

He and Ms. Siker expressed the view that cutting these nutritional services for short-term savings may very well result in far higher expenses for health care programs and institutional care in the future. As the debate over Federal priorities and fiscal 1983 spending continues, I would like to take the opportunity to share some of this testimony with you.

#### IMPACT OF THE "NEW FEDERALISM" ON HEALTH SERVICES FOR CONNECTICUT CHILDREN

I am Estelle Siker, Director of the Community Health Division in the State Department of Health Services. I am a board certified pediatrician with a Masters in Public Health. The major responsibility for health programs for mothers and children (Maternal and Child Health) rests in my division.

Our priorities are promotion of good health and prevention of disease and disability. Our efforts are directed to assure that (1) babies are born healthy, (2) that children are provided with ongoing care to promote good health and provide early identification and intervention for potential health problems, especially in the first 6 years of life, (3) that children receive comprehensive rehabilitative care for physical disabilities.

The "New Federalism" with diminished federal dollars in the Maternal and Child Health services block grant, has meant a 25% reduction in funds from fiscal 1981 to fiscal 1983 with an anticipated reduction in services to approximately 9,000 children. This has resulted in reduction of services to handicapped children by elimination of 3 regional clinics, reduction in dental health services, reduction in breadth of services at local MCH primary care clinics funded by our department and reduced technical assistance and monitoring in our child day care licensing program.

The impact of these reduced services is greater on the populations targeted in the

MCH services block grant legislation, low income mothers and children and those with limited availability of or access to quality maternal and child health services.

We ask you to consider the capacities of these neglected children, 20 years from now, for independent living, responsible citizenship and even political leadership.

We will be happy to provide additional information.

#### LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF CONNECTICUT TESTIMONY AT CONGRESSIONAL FORUM, ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE, HARTFORD, CONN., SEPTEMBER 8, 1982

I am Gene Bennion, social policy and human resources director for the League of Women Voters of Connecticut. We would like to present brief testimony on "New Federalism: Its Impact on Connecticut Children".

Throughout Connecticut one of the unheralded but significant changes is that clinics and agencies are limiting and/or eliminating educational and preventive programs. Lack of funds is forcing a return by agencies and clinics to the traditional fee for service. Neither corporate giving nor giving from the rest of the private sector has grown to cover lost federal funds. Examples of the programs that have been restricted at one agency are the program for child abuse prevention and the emergency service program at the Wheeler Clinic in Plainville, Conn. Present projections are that all funding for the child abuse prevention programming may be gone in one year. The emergency service program (which is an emergency mental health program serving both adults and children) faces shrinking funds and increasing demands. Other agencies and clinics throughout Connecticut have similar needed programs which share bleak chances for survival.

The WIC program, a federally funded nutrition program serving children under five, pregnant women, and nursing mothers and their infants has been cut. Formerly eligibility was based on 195% of poverty level; now for persons to be eligible, their income must not exceed 185% of poverty level. In the Waterbury area this change resulted in 132 being dropped from the WIC program. It is important to note that the change in eligibility requirements has not resulted in a decrease in program participants because of unemployment. Unemployment has increased and unemployed persons are eligible to participate if they meet the WIC guidelines.

Research indicates that without adequate nutrition during pregnancy and early childhood, physical and mental development is impaired. The costs of this preventable damage are higher for society in terms of schooling and other institutional care. WIC is a successful preventive program that should be strengthened.

The programs mentioned in today's testimony help children and their parents. Under new federalism these programs have shrunk. The League of Women Voters of Connecticut does not believe that this is appropriate or wise social policy.

Thank you for your attention.●



## RACIAL INJUSTICES INFLICTED ON BLACK AMERICANS

HON. WILLIAM L. CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, with the many problems that our great Nation is facing today, we cannot afford to let the continuing struggle of America's minorities be abandoned. Black Americans, for one, have made tremendous gains in the fight for equality. That is why it is imperative that now, more than ever, we must critically examine the policies this administration has advanced toward the minority community.

In a recent editorial written by Carl T. Rowan for the National Leader, Mr. Rowan focuses on the racial injustices the administration's policies have inflicted on black Americans.

I commend this column to my colleagues:

LETTER TO LYNDON

(By Carl T. Rowan)

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I hope this letter finds you and President Kennedy in the same precinct, and that you both can brace yourselves on a cool stump, because I'm about to write about how you conned up Black people into thinking that you were our friends, leaving us to find out at this late date that your Great Society programs injured Black people severely.

All these years I've been talking and writing about how Mr. Kennedy made racial justice and integration fashionable in a Washington that had been shamefully Jim Crow, and how you were the nation's greatest civil rights president. I've been praising you for bludgeoning Congress into passing a Public Accommodations Act that ended apartheid in America's hotels, restaurants, buses; for daring to say to a joint session of Congress, on national TV, in those turbulent '60s, "We shall overcome," as you pushed into law a Voting Rights Act that opened the door of democracy to millions of Blacks who had been disenfranchised through violence, intimidation, trickery.

Now comes the terrible revelation that, unwitting or not, you sold Black people into bondage.

Who is the Great Revealer? President Ronald Reagan, the new champion of racial justice—the man who is trying to give tax-exempt status to schools and colleges which practice blatant racism, and who made a futile effort to sabotage your Voting Rights Act.

I hate to suggest, sir, that your reputation, and that of Jack Kennedy, for producing social programs that helped Black families is phony. But that is the word that 10,000 conservative Black Republicans are exhorted to spread across the land (their inflated number).

You understand my dilemma, I hope. I've been telling Americans how Mr. Kennedy and you raised Black family income from a level of 54 percent of white family income in 1961 to where it was 64 percent of white family income in the late 1960s.

Now I ask: How could you hurt Black families this way?

I am inspired to ask that question by Ronald Reagan, who has befriended Black

families by imposing policies that have pushed Black family income down to where it is now only 56 percent of white family income.

Before I deliver my ultimate "Shame on you!" I want to deal with education. I've been telling college convocations and educators' conventions that fewer than 750 Black Americans were in college at the turn of the century, and only 274,000 in 1965 when you pushed through the Higher Education Act that made it possible for 1,133,000 Blacks to go to college in 1981.

How could it have taken me so long to learn that this was just another of your "Great Society" tricks to enslave Black people?

Who exposed you on this matter? President Reagan, who has slashed federal funds for education, from kindergarten through graduate school, and who is miffed that a Congress yet unweaned from your wicked ways recently thwarted his attempt to snatch another \$365 million away from the education of disadvantaged children and needy teenagers aspiring to a college education.

You ask why I listen to Reagan? Well, he did tell those Black conservatives that Blacks were worse off in 1980 than in 1969—the same thing I've been saying. All this time I've thought that the villains were Richard Nixon and Howard Phillips, the Conservative Caucus honcho that Nixon commissioned to wage war on your War on Poverty.

Now Reagan tells me that *you're* to blame for almost everything—especially the rise in Black unemployment, since Reagan took office, from 14.3 to 18.8 percent, including a jobless rate among Black teenagers of 51.6 percent. Reagan implies that your ghost holds his hand when he jerks food away from hungry kids.

We are sure lucky to have Mr. Reagan to tell us what enemies of Black people you and John Kennedy and FDR and Hubert Humphrey really were.

That's why I wish you were still in the Oval office, so we Blacks could drop in and say exactly what we think about you.

Sincerely,

CARL T. ROWAN.●

## THE MURDER OF FOUR AMERICAN CHURCHWOMEN IN EL SALVADOR

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago today, four American churchwomen were killed by soldiers of the Government of El Salvador. In today's Washington Post we are informed that the families of these slain Americans are giving up their efforts to participate in the trial of the soldiers charged in the killings. The families have been unable to find a Salvadoran lawyer who is willing to handle their case, because the fear of retribution at the hands of the military is so great. There is reason to believe that these five soldiers were acting under orders, but without a lawyer, the aggrieved families will never see this possibility investigated.

Mr. Speaker, I am outraged that the Reagan administration will be seeking certification for human rights conditions in El Salvador. It takes a rather avid imagination to perceive improvement in the human rights situation in El Salvador. The administration appears to have such an imagination. The same voices which speak with such fervor about totalitarian repression in the Soviet Union are strangely indifferent to the excesses of the Salvadoran army. Are the victims of such terror to find comfort in the fact that their government is only "authoritarian?"

I wonder when the administration will see fit to apply the same standards of conduct to our authoritarian friends as it does to our Communist adversaries. How many people will be killed, tortured, or maimed, before we decide that we can no longer support the Government of El Salvador in good conscience? How much are we willing to sacrifice in the name of anti-Communist paranoia? Are we willing to sacrifice the very ideals of freedom which this country was founded upon, and which form its unique strength?

Two years ago, four American churchwomen were killed and raped by Salvadoran troops. It is difficult to conceive of a more heinous crime. Sadly, conditions in El Salvador have not improved since that time. The land reform program is in a shambles, and the current government has even less respect for human rights than the one which preceded it. Yet 2 dismal years after these American churchwomen were slain, the Reagan administration is seeking certification for human rights improvements in El Salvador. Such certification would be absurd. If the term "human rights" is to have any meaning whatsoever, then we cannot continue to support the Government of El Salvador.●

## JUDICIAL REFORM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned with the judiciary system's encroachment upon the legislative branches, constitutionally directed responsibility to make policy. Senator JOHN EAST has introduced a bill that would restore the proper role the court system has ceased to occupy. The bill would also return to the legislative and executive branches the authority that is constitutionally delegated to them. It would reinstate the separation of powers intended by the Founding Fathers which has been disregarded and ignored.

Today, the Federal courts have overstepped their boundaries by focusing on the creation of policy and not on judicial review of errors and injustices that occur in our system. Their constant and broad interpretations of the Constitution and its amendments have led to a proliferation of policy initiatives. The courts have no constitutional jurisdiction in this area. Senator EAST's bill will give Congress the opportunity to reassume our constitutionally defined legislative function of originating, deliberating, debating, and formulating policy.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to call to my colleague's attention a Washington Times lead editorial in today's edition. I commend the paper for bringing the aforementioned problem to the public's attention, and I commend Senator EAST for his comprehensive and necessary proposal. I urge my colleagues to seriously review this important bill that would return our governmental process to the fundamental basis on which it was founded.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Times, Dec. 2, 1982]

#### RESTORING THE CONSTITUTION

Sen. John East has fired the first resounding shot in what promises to be one of the most important congressional battles of the century. A few days before the election recess he introduced the Judicial Reform Act of 1982. This is no half-hearted attempt to redress this or that example of overreaching by the federal courts. The bill's 12 parts propose nothing less than to return the U.S. Constitution to its original "uninterpreted" state.

The several provisions would strip the federal judiciary of the legislative and executive authority it has usurped from Congress and the executive branch. It addresses every issue raised by the irrepressible judicial activism of the last several decades. The fight will be a glorious one.

The proper role of the federal judiciary has been one of the most intensely debated issues in this nation's history. Where, out of political cowardice, Congress has defaulted on its responsibility to resolve difficult and controversial disputes, federal judges have stepped into the vacuum. The result has been that too much of the most important "legislation" of the 20th century has been written, not by elected representatives, but by appointed judges.

Although some parts of the bill overshoot the mark, the Judicial Reform Act gives Congress the opportunity to reassert its unquestioned, if little-used, powers to shape and control the jurisdiction of the federal courts. Led by the Supreme Court, federal judges have redrawn political boundaries, taken over school boards, directly interfered in prison administration, punished police by excluding completely reliable evidence, taken religion out of the schools, and even told doctors when they may—and may not—perform abortions. It is the premise of the East bill that Congress could—and should—accept its legislative responsibility to debate and decide these issues itself.

But it is not only Congress that will benefit from once again having the constitutional power the bill would retrieve. State governments will find themselves freed of the large and onerous burden of federal judicial

second-guessing which has been grafted onto the Constitution by ever-broader interpretations of the 26 amendments. The powers reserved by the Founding Fathers to the states and to the people will be theirs once more.

Sen. East's legislation also includes provisions which would greatly improve congressional oversight of the federal judiciary, which would make the Supreme Court's membership geographically representative—as it was at the beginning, and which would in other ways reduce the tremendous power of the federal courts.

The Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Separation of Powers, chaired by Sen. East, will schedule hearings after the 98th Congress convenes in January. We'll have more to say before then. ●

### COMMEMORATING AMERICAN MARTYRS IN CENTRAL AMERICA

#### HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, today is the second anniversary of the brutal slayings of four churchwomen in El Salvador. I would like to take this opportunity to express my continued personal concern to the friends and family of Maura Clarke, Ita Ford, Dorothy Kazel, and Jean Donovan, and my support for the dedicated men and women who continue these women's work with the poor and suffering in Central America.

Yesterday the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations held a hearing on the subject of "Religious Persecution as a Violation of Human Rights in Latin America." I would like to commend to the attention of my distinguished colleagues my opening statement.

The statement follows:

Today's hearing is the eighth in a series on Religious Persecution as a Violation of Human Rights. Over the past year, the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations has examined many examples of religious persecution, including the Baha'is in Iran, the Christians and Jews in the Soviet Union, the Copts in Egypt, the Falashas in Ethiopia, and the Presbyterians in Korea and Taiwan. This afternoon we will be examining the plight of the Christian Church in Latin America.

The issue of the repression of the Church in Latin America is of particular interest to me because several American priests and nuns have themselves been the victims of murderous repression. Two years ago, four U.S. churchwomen: Maryknoll Sisters Maura Clarke and Ita Ford, Ursuline Sister Dorothy Kazel, and lay missionary Jean Donovan were brutally murdered by Salvadoran soldiers. Over a year ago when the then-President Duarte appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee, I asked him about the status of the investigation and prosecution of those responsible for the murders. To this day there has been no investigation of the high level officers who may have ordered their murders, and no prosecution and conviction of the soldiers who actually carried out those orders. The

tragic assassination of Archbishop Romero illustrates the problems of the Church vividly.

In nearby Guatemala, two American priests were assassinated: Father Stanley Rother in August of 1981 and Brother James Miller in February of 1982. Both of these men worked with indigenous communities in rural Guatemala, and both were gunned down by "death squads". A Mennonite missionary, John Troyer, was also killed by unidentified gunmen. Eight Guatemalan priests and dozens of Catholic catechists were victims of government violence last year.

The Catholic Church has experienced similar repression in Chile and Brazil. In these countries, the Church has emerged as an advocate for the poor, the oppressed, and the tortured.

In Nicaragua, church activities were restricted under the Somoza dictatorship, and priests and nuns were persecuted. I am concerned that church-state relations continue to be tense under the Sandinista government. Prominent clerics have been attacked, the church's access to the media is restricted, and there is an increasing tendency to substitute mob rule for dialogue and discourse. And the Moravian Church, an important advocate for the Mesquito Indians who have been subject to relocation by the Nicaraguan authorities, is under increasing pressure.

Because of our close proximity to our Latin American neighbors, relations between U.S. church groups and Catholic and Protestant church workers in Latin America have been particularly close. We are honored to have with us today several distinguished representatives of the U.S. church community who have close ties with their Latin American co-religionists. ●

### A TRAGIC ANNIVERSARY

#### HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues of a tragic anniversary—one which I, and the entire American people wish had never happened. I am referring to the brutal events of December 2, 1980, when, thousands of miles from home, four American churchwomen were massacred by a group of Salvadoran National Guardsmen. These four courageous women, Ita Ford, Maura Clarke, Dorothy Kazel, and Jean Donovan, were in El Salvador because of their convictions in helping the people of El Salvador. Amidst the bloodshed and continuous violence, they tried to alleviate the fear and death surrounding the populace. It is a crime to humanity that these women were murdered, that innocent lives were lost.

Mr. Speaker, this anniversary cries out for recognition—American citizens, blameless but for their humanity to their fellow man, are slain without any regard for their vocation or nationality. We cannot allow this anni-



versary to go forgotten. We must continue to pursue a thorough investigation and trial of the accused. It has been too long. Justice delayed is justice denied. I have proposed, Mr. Speaker, and will continue to insist, that this incident must be a major factor in any consideration of aid by this Government to the country of El Salvador. This case must be a test of the good will of the El Salvadoran Government. The actions taken by the Government of El Salvador can represent their commitment to respecting human rights, individual liberties, and the rule of law. But too few steps have been taken in this direction, and I continue to urge the Salvadoran authorities to leave no stone unturned in efforts to fully uncover the facts of this tragic situation, as well as resolving beyond any reasonable doubt the guilt of all those responsible for these actions.

Mr. Speaker, in recent times I have proposed, and this body adopted, a provision requiring Presidential certification of progress made in El Salvador before aid can be granted. I am, therefore, pleased that H.R. 7323 has already been considered and endorsed by my Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. As you know, this bill for "good faith efforts" to investigate the crimes against the four churchwomen and the two labor leaders as a permanent condition of certification. I laud the intent of this bill, and am pleased to be a sponsor.

Yet, we must remember this infamous day, recognizing that it occurred 2 years ago. And that in those 2 years, the guilty have not yet been convicted. This unconscionable act must not go unpunished, nor should we allow any undue delay. In honoring the memory of these brave, dedicated women, we must persist and prod, resolve and remember. ●

#### A CRUEL INVASION OF PRIVACY

**HON. RON WYDEN**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago, women suffered a cruel invasion into their private lives.

I am shocked and alarmed by a provision included in the Treasury and Postal Service appropriations bill that passed the House on Tuesday—a provision that many of us were unaware was included in the bill.

Tucked away in that spending bill was a provision that severely restricts the right of a woman to control her own body. It restricts that right by denying any funds appropriated in the act to be spent on abortions, except where the life of the mother would be in danger.

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled that women who depend on Federal funds have been singled out for this unfair restriction. The decision to terminate a pregnancy should be left to a woman and her physician. At a time when we are attempting to pare down the role of the Federal Government, how can we justify more governmental intrusion into this highly personal matter?

In 1973 the Supreme Court, in *Roe* against Wade, extended the right of privacy spelled out in the 14th amendment to protect a woman's right to terminate her pregnancy.

Congress has no business undercutting this constitutional right by backdoor ploys to cut funding for abortions. The right to choose should be respected for all women—including those who cannot afford an abortion.

It is my sincere hope that this unfair provision will be deleted when the Treasury and Postal Service appropriations bill goes to conference committee.

Thank you ●

#### TIME FOR ANOTHER SPUTNIK?

**HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, during the recent congressional recess, the Nation celebrated a significant anniversary—the 25th anniversary of the launching of Sputnik by the Soviet Union. Few single events in recent decades so shook our Nation's self-confidence. Fewer still proved to be an impetus of such magnitude that we were thrust forward to reach a well-defined national goal.

Twenty-five years ago the United States came face to face with our clear second place position in space exploration. The success of the Soviets defined our own weakness in math, science and technical fields. Of course, the Sputnik launch did more than simply define our weaknesses in the technical fields; it gave us the opportunity to demonstrate our great resourcefulness and ability to establish ourselves as preeminent in vital disciplines.

Following the Sputnik launch, the Nation put together its greatest scientific minds and dedicated its resources toward space exploration and the reestablishment of math and science capabilities. Within months of Sputnik, Congress, at the request of President Eisenhower, passed the National Education Defense Act. Along with the act came not only dollars, but a comprehensive plan for making science, math, and foreign language training a prominent goal for America's economic well-being and national security.

Today we again witness the softness of our technical capabilities. No longer

is math and science excellence an established fact that accompanies a diploma. Two articles that appeared recently highlight our serious problems. The first column, by Edward B. Fiske, dramatizes our deficiencies in science and math and notes that the challenge we face is not in the training of our needed technical specialists, but in combating the scientific incompetence of the work force as a whole. The second item, written by Thomas Y. Hobart, Jr., president of the New York State United Teachers, presents sobering statistics on the level of student accomplishments in the technical fields. Mr. Hobart advises us that:

We are already past the time for exhaustive discussions. . . Action to restore vitality and meaning to science and math education is needed now if we are to halt the withering of those human resources and technological skills which have made our nation a world leader.

Mr. Speaker, bills that have been introduced in recent months to address the math/science/foreign language competency crises lay dormant. As we set our sights on the 98th Congress we must resolve to push forward with these and other measures to insure success. If we do not act quickly, we may find ourselves hopelessly unable to respond to the next Sputnik that our foreign friends or foes may launch.

The articles by Mr. Fiske and Mr. Hobart follow:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 5, 1982]

#### SPUTNIK RECALLED: SCIENCE AND MATH IN TROUBLE AGAIN

(By Edward B. Fiske)

Twenty-five years ago yesterday, the Soviet Union's launching of the satellite Sputnik not only ushered in the modern space age but shocked Americans into the recognition that Russian science and technology were capable of surpassing their own.

Sputnik was a dramatic and vivid symbol. Americans could go out into their backyards at night and watch the tiny speck move slowly and inexorably across the sky. The Russian accomplishment was to inspire profound changes in many aspects of American life, and in none more than education.

In the next decade, the quality of education at all levels became the center of a national debate and the focus of major Federal programs. High school science education was catapulted in a few short years from the 18th to the 20th century, and schools at all levels discovered foreign languages. Millions of dollars were poured into retraining a generation of science, math and language teachers, and the precedent was set for pervasive Federal involvement in elementary and secondary education.

A decade later, the rush to reconstruct American education ended as abruptly as it had begun. When Neil Armstrong walked on the moon in 1969, it signified that the immediate job of "catching up with the Russians" had been accomplished. The Great Society programs, the war in Vietnam and other changes sent the country looking in other directions.

Today, educators look back on the post-Sputnik decade with some nostalgia. "There was an excitement in education at the time," recalled Ernest L. Boyer, a former United States Commissioner of Education. "The public seemed to turn to education for answers to a critical problem. Teachers and local schools were brought into the action."

They also look back with some sense of irony. There is evidence that, in the face of new kinds of threats—such as economic competition from Japan—the country faces the same urgent need to bolster declining science, math and language skills as it did in the late 1950's, but today there is no vivid symbol like Sputnik to rally national attention.

"What we need is another Sputnik," Mr. Boyer suggested. "Maybe what we should do is get the Japanese to put a Toyota into orbit."

To some, the weaknesses in the American educational system dramatized by Sputnik came as no surprise. The country emerged from World War II knowing that science and technology would play an increasing role in American life. "The development of radar, the atomic bomb, electronic intelligence—all of these gave the country a sense that science and technology were going to improve the quality of life," observed Alphonse Buccino, deputy director of the Office of Scientific Engineering Personnel of the National Science Foundation.

In 1945, Vannevar Bush, director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, reported to President Truman that in the absence of significant scientific progress "no amount of achievement in other directions can insure our health, prosperity and security as a nation in the modern world." His report led Congress in 1950 to establish the National Science Foundation, which was to develop a national policy to promote basic research and education in science.

Throughout the early 1950's, critics were pointing out flaws in American education. Nicholas DeWitt of Harvard found evidence that the Soviet Union had overtaken the United States in turning out engineers and scientists, and a 1956 study by the Modern Language Association pointed to the low number of people studying foreign languages in a country that had taken on a new role in the world.

In 1957, Elliot L. Richardson, then Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, organized a task force on the educational needs of the country, and a subcommittee of the House of Representatives began hearings on what might be done.

So when Sputnik burst across the sky it dramatized problems already identified by academic and political leaders, but pushed them higher on the national agenda. "Nothing really happened until Sputnik made the situation into a crisis event," said Paul D. Hurd, professor emeritus of science education at Stanford.

#### EISENHOWER'S PLEAS TO CONGRESS

In January 1958, President Eisenhower twice appealed to Congress, stressing the importance of education to national security, and that July Congress passed the National Defense Education Act, identifying math, science and foreign languages as areas in which the nation had a special stake. Financing of educational programs by the National Science Foundation also began to soar.

The net result was a truly remarkable crash program to upgrade the nation's educational resources. By 1973 half a million secondary schoolteachers in math, science,

languages and, eventually, other areas, had gone through summer workshops and other federally supported programs to raise their skills. Thousands more had received graduate fellowships.

The next priority was curriculum reform. In the years after Sputnik, the N.S.F. poured more than \$100 million into new curriculums that revolutionized the teaching of the sciences. The "new math" and the so-called "alphabet soup" curriculums, such as P.S.S.C., the Physical Science Study Committee, were designed to incorporate the latest findings into the high school textbooks and to break the traditional cycles of reading-lecture-recitation. "High school science curriculums went from Newton to Einstein in little over a decade," recalled Harold Howe 2d, a former United States Commissioner of Education.

Meanwhile, new connections were established between research-oriented scholars and classroom teachers. The language laboratory became a permanent fixture in schools at all levels, and the National Defense Education Act set the precedent for Federal involvement in local elementary and high schools.

#### A REDUCED SENSE OF URGENCY

By the late 1960's, though, these strenuous efforts had begun to run their course. The moderation of the cold war and the success of the space program had reduced the sense of urgency. A back-to-basics movement took root, cutting into school time for science and languages.

Perhaps the most important, President Johnson's Great Society program created a new social agenda that emphasized equal access to education, in contrast to the earlier emphasis on producing high-level specialists. The National Defense Education Act was replaced as the focus of Federal educational efforts at the precollege level by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which supported projects such as Head Start for disadvantaged students.

Reaction also developed against the "alphabet soup" curriculums and the "new math." These had worked well for many teachers and for the most talented students, but many others found them too specialized and abstract, and most high school science teaching has now gone back to the old methods. Enrollment in high school language instruction dropped sharply, largely because, during the revolt of college students against required courses in the 1960's, language requirements were the first to go.

The pendulum continued to swing, and evidence is now plentiful that 25 years after Sputnik the country finds itself debating many of the same issues that it faced then.

The National Assessment of Educational Progress has issued a series of reports on the low level of knowledge of science and math by elementary and high school students, and three years ago a Presidential commission headed by James A. Perkins, the former head of Cornell University, criticized what it called the "scandalous incompetence" of American citizens in foreign languages.

"Nothing less is at issue," the panel warned, "than the nation's security."

#### A DIFFERENT KIND OF PROBLEM

There are, however, some significant differences between the situations now and in the 1950's. Today there is no dearth of able science majors in college and none of the manpower shortages in scientific fields that marked the pre-Sputnik era. Instead, the problem revolves around the scientific com-

petence of the population and work force as a whole.

"Sputnik made us realize we were still importing scientists, said F. James Rutherford, chief educational officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. "But it did not reach people who are legislators and heads of business enterprises who don't understand enough about science and technology but still have to make decisions involving it."

Gerald Holton, the prominent Harvard physicist, agreed, suggesting, in retrospect, that Sputnik had not been crisis enough. "The reasons the Russians got Sputnik into orbit first was that they put their money on large boosters," he said. "Their electronics was not at all that sophisticated. It only took us six months to get back in the race, and once we'd won it we relaxed."

In doing so, Mr. Holton said, the nation passed up the opportunity to develop a scientifically educated citizenry. "The post-Sputnik era turned out scientists, but the real challenge was to lay the foundation of scientific literacy in the nation as a whole."

Another difference lies in the public perception of the threats faced by the country. "The problem today seems both more pervasive and more ominous," suggested Mr. Boyer of the Carnegie Foundation. "The threat is not just military, but it seems to have found its way into the interior of the economy. Somehow it doesn't have the headline-grabbing, traumatizing explicitness of that little basketball glittering up there 25 years ago."

The political climate is also different. President Reagan, while he has been publicly critical of the level of math and science instruction, is committed to mobilizing the private sector while reducing the Federal role in education, not to enlarging Federal programs under the guns of such threats as Japanese technology. Because the threat is seen in terms of economic rather than military security, many people feel the solution lies outside the political system.

Others, however, reject that approach. "There seems to be a myth that somehow if we let every school district do what it wants without any guidance, the national purpose will somehow be served," said Paul Simon, the Illinois Democrat who heads the House Select Subcommittee on Education. "It will take leadership to provide this, but unfortunately the Reagan Administration is not prepared to do so."

In a broader sense, though, the change is rooted in the way Americans have traditionally approached education. Since the late 19th century the Government has poured billions of dollars into education, but rarely for plainly educational purposes. The Morrill Act of 1862, establishing the land grant colleges, was a means to dispose of excess Federal land. The G.I. Bill was a device to reward veterans and ease their way back into normal life. The Elementary and Secondary Act, pushed by a President who was once a teacher but never had his name on a major educational bill, was essentially a device to combat poverty.

The outpouring of Federal funds into education that followed the launching of Sputnik in October 1957 may have been a response to a military threat, but it also represents one of the rare moments in American history when the core of the educational process—the content of curriculums and textbooks, the skills of teachers and so forth—moved to the center of the national attention.



Perhaps the nostalgia of educators for the post-Sputnik decade lies in the fact that such a fervor for education had rarely occurred before and has not happened since. Like Sputnik itself, the urgency about education as a national priority and the excitement of educational reform passed across the sky and over the horizon.

[From the New York State United Teachers, Nov. 7, 1982]

**PRESIDENT'S PERSPECTIVE—MATH, SCIENCE PROGRAMS MUST BE UPGRADED**

(By Thomas Y. Hobart, Jr., President)

The space shuttle *Columbia* is being prepared for another journey to space. Each time this remarkable craft blasts off and then returns with a new knowledge about space, Americans are reminded of the pre-eminent position which our country holds in both science and technology. We are also reminded of the drastic changes which our educational institutions had to make in teaching math and science following the successful launching of Sputnik a quarter century ago.

Americans were rudely awakened by this Soviet success and realized the harsh reality that other countries had made an all-out commitment to science and math education. This commitment had paid handsome dividends to the other countries while America faced the ultimate embarrassment of being beaten to space by the Soviet Union.

It was a credit to our national pride that we rededicated ourselves to the pursuit of scientific knowledge and gained a clear and almost insurmountable edge in the "space race."

Now, however, our position as leader of the world's scientific community is once again clearly in jeopardy. There has not been a single startling event, such as the launching of Sputnik, to demonstrate this slippage. Rather it is best seen in the de-emphasis of science and math in our schools over a long period of time. Once more, however, our national leaders are regrouping and seeking ways to strengthen the science and math curricula in our schools. Already there have been several national conferences called to study this issue, and numerous groups, including the American Federation of Teachers, are preparing policy statements aimed at reversing a shocking and potentially dangerous national condition.

Statistics presented at a national convocation sponsored by the National Academies of Sciences and Engineering point to the seriousness of this problem.

There have been marked declines in math scores for both 13-year-old and 17-year-old students. Each of three successive nationwide assessments has shown a decline in achievement over the preceding test.

The science and math scores on the SAT tests have been dropping steadily for two decades. This decline exists at all levels—from 1967 to 1975 those scoring above 700 declined by 15 percent while those students scoring below 300 on that test increased 38 percent.

The shortage of qualified math and science teachers is becoming critical. In 1980, 28 states reported a shortage of mathematics teachers; by 1981 that figure had increased to 43 states. Similar shortages exist for science teachers.

Science and math programs in other countries, such as Japan, the Soviet Union, East Germany and the People's Republic of China, are thriving. Students in these countries spend approximately three times as

much time on science and math as even the most science-oriented American students do.

The seriousness of the problem has been recognized. We must now begin the more difficult task of finding solutions. Some of the important issues which will have to be addressed include:

**RAISING STANDARDS**

For too long educators have allowed a softening of the curriculum. The norm in many states today is a requirement of only one year of science and one year of mathematics for graduation from high school. Already, there are serious attempts to reverse this pattern. For instance, California is now proposing at least three years of math and two years of science for graduation and a special commission in Florida has recommended a requirement of four years of math and four years of science. Such a stiffening of standards will play an important role in rebuilding math and science programs.

**UPGRADING TEACHING STAFF**

The current shortage of math and science teachers has aggravated the poor state of science education. There must be wide ranging discussions on ways to attract top candidates into science and math teaching. This discussion must center on ways to provide adequate remuneration, necessary teaching equipment and opportunities to conduct meaningful research programs. In order for these discussions to be fruitful it is essential that the designated representatives of the teaching staff play a key role.

**CHANGING NEEDS**

Educational curriculum must also be examined to insure that it is meeting the changing technological needs of our society. America is rapidly approaching a critical shortage of skilled workers in high technology fields. Education, government and private industry must work cooperatively to insure that these labor shortages can be corrected.

There will be no single answer to meeting the scientific and technical needs of our country during the remainder of the twentieth century. Debate is already under way. All participants in this debate must recognize one rather harsh fact of life as they go about their work—we are already past the time for exhaustive philosophical discussions. Action to restore vitality and meaning to science and math education is needed now if we are to halt the withering of those human resources and technological skills which have made our nation a world leader. For it is precisely that position in the world which will be in jeopardy if we fail to respond.●

**TIME TO CUT FUNDS FOR GARRISON DIVERSION PROJECT**

**HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment to delete funding for the Garrison diversion project in North Dakota.

Many words have been spoken today in an attempt to sway the undecided

and perhaps change the minds of others who have voted to continue this project in the past. It is my fervent hope that there will always be Members with open minds who can change their positions, as many noted colleagues have done on this one issue.

With all the many facts and figures and noted champions on the side of Garrison, year after year it rolls on. Congress after Congress continues to appropriate money for it. Each year we come closer to killing this wasteful boondoggle but victory has eluded us. Why? Why do some of us continue to vote for a wasteful and destructive water project of such magnitude that it almost defies description? Why do Members who vote correctly on a whole score of other environmental issues vote for Garrison? Why do Members who otherwise favor good Canadian-United States relations vote for Garrison? And why do Members who categorically vote against high-priced Federal expenditures continue to vote for Garrison?

This country has been coasting along for decades, finding the easiest way to deal with pressures and party lines and problems it to vote money for them. The downhill ride is about to end and I fear a brick wall looms ahead. A wall of economic recession, environmental degradation, and loss of faith with the American people we represent. We must put the brakes on wasteful Government spending now. There is simply no way we can continue to vote for projects like the Garrison diversion unit with equanimity.

I ask that each of you reach down into your conscience and ask a few honest questions: Do we really need this project and it's \$1 billion price tag? Might there not be a better way, a cheaper way, to give the people of North Dakota the kinds of benefits they need rather than a project that will only irrigate six-tenths of 1 percent of the land? Is the damage or destruction of 12 congressionally authorized national wildlife refuges not worth considering? And is there any reason we should continue to antagonize our good neighbors in Canada? They are deeply concerned about the intrusion of runoff from this project in North Dakota into the Hudson Bay watershed in Manitoba.

Certainly there are no easy answers to these questions. I only say that we must take our responsibilities as representatives of the people seriously enough to ask them and to come up with an answer of no funding for Garrison until some of the harder questions are put to rest.

I hope you will join me in supporting the Conte amendment to cut funding for Garrison in fiscal year 1983.●

## EL SALVADOR

## HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago today, four American churchwomen were brutally murdered in El Salvador. It is the shame of our country that we continue to back with military aid, a government that has failed to bring those responsible for this crime to justice, and whose repressive policies continue the flagrant violation of its own citizens' human rights.

We should not use this anniversary merely to deplore the manner of those brave women's death but to dedicate ourselves to the cause for which they lived—social justice and a lasting peace for the people of El Salvador. I take this occasion to reiterate the plea made last summer by the bishops of El Salvador, a plea for all parties to begin the process of political dialog, and I would now like to insert their statement in the RECORD.

## SALVADOREAN BISHOPS CALL FOR DIALOG

Having completed four days of intense work, we, the bishops of the ecclesiastical province of El Salvador, cannot leave without directing a pastoral message to the beloved faithful committed to our care and to all Salvadoreans of good will concerning the dramatic situation in which we live in El Salvador.

Conscious that we are not expert in social, economic or political questions, we seek to be interpreters of our suffering people and, from a pastoral perspective, to express the following:

1. From the depths of our heart as pastors we share the sorrow and the anguish of our people, innocent victims of this uncontained wave of violence which has already exacted too high a price in human lives and material goods, putting thousands of homes into mourning and making daily existence ever more unbearable.

2. As people of faith we believe that there is a solution for this dramatic situation and that the solution has to be sought along the paths of reason and not the sterile way of violence.

3. For this very reason we exhort all the parties involved in the conflict to abandon every obstinate attitude and be open to a dialogue that is sincere, open and true, animated by good will and a spirit of authentic patriotism, placing the unity of the Salvadorean family above individual or group interests. For its part, the Church maintains its readiness to work tirelessly, within its own proper sphere, for peace and for reconciliation among Salvadoreans who have been constrained to become enemies to one another.

4. Finally, we invite everyone to place their hope not in human forces but in Him who said "Peace be with you" and who came to give us the Good News of peace.

May the Divine Saviour, whose feast we are about to celebrate, together with the Queen and Peace, inspire, sustain, and bring to a happy conclusion every effort for peace accomplished among us in order finally to establish that longed for gift.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

With our blessing, /S/ Bishops Alvarez, Aparicio, Revelo, Rivera, Rosa, Fr. Delgado  
San Salvador, July 15, 1982.●

TRAGEDY IN EL SALVADOR:  
TWO YEARS WITHOUT JUSTICE

## HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, it has been 2 years since four American churchwomen were murdered in El Salvador. On December 2, 1980, Sisters Maura Clark, Ita Ford, Dorothy Kazel, and Lay Missioner Jean Donovan were found in a shallow grave in El Salvador. They had been raped and brutally murdered by members of the Salvadoran Armed Forces.

During these 2 long years, many Members of Congress have shared the grief and sadness that is felt by the members of the families of the women. We have shared the frustration over resistance to investigate the murders, and then to the painful discussion of the details as pressure was brought to bear on officials in Washington and in San Salvador. At each turn of events there have been reassurances that the killers had been found and that they would soon stand trial. To date, there has been no trial and we are all still waiting for justice.

It was only a few weeks ago that U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador Dean Hinton voiced his concern over the breakdown of the Salvadoran justice system and went on to note that over 30,000 Salvadorans have been killed during the civil war. There have been no trials for the murders of Salvadorans or Americans. This is a tragedy. It is a tragedy for the families of the dead, a tragedy for the Salvadoran people, and a tragedy for the American people.

It is time that justice be done for the dead. And it is time that justice be done for those who must deal with the threat of death daily. The civil war in El Salvador must be ended and the killing must stop. I know that the families of the four American churchwomen want justice for their loved ones, but they also want the killing to stop.

As we contemplate the memories of these four brave women, we should also think about U.S. policy toward El Salvador. Neither subject is pleasant but both are important today.●

A TRIBUTE TO THE OBSERVER  
NEWSPAPERS

## HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today in tribute to one

December 2, 1982

of America's outstanding black journalistic enterprises, the Sacramento Observer, which is celebrating its 20th anniversary under the leadership of its publisher, Dr. William H. Lee.

Recently lauded in a Columbia Journalism Review article as one of the more successful black newspapers in the country, the Observer plays a major role in the life of our city and county, with its influence extending beyond the black community, which it serves so well.

Bill Lee, who I am proud to count as a personal friend, started the Sacramento Observer with his wife and business partner Kathryn to fill what they felt was a void in positive information about the black community.

Our philosophy is to improve the quality of life of the people that read our newspaper and follow its direction.

Dr. Lee said in a recent interview with the Sacramento Bee.

We can't just give them civil rights news and black news; we've got to show them how to survive, how they can buy a house or live happily. In our communities we have acute health problems, acute crime problems and we must provide some of the answers through our papers.

Those comments from Bill Lee provide insight into the success he has achieved with his three newspapers, including the Observer papers he publishes in Stockton and San Francisco as well as Sacramento. He has been successful because he has approached his publication enterprise with an enlightened attitude about the needs of the black community and of our entire Sacramento community.

The future is bright for the Sacramento Observer. Dr. Lee plans to begin construction of a new 20,000-square-foot plant next year, and a 500-page special edition commemorating his paper's two decades of service to Sacramento is slated for publication in February.

Because of Bill and Kathryn Lee and the entire staff of the Sacramento Observer, our community is a better place in which to live.

I am sure that all Members of this House, and particularly my colleagues from the State of California, will join me in an enthusiastic tribute to the Observer Newspapers.●

DAVID POGOLOFF

## HON. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize today one of the Veterans' Administration's most dedicated and conscientious employees. For 25 years, Dave Pogoloff, chief of the VA's House liaison staff, has executed a difficult job in an out-



standing manner. He has rendered valuable assistance to virtually every congressional office on the Hill, while very ably and quietly assisting untold thousands of veterans and their dependents.

I am very pleased the Administrator has recognized Dave's many years of outstanding service by recently giving him the VA Administrator's Superior Performance Award, which carries with it a cash payment of \$3,800. The award is presented when an employee's contribution substantially exceeds performance requirements.

Dave is no less an inspiration to his colleagues and friends for his personal achievements. A combat veteran of World War II, he lost a leg soon after returning to the States as a result of his war injuries. To his great credit, Dave has come to represent the highest ideal of the physically disabled in the work force, an ideal of successful integration and extraordinary contribution of which we, the public, are the real beneficiaries.

I know Dave's many friends on the Hill join me in expressing appreciation for his service and best wishes for many years of continued success.●

#### PURSUIT OF TRUTH FOR THE MARYKNOLL SISTERS

##### HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, Maryknoll Sisters Ita Ford and Maura Clark, Ursuline Sister Dorothy Kazel, and Jean Donovan disappeared 2 years ago today. Their burnt-out van was found the next day, along the airport road. On the anniversary of their deaths, I want to share some thoughts expressed by the Maryknoll community with regard to the trial of their accused slayers, and the search for justice in El Salvador:

##### THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY

MARYKNOLL, N.Y.—On December 2nd and 3rd, families and friends of Maura, Ita, Jean and Dorothy will come together at Maryknoll to mourn and to celebrate their deaths and their lives. During these two years we have grown together in our pursuit of truth; we have become more sensitive to the suffering and pain of our sisters and brothers who are poor and powerless; we have come in direct contact with the network of injustice and evil in our world. During these years our hearts have not turned to stone in a spirit of revenge but we have been made strong in our search for justice. Our commitment to justice with forgiving hearts confuses and unsettles many. Our hope is that we may continue to grow in that love which is the source of action for justice in our world; that love which embraces our enemies in truth.

We extend our gratitude to all those who have joined with us in seeking truth and justice so that God's peace may come to our sisters and brothers in El Salvador.

#### STATEMENT REGARDING TRIAL IN EL SALVADOR

No matter what the outcome of the trial of these five men, we (the Maryknoll Sisters) hold that justice and truth have not been served because the involvement of higher-ups has not been vigorously investigated. Neither Maryknoll nor the families felt it was just to hire a lawyer to prosecute these five enlisted men alone. Prosecuting and perhaps executing these five men does nothing to stop the officers and government officials who are tolerating, permitting and encouraging the climate of terror and violence in El Salvador that has claimed 35,000 lives in the last three years. Therefore, we are not hiring a lawyer to represent us for fear of giving our stamp of approval or seeming to legitimize the trial.

For Maryknoll, the trial has always represented the culmination of a long legal process during which a genuine investigation could be conducted. With the announcement of the trial of the five National Guardsmen alone all investigation ceases.

We regret that seeking justice in the way that we know it here is impossible in El Salvador today. We believe that the trial as it is designed to be carried out cannot lead to justice.

We hope that the Government of the United States will play an active role in the pursuit of truth regarding the death of its citizens in El Salvador. If justice cannot be pursued with the support of the U.S. Government in relation to U.S. citizens, how can we hope that it will be pursued for citizens of El Salvador?

On this day in particular these words hold special meaning, and give us an added purpose and resolve to work for a just solution to El Salvador's problems.●

#### A COAL MINER'S SON

##### HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the late Mr. Harold J. Gibbons, a man who epitomized the virtues of the working citizens of our Nation. The son of a coal miner, Harold Gibbons worked to become one of the most instrumental and respected figures in the American labor movement. His love for humanity and democracy are documented in his service to our society.

In his lifetime, Harold Gibbons was preceded by his reputation for unmitigated integrity. Long after his death Harold Gibbons will be remembered for the many countless contributions he made to the labor movement. A self-made man and champion for the underdog, his life was an exercise in strength and fortitude. The death of Harold Gibbons is a great loss to our Nation and to the St. Louis community where he was especially loved and admired. I am honored to have known and worked with Harold Gibbons and I would like to share with my colleagues a brief biography of his life.

#### HAROLD GIBBONS—FROM COAL MINER'S SON TO INTERNATIONAL FIGURE

Harold Joseph Gibbons, longtime St. Louis Teamsters leader, was once thought to be a likely successor to Jimmy Hoffa as head of the 2 million-member union.

Gibbons, 72, had been a vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters—the largest labor union in the free world—since 1957.

The youngest of 23 children, he was the son of a coal miner. Born April 10, 1910, at the mining camp of Archibald Patch, Pa., Gibbons rose to become one of the best-known leaders in the American trade union movement.

He came to St. Louis from Chicago in 1941 as director of the old St. Louis Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union, CIO.

In his rise to national prominence, he became known as a major intellectual of the labor movement, one of its most articulate leaders and a social activist. Through most of his career, he was a staunch supporter of Hoffa.

He was also known as a political liberal who bucked the union leadership in 1972 to support Democratic U.S. George S. McGovern for president and who harshly criticized the Vietnam War—positions that some observers maintained cost him much power and influence in the Teamsters hierarchy.

During his colorful career, Gibbons was executive assistant to Hoffa, who asked him to be his right-hand man from 1957 to 1964. During that time, Gibbons also headed Teamsters Local 688 in St. Louis, the largest Teamsters local in Missouri, which he helped form in 1949. He also was director of the Central Conference of Teamsters and the union's national airline and warehouse divisions.

Among his many accomplishments, Gibbons pioneered the development of such pacesetter programs as the Labor Health Institute, its Health and Medical Camp in Fevely and a \$20 million retirement complex, Council House, 300 S. Grand Blvd.

Gibbons was vitally concerned with civil rights, public housing and health care for the poor.

A community action program started by Local 688 under Gibbons' leadership in 1951 was the subject of considerable national and international attention. The outgrowths of the program today are the Tandy Area Council and the Carondelet Area Council, which give residents the means and skills to voice their interest in community affairs.

He also was the founder and president of the St. Louis Civic Alliance for Housing, a coalition of about 70 community leaders and tenants that brought an end to the lengthy public housing rent strike in St. Louis in 1969.

Gibbons was only 14 when his father died and his family moved to Chicago, where he finished high school and worked at odd jobs to pay for night classes.

He later attended an industrial workers' summer school program at the University of Wisconsin. His tuition was paid by the YMCA after he won a contest.

Gibbons was quoted in an interview several years ago as saying that while in the program—where he participated in a number of socialist discussion groups—he saw "a society divided between those who own and those who work." It was then he developed a desire "to be a trade union man," he said.

He later studied economics and history at the University of Chicago, until he was

forced to quit during the Depression. After leaving school, Gibbons wrote textbooks for the Works Progress Administration in a worker education program.

While working for the WPA, Gibbons organized and became the first president of Local 346 of the American Federation of Teachers. In 1936, he was elected an international vice president and organizer for the AFT.

He also was among the delegates who attended the first convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, when United Mine Workers leader John L. Lewis was elected president. The CIO merged in 1955 with the American Federation of Labor to form the AFL-CIO.

In 1937, after leading a strike of Chicago taxi drivers who became members of the Teamsters, he was appointed assistant regional director of the CIO in Chicago. In 1938, he was named Midwest organizer for the Textile Workers Union.

During that year, he met his first wife, the former Ann Colter, at a Socialist-sponsored peace rally. She was chairwoman of the rally and he was a guest speaker. Three months later, they married. She died in 1974.

As the CIO's assistant regional director in Chicago, Gibbons worked with and became a friend of Lewis, he said during an interview several years ago.

Gibbons came to St. Louis in 1941 as director of the St. Louis Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Employees Union, CIO, which affiliated with the then-AFL Teamsters in 1949 and became the powerful Teamsters Local 688.

In 1949, Gibbons engineered the merger of the CIO United Distribution Union's 6,000 members into the ranks of AFL Teamsters Local 688—one of the biggest labor raids in St. Louis labor history and a major step in the Teamsters' drive to double the union's membership to 2 million.

Gibbons emerged as one of the city's top Teamster leaders at the end of an 85-day 1953 building industry strike when he was named trustee of the Teamsters Joint Council and eight Teamster locals here.

That year, he was promoted to lead the 250,000-member national warehousing section of the Teamsters union, establishing a Washington office while maintaining leadership of Local 688 here.

Gibbons was jailed for 43 hours in 1954 for refusing to provide records to a federal grand jury investigating Local 688, although he later agreed to supply the information. An indictment accusing Gibbons and other union officers of making false reports to the U.S. Department of Labor was dismissed in federal court.

As his influence grew locally, Gibbons took stands on such political issues as the lack of cooperation among St. Louis County municipalities and the lack of progress in controlling rats in the city.

He also became more active nationally and internationally, appearing before a congressional committee investigating health care to explain the Labor Health Institute—an employer-financed health program started by Gibbons for his members—and urging support of Israel after a 1955 visit on behalf of the American labor movement.

In 1957, Gibbons was selected an international vice president of the union, giving him a seat on the Teamsters' general executive board, a post he held until his death. He was elected president of Teamsters Joint Council 13 here in 1958 in an election in which his opponent, E. E. "Gene" Walla,

former president of Teamsters Local 682, charged vote rigging. Gibbons' election was upheld.

In the same year, Gibbons dedicated Local 688's employer-financed Health and Medical Camp near Pevely, considered the trend-setting concept in union activities and contract bargaining.

During the years he helped guide the union under Hoffa, Gibbons became known as one of the Teamsters' most articulate spokesmen during testimony before U.S. Sen. John McClellan's racketeering committee hearings. A member of the committee was then-Sen. John F. Kennedy, D-Mass., and its attorney was Robert F. Kennedy, later to become U.S. attorney general in his brother's administration.

Gibbons once told a reporter about how he enjoyed an almost mischievous delight at "tweaking the nose" of young Robert Kennedy during the hearings.

"During testimony, he asked me in a snub tone, 'Mr. Gibbons, can you tell this committee if you know Anthony Giordano, head of the underworld in St. Louis? And can you, Mr. Gibbons, tell the members of this committee if you know John Vitale, Giordano's right-hand mobster?'" he recalled. "And I answered, 'Yes, I know both of those men. But I also know Cardinal Cody and Archbishop Ritter, too.'"

With that answer, the gallery broke into laughter, Gibbons said.

Gibbons resigned as Hoffa's executive assistant in late 1963 after a falling out with the fiery Hoffa. Gibbons had ordered that the flag on Teamsters headquarters in Washington be lowered to half-staff and the union's offices closed when President Kennedy was assassinated—a gesture strongly opposed by Hoffa, who hated the Kennedys.

Gibbons headed Local 688 until 1973, when he was ousted from nearly all his leadership posts by then-Teamsters General President Frank E. Fitzsimmons. Gibbons, who always maintained his loyalty to Hoffa, often disagreed with Fitzsimmons on union and political matters.

Although several members of Local 688 had started a movement against Gibbons, his Waterloo came in 1972 when he publicly endorsed McGovern, Democratic nominee for president, over Fitzsimmons' choice of the GOP presidential candidate, Richard M. Nixon.

While Gibbons kept his elected office of international vice president, he was stripped of his other posts when he was forced to resign as Local 688's chief executive.

In February 1977, three years after the death of his first wife, Gibbons married longtime friend Toni Stein, who had a modeling agency here.

Gibbons, an idealist, was quietly being pushed in June 1981 to make a run for the union presidency after Fitzsimmons died of cancer one month before the Teamsters convention in Las Vegas. Although there was some support for Gibbons and Canadian Teamsters leader Ed Lawson to seek the union's top two jobs, a groundswell never materialized. Subsequently, Gibbons ran for and was re-elected the union's second vice-president.

He served under Teamsters President Roy L. Williams of Kansas City, who was more generous to Gibbons than Fitzsimmons had been. He gave the aging labor leader responsibilities that Gibbons "a purpose, a feeling of being needed," one close friend said.

In his younger days, Gibbons, had been one of the union's chief strategists, second only to Hoffa, who was kidnapped from suburban Detroit and apparently killed in 1975.

In an interview several months ago, Clayton attorney Gene Zafft, Hoffa's tax lawyer for many years, said Hoffa had told him that one of the greatest mistakes he ever made was naming Fitzsimmons, rather than Gibbons, as his successor.

After his rise through Hoffa to the union's presidency, Fitzsimmons betrayed Hoffa and battled to prevent him from receiving part of his pension after Hoffa resigned from the presidency as part of a probation agreement.

Gibbons was the subject of an entire chapter in the Steven Brill book, "The Teamsters," which both praised and criticized Gibbons.

Gibbons was chairman of the Cervantes Convention Center Commission, a board member of the Gateway National Bank in St. Louis, and a board member of the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation and a number of other charities. He was also a member of the national advisory board to the American Civil Liberties Union. He was recognized as Man of the Year by B'nai B'rith, was a trustee of the Martin Luther King Center and a board member of the All-American Collegiate Golf Foundation. ●

## THE YEAR OF THE FINNISH AMERICAN ARCHIVES

### HON. MARTIN OLAV SABO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise in honor of over 400,000 Finnish immigrants who have graciously shared with this Nation their cultural traditions and heritage. The preservation of Finnish history has been threatened, however, because of insufficient funds to insure that Finnish historical materials are transferred to microfilm and otherwise protected from deterioration. In an effort to raise funds for this important project, Minneapolis Mayor Don Fraser has declared that 1983 be known as "The Year of the Finnish American Archives." This proclamation reads:

Whereas, three hundred and forty-five years ago the history of Finnish Americans began in a settlement on the Delaware River; and, since the year 1865 over 400,000 Finnish immigrants have given America both the benefit of their labor and the richness of their culture; and

Whereas, their descendants continue to assert their identity as Finnish Americans within the ethnic and cultural diversity that is America; and

Whereas, historical archives at Suomi College in Hancock, Michigan and at the Immigration History Research Center of the University of Minnesota are the source of inspiration and information that make Finnish Americans more conscious of their heritage as well as more visible to America; and

Whereas, these archives are threatened by lack of resources to microfilm and otherwise protect their holdings from deterioration and are unable to further build their collections of historical materials; and

Whereas today public funds alone will not adequately support these archives, and this



responsibility falls on their principal beneficiaries: both Finnish Americans and all other Americans aware of the need to preserve cultural diversity.

Now, therefore, I, Donald M. Fraser, Mayor of the City of Minneapolis do hereby declare 1983 as

The year of the Finnish American Archives in Minneapolis and urge all citizens to join with me in working for the preservation of the rich cultural heritage of our Finnish immigrants. ●

#### WELCOME HOME, GARY ACKER

### HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, words cannot adequately express the joy that I feel for Gary Acker and his wonderful parents now that he has returned safely to his home in Sacramento, Calif., after rotting for nearly 7 years in a Communist prison in Angola. "More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of," Tennyson reminds us, and I have no doubt that countless prayers said on Gary's behalf have been instrumental in his release and return home.

Gary Acker can best be described as a volunteer American freedom fighter in whom his fellow countrymen can take great pride. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that Gary felt that he was being hired by an intelligence arm of the U.S. Government to fight for freedom against Communist forces in Africa. He was funded by our Government in the same manner as was the Lafayette Escadrille fighter squadron in France before our entry into World War I; the way our American volunteer group, the Flying Tigers, were funded to fly and fight in China against the invading Japanese in 1941; and, also, in the exact same manner our young American fighter pilots were supported in 1940 to fly with the RAF Eagle Squadron in England against the Nazi enemy of liberty in those dark days before our entry into World War II. Gary Acker certainly falls within the category of a modern day Flying Tiger, or for that matter, a Lafayette who, at age 23 when he arrived to join George Washington in 1776, was only 2 years older than 21-year-old Acker when he arrived in Angola in 1976. When Gary left for Angola in January 1976 he was firmly committed to rekindling the torch of freedom that had been left barely flickering by the U.S. Congress tragic and shortsighted decision to end all assistance to the forces fighting for Angolan freedom. As soon as Gary learned of the Communist aggression in Angola from a classified Sacramento newspaper ad request for professional assistance, he decided to go to Africa to do what he personally could

to prevent millions of people from falling under a Marxist totalitarian dictatorship as had happened only 8 months before in South Vietnam. Of course he expected to get paid, but keep in mind that General Chennault's Flying Tigers personally received \$500—in 1940 dollars—for every Japanese aircraft shot down.

But Gary's decision was reached not for reasons of money, glory, or excitement. He went to Angola in the belief that a man must do more than just hold to a set of principles; a man must also live by his principles. A proud American, he was sickened by the retreatist attitude of some of the leadership of this country. Gary was going to make his mission count, the forces of freedom would triumph, and he would play a part in it.

As we know, things did not work out that way. The pro-Western forces never even came close. But it was not due to the likes of men like Gary Acker or his companion freedom fighter Danny Gearhart of Maryland who was executed in Angola on July 10, 1976, after a kangaroo court trial.

Just 4 days after they arrived in Africa, Acker and Gearhart were captured in an ambush by a phalanx of Cuban-armed troops working for MPLA—the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola. Gary was subsequently sentenced by a phony court to 16 years in prison. He served nearly 7 of those years—unnecessarily harsh it seems to me—since Gulf Oil Corp., which pays Angola more than \$500 million a year for the oil it takes out, could easily have exerted leverage on Gary's behalf years ago. After all, the entire Communist controlled part of Angola is supported almost solely by the oil money Gulf must pay to the Communist dictatorship.

To those who still believe in the principles of freedom, Gary's sacrifice of 7 of the best years of his life was admirable. I wish him well in rebuilding his life. He has a running start—two wonderful, helpful, loyal, loving parents to help him. Joyce and Carl Acker are terrific. They could not have fought harder to keep our U.S. Government working to gain the freedom of their "freedom fighter." God bless them.

And may we never forget our hero Daniel Gearhart or his loving wife and beautiful children. America is lucky to have such a dedicated man. ●

#### LAWYERS COMMITTEE AGAINST U.S. INTERVENTION IN CENTRAL AMERICA

### HON. JAMES WEAVER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to action on the

part of the Oregon State Bar Association, and a group of attorneys making up the Lawyers Committee Against U.S. Intervention in Central America, to denounce the Reagan administration's foreign policy in Central America. As a long-time opponent of foreign military aid, I commend these organizations for their concern and resolve in speaking out against these unconscionable policies.

I only hope that more citizens, organizations, and professional associations around the country will raise their voices against our interventionist foreign policy as these Oregon groups have. I strongly recommend the following letter from Ms. Peggy Nagae of Portland to all my colleagues:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WEAVER: I am happy to announce that at the last Oregon State Bar Convention, a resolution against United States intervention in Central America was passed. It is very important that lawyers acknowledge the important role they play in U.S. politics and exercise responsibility in that role. By passing this resolution, we feel that fellow members of the Oregon bar made a definite statement about governmental overstepping. The specific resolution was, as follows:

*Be it hereby resolved,* That the Oregon State Bar supports the following principles based on United States and International Law, including but not limited to U.S. Const. art 1, section 9, cl. 11 and the War Powers Resolution, 40 U.S.C. section 1541 et. seq.:

We oppose any form of covert action or economic pressure by the United States, whether directly or through intermediaries, aimed at de-stabilizing governments in Central America.

*Be it further resolved,* That copies of this Resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon, to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives respectively, to the Chairman of all other committees of Congress into whose jurisdiction such matters may fall, and to the Ambassador of the United States to the United Nations.

Presenter: Michael D. Royce ●

#### DOCUMENTARY TELLS OF AMERICAN POWS' EXPERIENCES

### HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, December 5, from 7 to 8 p.m., NBC News will present an hour-long documentary "NBC Reports: Bataan, the Forgotten Hell." The documentary describes the experiences of several American veterans who survived the Death March of Bataan at the beginning of World War II and the tremendous brutality of their Japanese captors during 3½ years of imprisonment.

In the documentary, former POW's describe their terrible experiences in cruel and deadly prison camps where thousands died of starvation, disease, physical abuse, and outright execution.

NBC crews gathered their material in Bataan, Corregidor, and Japan, and survivors are interviewed on the sites of the battles and prison camps in the Philippines where they had been 40 years before.

This important documentary lets Americans know at long last the story of the suffering and sacrifices of those prisoners of war who endured Bataan and afterward. I highly recommend this program to my colleagues.

In Washington, the program will be shown on WRC-TV, Channel 4.●

#### LET'S TAKE A VOTE: STUDENT EDITORIAL

**HON. CARL D. PURSELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial by 16 year old Dane Peterson of Jackson, Mich. Dane's editorial, which appeared last month in the Lumen Christi High School paper, the Titan Times, reminds all of us that we do have more than just a responsibility to vote. I find it refreshing to see that someone so young is already actively looking for more ways to get his fellow students involved in such an important democratic practice. I proudly present the following editorial to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a tribute to Dane and his fellow students.

The article follows:

LET'S TAKE A VOTE  
(By Dane Peterson)

Is voting a moral obligation?

I believe it is. My own interest in politics comes from a heritage handed down in my family. This heritage states that one cannot be a good Christian without being a good citizen. In order to be a good citizen, one must take an active role in the political picture with it being a responsibility to be informed on the issues and the candidates.

Main reason why it is so important is that the government touches the lives of all people and since God has put us in a social structure, in order to be responsible for others and to help others we must do as much as possible to make the government responsive to all people. We can do this by voting and by helping others in any way we can to become more and better informed.

An old proverb says "as the twig bends, so grows the tree," which means people do as adults what they practice as young people.

We may be a part of the generation who is shying away from our moral obligation of voting. In the recent Homecoming King and Queen election, of the 1,083 students at Lumen Christi only 387 voted, or 36 percent. Voting statistics are based on voting records kept by Student Council.

Senior class led the voting with 56 percent. This is to be expected because they had the privilege of voting for their peers.

One of the problems with not having an underclassman court for Homecoming is that the underclassmen have little interest in the election of the king and queen. One way to get these students involved in the election and voting procedure would be to have an underclassman court involved in the Homecoming festivities.

Many of the reasons students gave for not voting were that it didn't make a difference in their lives, they forgot or they thought of the election as just a popularity contest.

Another aspect of the lack of involvement of the students can be found in the low level of enthusiasm at the Pep Rally and non-participation during Titan Week.

Now we don't pretend to have all the answers to these problems. Perhaps letter to editor or a suggestion column might be in order. Let us know what you are thinking.

If our experiences at Lumen Christi are to do a complete job of preparing us for the future, we must be more in tune with our world.●

#### PROMPT ACTION NEEDED ON THE IMMIGRATION BILL

**HON. ROBERT McCLORY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it would be most unfortunate if the 97th Congress adjourns without taking final action on the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1982. This measure, with which I have been personally involved for the last 2 years as well as during the preceding 2 years as a member of the Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy, culminates the efforts of virtually every possible political, economic, and social interest in the Nation. If we are to regain control of our national borders and regulate the flow of immigrants and refugees into our country, we must first establish the basic law upon which this control can be based.

Mr. Speaker, a most illuminating article in support of the position which I am endeavoring to advance appeared in the Wednesday, December 1, issue of the Chicago Tribune. The article by the Tribune's staff columnist Joan Beck deserves the thoughtful attention of every Member of this body. I am attaching Joan Beck's article to these remarks and invite your thoughtful attention to the message which she projects.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Dec. 1, 1982]

CAN IMMIGRATION BILL BE SAVED?

(By Joan Beck)

One of the most useful actions Congress can take in its lame duck session is to pass a stiff version of the Immigration Reform and Control Act proposed by Sen. Alan K. Simpson (R., Wyo.) and Rep. Romano L. Mazzoli (D., Ky.).

The Simpson-Mazzoli bill has already been okayed by the Senate and in somewhat different form, by the House Judiciary

Committee. But unless Congress finishes work on it this month, three years of hearings, debate and bipartisan effort will be lost. The United States will be left without effective control of its porous borders and the rapidly increasing millions of illegal aliens.

An uncomfortable mix of compassion and guilt makes it hard for Americans to act sensibly in tightening controls on illegal immigration. We are distracted by mental snapshots of malnourished Mexicans trudging through the border desert in hopes of stoop-labor jobs and of helpless sweatshop workers rounded up by Immigration and Naturalization Service officers for deportation.

This is a nation of immigrants' offspring. To shut the golden door even an inch to illegal entrants feels elitist and mean. Besides, who else but undocumented aliens will do the menial chores too demeaning for such a rich people?

But 1880s Statue of Liberty poetry doesn't work as 1980s policy. What was once a legal, orderly, controllable flow of immigrants now includes at least half a million illegals a year. At least 6 million aliens are here unlawfully and the number may be far higher.

Much else is new since the last immigration legislation in 1965. Net immigration was the highest in the nation's history in 1980 and now accounts for half of all U.S. population growth. The economic ills, unemployment and high birth rate of Latin American nations—especially Mexico—spur hundreds of thousands of people to make the easy crossing of our borders illegally every year; many stay here permanently.

It's often argued that illegal aliens do jobs Americans won't and pay more in taxes than they cost in government benefits. But new data show that a big percentage of illegals hold jobs in construction and industry that pay well over minimum wages and millions of Americans take precisely the same jobs as undocumented workers. American unemployment could be cut substantially if the flood of illegal aliens could be abated.

Illegal aliens are also making increased use of state and federal antipoverty programs, in some areas more so than citizens. And the Supreme Court decision last June that children of illegal aliens have a right to public schooling raises the likelihood that further court actions will increase such rights.

Even if illegals were adding more to the economy than they were getting in benefits, it would be reason to change the situation. The moral and political peril of importing and exploiting helpless workers is a lesson this nation should have learned with slavery and its aftermath.

There are, however, problems with the Simpson-Mazzoli bill, most of which can be worked out before passage. It does aim at the right target: employers of illegal aliens. Jobs are the magnet that attracts most immigrants. Making it unlawful to hire those who are here illegally would help stem the tide of undocumented workers.

Unfortunately, this would necessitate some kind of reliable way to identify those who are here legally. The bill would require the President to design a fraud-proof system within three years. The House version mandates considering a telephone verification system similar to that used for checking credit cards; both versions slide over the controversial question of a national ID card which is anathema to many Americans.

Even if the bill eventually results in a national ID card as a price for regaining con-



trol over our borders, we can probably learn to live with it without loss of civil rights—just as we tolerate drivers' licenses and Social Security numbers.

The bill would give permanent resident status to illegal aliens who have been in the United States since before Jan. 1, 1977, and temporary resident status to those here before Jan. 1, 1980. Both groups could eventually become naturalized citizens.

Such a humane action would be expensive. It's estimated that the cost of adding new eligibles to the nation's social programs, even after a proposed three year waiting period, would cost at least \$10 billion. But it's the only way to provide legal protections to millions of people already permanently in the United States in second-class limbo.

Such a drastic move can only be justified by reducing the flood of illegal aliens to a small trickle. Since it is impossible to police our long borders adequately or round up those who overstay visas, workable sanctions to stop employers from hiring illegal aliens are essential.

Failure to pass the Simpson-Mazzoli bill would aggravate and perpetuate some of the nation's most worrisome problems, contribute to unemployment and increase pressures for the nation to become more bilingual and bicultural. It would also tell the world we have given up on keeping our immigration the orderly and generous process that has served the nation so well for more than a century. ●

#### HUMAN RIGHTS AND EL SALVADOR

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, the brutal murders of four American churchwomen in El Salvador outraged us and brought forth demands for an investigation from people all over the United States. Finally, after months of obfuscation and self-serving excuses on the part of the Salvadoran Government, a Salvadoran court has ordered five former national guardsmen to stand trial for these deaths. A long-awaited example of human rights improvement in El Salvador? Not quite.

The proceedings thus far are most notable for what they exclude. There is no indication that the court will allow introduction of evidence—of which there is no lack—on the role of Government officials in the deaths. To the contrary, it is as though by making an example of the five indicted men, the Salvadoran Government seeks to obscure its role in the murders, avoiding all responsibility.

The Reagan administration is calling this trial a human rights success. It is understandable—for the administration has precious little else to work with in a country where human rights continue to deteriorate. In mid-October, 15 Salvadoran political and union officials were seized in separate inci-

dents. Eight are still being held in military jails, the whereabouts of the others is unknown. Two national guard officials, identified as having given the order to assassinate two U.S. labor representatives and a Salvadoran agriculture official in January of 1981, were recently released by the Salvadoran Government. And the incidence of murders and disappearances within El Salvador marches along at a steady, brutal pace.

By continuing to supply massive amounts of military hardware to El Salvador, the United States undercuts any chance for a negotiated settlement and runs the risk of plunging the entire region into conflict. The American people know this and are calling for an end to U.S. military aid.

On November 2, Multnomah County, Oreg., citizens had the opportunity to vote on an initiative calling for an end to U.S. military assistance to El Salvador; 135,050 people, 61 percent of the voters in Multnomah County, a middle class, mainstream county, voted for the initiative.

Rather than touting the upcoming trial as an example of Salvadoran commitment to human rights, President Reagan should listen to what people across the United States are telling him—that nothing less than real, sustained commitment to human rights justifies our involvement in El Salvador. ●

#### DIFFERING VALUES IN ACADEMIA AND INDUSTRY

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, more and more, universities and businesses are collaborating on research and development that is so crucial to our scientific advancement. Cooperation between industry and academia blends the best resources that each has to offer, and the results are of mutual benefit to the academic and the business communities and the public at large.

If, in fact, "necessity is the mother of invention," then the academic community's need for financial support has certainly nurtured the assistance that has historically been provided by the business community. As we witness the inevitable closer ties between business and academia, it is important to keep in mind that their goals are not always identical, although they may be joined as partners on a common enterprise. The following editorial from Science magazine reflects the often diverging interests of these partners. I commend it to my colleagues.

[From Science, Sept. 17, 1982]

#### DIFFERING VALUES IN ACADEMIA AND INDUSTRY

(By Philip H. Abelson)

Many universities are examining searchingly their relations with industry. The basic reason is financial. The academic community is nervous about federal funding of research. Some universities report that they have retained a satisfactory level of support, but half or more have not. Apprehension about federal support has been coupled with other financial problems of the universities brought on by recession and inflation.

In this environment it has become fashionable to look to industry as a possible source of funds. Already a number of universities have entered into contracts involving substantial sums, and additional arrangements will doubtless follow. In general, industry has not been devoting a sufficient sum to basic research within its own laboratories or elsewhere. It was treated to a lesson when a large number of companies were caught flat-footed by academic developments in molecular biology. Other sectors of industry have become concerned about future supplies of personnel trained in computer-related fields.

Despite an apparent basis for close cooperation between academia and industry, the likely outcome is far from a cure-all for the financial ills of the universities. The money spent by industry at universities is unlikely to top 10 percent of the federal funds they now receive. Close cooperation between universities and industry could lead to harmful tensions induced by competing value systems. Universities already have their share of such differences. The humanists look down on the engineers and vice versa; the various science departments usually have little interaction. However, the faculty share common goals in the pursuit of knowledge and in fostering the education of the young. Most of the faculty place these goals above that of attaining personal wealth.

The value system and the mode of conducting research and development in industry are quite different from those of academia. To survive, a company must make a profit. It must evolve with the changing times. And it must be well managed, with a clearly defined chain of command. The bankruptcy courts are very busy these days. Only the strong and nimble remain viable.

In industry, the pressure of the bottom line inevitably dictates policies with respect to R & D. The goal is not pursuit of knowledge; it is the attaining of proprietary advantage. Accordingly, research results obtained at industrial laboratories often go unpublished or are released slowly in the patent literature. In the university, fast publication of scientific findings is eagerly sought. Much of the activity in industry is conducted by interdisciplinary teams whose members are arbitrarily assigned to tasks. Projects may be suddenly terminated. Only a favored few in the typical industrial laboratory have the privilege of personally choosing a research area and sticking with it through discouraging phases of effort. This frenetic tempo is incompatible with the tempo of graduate training in the natural sciences. In their thesis research, it is essential that students pursue a line of inquiry patiently and in depth.

These examples of differing values and procedures make it obvious that close collaboration between academia and industry is likely to create new problems and tensions. That is not to say that cooperation is

undesirable. One time-tested method of co-operation is that of consultation, preferably conducted off-campus. Professors spend at most an average of a day a week at this. They bring their expertise to industry and in turn learn of new developments and new job opportunities for their students.

However, some of the new arrangements between universities and industry come close to inserting an industrial enclave into the campus. It would be unfortunate if such examples were carelessly multiplied. Rather, emphasis should be placed on avoiding relationships that might damage the universities and their ability to carry out well their essential functions of undergraduate and graduate education.●

### TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY

**HON. TOM BEVILL**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, the opponents of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway have consistently disseminated misinformation about this project to the Members of the Congress and the public.

The most vicious and misleading attack was contained in a recent allegation by the Environmental Policy Center that construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee has not benefited minorities because of flagrant acts of racial discrimination. Nothing would be further from the truth.

My distinguished colleague from Ohio and a leading member of the Black Caucus, Mr. STOKES, was personally maligned by these allegations because of his strong support for completion of the waterway. Mr. STOKES has investigated these charges by the Environmental Policy Center and issued a comprehensive report on his findings. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. STOKES' report be printed in the RECORD and encourage each Member to carefully review his findings.

Recently, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, carried an article written by a Washington Bureau reporter captioned, "Should Stokes Have Backed 'Boondoggle' Canal?" The reporter begins the article with the misleading and dramatic statement that "Rep. Louis Stokes is under fire for persuading some of his Black House colleagues to vote for a controversial deep south canal that never has met federal quotas for minority hiring."

The reporter's assertion that I am under fire is based upon the reporter's knowledge of only one letter written by Brent Blackwelder, Executive Director of the Environmental Policy Center, Washington, D.C. In the article singling me out for special attack, the reporter near the end of the article, reports that Rep. Mary Rose O'Carroll voted for the project, as I did, but that Reps. Eckart and Mottl opposed it.

One must question how I am singled out for a special story attacking my vote on a project in which two Cuyahoga County representatives vote for it and two vote against it. Additionally, one must question the pur-

pose or reason for singling me out when ten of the twenty-three Members of Congress from Ohio voted in favor of the project, as I did.

In singling me out for attack and utilizing the letter of Brent Blackwelder, the reporter made it look as though I and other members of the Congressional Black Caucus were voting for a project that was not in the best interest of Black people in terms of minority hiring.

I was disappointed that the reporter, who spent an hour in my office interviewing me during which time I provided data justifying my vote, chose to omit such material from the article, thereby depriving the article of both fairness and balance.

Since the reporter chose, for reasons of her own to omit these facts, I hereby resort to this medium to put the facts on the table.

I told the reporter that two years ago, when the bill was on the Floor, a white paper had circulated accusing the Army Corps of Engineers and the Tennessee-Tombigbee officials of denying minorities meaningful participation in the multi-million dollar project. I told the reporter that as the top-ranking Black Member of the House Appropriations Committee, I went to Tom Beville, Chairman of the Subcommittee on this bill and asked him about it. I explained to the writer that he told me that it was absolutely untrue and invited me to come down to tour the site and ascertain the facts for myself. I told the reporter that I accepted that invitation and visited the project. That while there, I took a helicopter trip over the Tennessee, Mississippi and Alabama segments of the project. That I also talked with the Army Corps of Engineers officials, employees and Blacks in a leadership position in those states.

I specifically told the Cleveland Plain Dealer reporter that I also met Mr. Wendell Paris, Executive Director, Minority People's Council, who represented over 4,000 people organized into 15 or more County Chapters bordering the Tennessee-Tombigbee.

The reporter was also informed that when Mr. Paris came to Washington to testify in favor of this project that at his request, I accompanied him to the hearing and was permitted to sit in on Chairman Tom Beville's Subcommittee of which I was not a member. The reporter was provided with a copy of Wendell Paris' testimony in which he stated, "The major goal of our organization is to insure that minorities and poor people receive a fair and proportionate share of all the benefits of this \$2 billion federal public works project." While Mr. Paris did criticize the Corps for not complying with all established goals, he stated in his testimony, "The Minority People's Council has consistently supported full federal funding for construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, provided that minorities, women and poor people are given an equitable share of the jobs, training contracts, and other benefits of the project."

I also provided that reporter with two letters which she chose not to quote in the article. Both letters were written to the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development by Dr. Aaron E. Henry, nationally recognized civil rights leader and President, Mississippi State Conference, N.A.A.C.P. In both letters, he urged full funding for this project and in a letter dated March 18, 1982, explicitly stated, "To date, over \$35 million of construction work has gone to minority business . . ." In the same letter, this distinguished civil rights leader said, "Tenn-Tom flows through one of the most economically

depressed regions in the nation. We respectfully request this Committee and the Congress to continue construction of this project. . ."

Since the article appeared, I have talked again with Mr. Wendell Paris, Chairman of the Minority Council who stated, "All I have tried to say is that we are not satisfied. We have never wanted this project shut down." Dr. Aaron Henry says, "I still vigorously support it because what employment there is due to Tennessee-Tombigbee." He stated that he wants the same thing for Blacks in the Delta that was done for whites in Appalachia.

In the article, the reporter attempts to give the impression that Blacks in the South will not support the project this year. In a letter written since the Plain Dealer article by Ms. Esther M. Harrison, Executive Director, Construction and Business Assistance Center, Inc. to Mr. Brent Blackwelder, she says, "I am writing this letter in a two-fold capacity. First, as the local Branch President of the N.A.A.C.P. and as Director of the Agency that deals with contracting assistance for disadvantaged and minority business." Ms. Harrison then says, "The N.A.A.C.P. has never gone on record opposing the project nor has it made statements that minorities were not benefitting. The State N.A.A.C.P. has always given its full support for continued funding and construction of the project and has made this known to the Congressional Black Caucus."

I am at a complete loss as to why the Plain Dealer reporter did not report that the Corps of Engineers has established a training program in conjunction with this project wherein 101 trainees have graduated from this program. 50.5 percent of the graduates are minorities and 23.8 percent are female. Additionally, over \$5 million has been awarded in 8-A sub-contracts and \$32 million in sub-contracts to minority firms.

In investigating the circumstances around the reporter's article, I became curious as to what kind of minority hiring record was evidenced by the Environmental Policy Center, whose Executive Director, Brent Blackwelder, is quoted extensively in the article. For instance, in one paragraph, Mr. Blackwelder excoriates the Army Corps of Engineers for setting 30 percent Black employment as a goal. He stated that, "This would be like setting a goal of hiring 30 percent Blacks for a youth jobs program in the District of Columbia. The District's population is about 70 percent Black." The fact is that the Corps of Engineers has consistently maintained a 27-30 percent goal and under their affirmative action plan, the overall percentage minority utilization has averaged in the 23-27 percent range. Now let's look at the minority employment record of the Environmental Policy Center of which Mr. Blackwelder is Executive Director. It consists of two organizations and two policy making Boards of Directors. One Board of Directors has 16 members, none of whom are Black and the other has 9 members none of whom are Black. Additionally, the Environmental Policy Center has 30 employees, only two of whom are Black. One employee is a clerical personal secretary to the President of the Corporation and one is a lobbyist. Ms. Louise Dunlap, President of this Corporation, which has no Blacks making policy and less than 1 percent Black employees also admitted that they have no affirmative action plans or goals in existence. All of this is in Washington, D.C., a city more than 70 percent Black. Ms. Dunlap also advised me that to her knowl-



edge, their record on hiring Blacks, as deplorable as it is, is the best in the environmental field. She is probably correct. The famous Sierra Club in Washington, D.C. admits that of their 14 employees, only one is Black.

In a few days, in this lame duck session of Congress, we will once again be voting on this \$1.8 billion jobs project known as the Tenn-Tom Waterway Project. To stop this project would cause the loss of 5,000 jobs, a large number of which would impact heavily upon Black Americans who reside in this tri-state area.

It is the height of callous indifference and arrogance for an environmental group with the record of the Environmental Policy Center to tell the Congressional Black Caucus that they should not be supporting this project because it will perpetuate a pattern of racial discrimination. As for my voting for a so-called boondoggle canal, I am painfully aware that nationwide, Black adults are unemployed at a rate of 20.2 percent and that Black youth are unemployed at a rate of 46.7 percent. Perhaps the environmentalists can afford the luxury of being concerned about the trees in the forests. I have to be concerned about human misery amongst the living. ●

#### U.S. QUERIES EL SALVADOR ON DEATH OF AMERICAN

#### HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, today is the second anniversary of the slaughter of four American nuns working in El Salvador. And nearly 2 months since the mysterious death of a young American, Michael Kline.

One can also say this marks the El Salvadoran Government's continued refusal to honor the rights of its citizens. Repeatedly, Congress has called for an end to this blatant and unjust denial of freedom. The perpetual discrepancies between official reports and contrary evidence can no longer be accepted. Cooperation and mutual understanding are always the keys to successful negotiating. However, murder, disappearances and the general disregard for social welfare negate that possibility. To relax our stance against this violent, inhumane existence would make us an accomplice to murder.

One of the requirements for any military aid to El Salvador is certification of continued investigation of the shooting of the American churchwomen in 1980. Instead of resolving these assassinations in order to prevent further brutality another blanket of lies is being thrown over the fire to smother the truth. I want to insert this article describing the vague demise of Michael Kline, an American youth. We cannot allow these deaths to slip into the safe haven of past issues. Nothing has been resolved. The rights as well as the lives of innocent El Salvadorans continue to be pulver-

ized. El Salvador, under its present regime, cannot in all good conscience be supported by the United States of America.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 19, 1982]

#### U.S. QUESTIONS SALVADORAN KILLING OF AMERICAN 'DRIFTER'

(By Christopher Dickey)

SAN SALVADOR, Nov. 18—U.S. officials here are investigating the possibility that a young American picked up for questioning by Salvadoran soldiers last month and reportedly killed while trying to escape may have been murdered.

The officials said in interviews this morning that they were concerned about apparent discrepancies between the soldiers' initial account of the Oct. 13 killing of Michael David Kline, 24, and later medical reports that raise the possibility he was summarily shot.

The death of Kline, described as a "drifter," comes as the Reagan administration is already under heavy pressure from Congress to show that the government it backs here is making progress in investigating and prosecuting the murders of four American churchwomen in December 1980 and two U.S. labor advisers a month later.

Members of the Salvadoran military have been implicated in both cases, and the United States has had only limited success in pushing for substantive investigations and prosecutions. This week, a Salvadoran judge ruled that evidence against five National Guard soldiers held in connection with the deaths of the four women was sufficient for trial.

Kline's death has placed the U.S. Embassy here again in the difficult position of pressing for evidence that could damage overall U.S. policy goals in El Salvador by making even more difficult the certification of human rights improvement demanded by Congress.

In a speech last month and later interviews U.S. Ambassador Deane Hinton warned that Washington's economic and military aid, needed by this country's rulers in their fight against leftist insurgents, could be cut off over the human rights issue in general and the American murder cases in particular.

A U.S. diplomat authorized to speak about the case described Kline's death as "sensitive" and said, "The important thing now is how it is resolved by the Salvadoran authorities." A new examination of Kline's body by Salvadoran doctors at the military hospital is under way.

"We are trying to verify the soldiers' story," the diplomat said. "It could be he did try to escape and maybe they dropped him and then came up close to finish him off."

Much about Kline is a mystery, including most details about his background, his motives for traveling to one of the most war-torn provinces in El Salvador, and why he was carrying \$500 in traveler's checks but no passport or other documents.

But there is also much about Kline's death that has the ring of the commonplace in this war where it is estimated that more than 35,000 people have died in three years.

The killings of Americans, as one Western diplomat put it, tend to "synthesize the whole problem here" by drawing attention to the conditions in which Salvadorans die.

The picture of Kline put together by U.S. officials is of a young "drifter" born in Tijuana, Mexico, to a German-born mother who has returned to her home near Ham-

burg and a father who lives in Chicago but who, according to the U.S. account, was said to be uninterested in the case.

A U.S. consular report from West Germany said Kline's mother, Renate Margaret Kline, believed he wanted to be a journalist.

There are spotty records of Kline buying traveler's checks in Alaska earlier this year, leaving Costa Rica in May, and reporting the loss of the checks and a passport in Cancun, Mexico, on Sept. 6. He apparently found them again before traveling to Guatemala later in the month, then crossed into El Salvador on Oct. 11, according to Guatemalan records given U.S. officials. The documents were reportedly gone when he died.

Kline was not positively identified as a U.S. citizen until Monday, when dental records arrived here. It was not until then, U.S. officials said, that they were able to press the investigation.

First word of Kline's death came when the head of El Salvador's Armed Forces Press Committee, Col. Marco Aurelio Gonzales, took the unusual step of calling a press conference here Oct. 15 to tell foreign journalists that a gringo mercenary, "possibly an American or Canadian, has been killed by government troops in Morazan province.

The press office reportedly claimed at one point during the conference that Kline had seized one of the soldiers' guns and fired at them before they killed him, but this is nowhere corroborated by the basic account of what happened. This account comes from Army Sgt. Jose Desposorio Lopez, who was directly involved in the incident.

As U.S. officials recount the story from Lopez's affidavit and an interview with him on Oct. 21, Kline was riding a bus that runs from the city of San Miguel to the garrison town of San Francisco Gotera about 100 miles northeast of the capital when it was stopped by the army at a routine checkpoint.

Lopez found Kline suspicious on the basis of his "long hair, dirty clothes and rubber sandals" and lack of identification papers, he said in his report. Kline was ordered detained.

Kline was taken to the bivouac at the checkpoint and his belongings searched. Initial accounts based on the press conference cited the report that he carried a knapsack, an air mattress, insect repellent, medicine (Alka-Seltzer) and lubricating oil that "could be used for cleaning a weapon" as evidence that he might be a guerrilla.

U.S. officials say that Lopez told them Kline spoke little or no Spanish and did not seem to understand everything he was told. He carried no identification except for the traveler's checks, Lopez reported.

Lopez said he, a soldier named Hector Rubina Reyes and another referred to only as "Cristobal" flagged down a pickup truck to take them to headquarters at San Francisco Gotera.

According to Lopez' account the truck slowed about four miles down the road and Kline lunged for one of the soldiers' rifles. When he failed to get it he jumped off and began running uphill.

Lopez told U.S. officials Kline was ordered to stop, but kept running and was shot down at a distance of about 30 feet.

"We have problems with the sergeant's story," said one embassy official. "He reports three shots two in the neck and one in the back, all from the back".

But photographs of the body and the first medical report on the case, written the day after the killing, showed that one of the

shots was in the head, from front to back, according to U.S. officials.

Moreover, the doctor who wrote that report noted that there were no powder burns on the wound in Kline's back, but he did not mention the state of the wound in his head (which has yet to be determined conclusively) and did not mention the third wound in the body at all.

The officials said they are awaiting the new report from the military hospital before deciding what further steps to take in the investigation.

#### VOLUNTARISM AT WORK IN THE 10TH DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

##### HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, at a time when voluntary efforts are being encouraged nationwide to meet the special needs and demands of our cities and communities, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives an extraordinary example of voluntarism at its best.

Last spring a group of parents whose children attend Glen Forest Elementary School in the 10th District of Virginia, which I represent, recognized the importance of a recreational facility in the physical and mental development of their children. At that time, the students' only play area was a small, flat and barren field.

These parents organized and coordinated a full scale effort to finance and construct a playground in the schoolyard. The dedication of these parents, who did the manual labor themselves; the faculty, students, staff, and the hundreds of citizens, businesses, and clubs helped make the playground project a successful and fun community event.

The generous contributions of money, time, services and equipment have resulted in a uniquely beautiful playground that will continually challenge the imagination of future classes of children at Glen Forest Elementary School.

I fully appreciate the enthusiasm and involvement it took to make this project successful and I want to take this opportunity to congratulate and thank everyone who participated including:

Bailey's Crossroads Host Lions Club, Fairfax County Park Authority, Arlington Fairfax Elks Lodge No. 2188, Charles E. Smith, Inc., Wild and Wooly Needlecraft, Mr. Thomas M. Davis III, Metro Antenna, Bailey's Crossroads Volunteer Fire Dept., Fairfax County Fire Department, Dunn Loring Station.

Southern Builders, Chapel Valley Nursery, Southern Railroads, Perceptions of Virginia, Inc., Hodges Tractors, Duron Paints, Dyer Brothers Paint, Spring Hill Motor Lodge, Lake Barcroft Women's Club, Arlington Unitarian Cooperative Preschool.

Smith and Sons Equipment Corp., Alwards Garage, Glen Forest Garden Club, Woodson High School/Mr. Simm's Class, Meenahan's Hardware, Fairfax County Dept. of Transportation, Dick Herriman Ford, Metal Distributors, Inc., Anderson Excavating, LRC Printing, Curray Copy Center, Walter Brothers Printing.

Glen Carlyn Baptist Church, Culmore United Methodist Church, Voluntary Action Center/Fairfax Co., Girl Scout Cadet Troupe No. 2387, Honeycutt's Inc., Giant Food, Willston Center, Dr. Richard B. Hicks, VEPCO, C & P Telephone, Sea Galley.

Jeb Stuart High School: Mr. Kobus' classes, Key Club, Keyettes, Civitan, Civinettes; Mr. Joe Gass, Jerry's Sunoco, Spencer Lock Company, S. J. Bell Contractors, KMT Contractors, Southern Office Supply, Advanced Bathroom Design, Carpet Bazaar.

Pizza Hut, Burke Lumber, Chuck E. Cheese Pizza Time Theater, Dino's N.Y. Style Pizza, Dart Drug, Arthur Treacher's Fish and Chips, Hechinger's, Shanghai 4-5-6, Wooten Associates.

Brownie Troop No. 342, Bekins, Natural Foods Supermarket, Culmore Pizza, Donut King, Reston Farm Market, Chesapeake Seafood, McDonalds, Roy Rogers.

Mr. and Mrs. H. Nathan, Mrs. Lillie Mae Harris, Plus Supermarket, Peking Gourmet, Mr. Mike Perez, Magruder's, Dr. Alfred C. Griffin, Safeway, Inc., and Fairfax County Public Libraries.

Erol's Color TV, Dr. Jerome Goldfarb, Falls Church Concert Band, Krispy Kreme Doughnuts, Wonder Bread, Tiffany Bakery, Culinary School of Washington, Georgetown Bagelry, Bread and Chocolate, Coca Cola.

Mr. Bill Moran, Northern Virginia Land, Inc., Magnifico's Pizza, Old Chicago Pizzeria, Mrs. Maggie Capozio, Subway Sandwich Shop, Cox Farms, Brownie Troop No. 342, Serafino's, Joe's Place. ●

#### SUMMARY OF EARLY WARNINGS ON SPENDING BILLS

##### HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the following early warning on the Interior appropriations bill was prepared by the staff of the Budget Committee:

##### EARLY WARNING

H.R. 7356, INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION, FISCAL YEAR 1983

Committee: Appropriations.

Subcommittee: Interior.

Chairman: Mr. Yates (Illinois).

Ranking Minority Member: Mr. McDade (Pennsylvania).

Scheduled: Friday, December 3, 1982.

##### I. Description of bill

This bill provides \$7,604 million in budget authority and \$5,179 million in outlays for discretionary programs in the Department of Interior and for related agencies for fiscal year 1983. Such funding has already been provided in the Continuing Appropriations Act (Public Law 97-276). This regular appropriation will supersede and replace funds provided in the continuing resolution. The effect of this bill, therefore, is to provide an incremental change to the current level of spending that is already provided by law.

##### II. Comparison with budget targets

Now that fiscal year 1983 has started, there are two budget targets to consider. The first is the aggregate ceiling on budget authority and outlays that was specified in the First Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1983. Pursuant to section 7 of that resolution, the aggregates automatically become binding ceilings on October 1. Summary table B, below, shows that while the current level of budget authority, based on enacted law, is substantially under the budget resolution ceiling, the current level of outlays is over the ceiling.

The second target is the 302(b) target provided for this subcommittee when the Appropriations Committee subdivided its share of the First Budget Resolution's budget authority and outlays. These are the targets which the Budget Committee scorekeeping system uses as a measure of spending action. These targets are separated between discretionary spending, over which this subcommittee has control, and mandatory spending, over which it does not. While the overall resolution ceiling has been breached by other bills, Summary table C, below, shows that, with this bill, the subcommittee would remain under the 302(b) targets for discretionary spending that were provided in the first resolution. This bill has no impact on the current level of mandatory spending.

##### III. Summary tables

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
Summary table A.—Comparison of continuing and regular appropriations, discretionary spending: <sup>1</sup>		
1. Continuing appropriations (Public Law 97-276) <sup>a</sup>	7,881	5,352
2. This bill (H.R. 7356).....	7,604	5,179
3. Over (+)/Under (—).....	-277	-173
Summary table B.—Comparison with current level and ceilings:		
4. Budget resolution ceilings.....	822,390	769,818
5. Current level.....	806,948	775,026
6. Over (+)/Under (—).....	-15,442	+5,208
7. a. Impact of this bill.....	-277	-173
b. Scoring adjustment due to this bill <sup>a</sup> .....	+85	+85
8. Over (+)/Under (—).....	-15,634	+5,120
Summary table C.—Comparison with 302(b) subdivisions, discretionary spending: <sup>1</sup>		
9. 302(b) targets.....	7,650	5,335
10. Current level.....	7,881	5,352
11. Over (+)/Under (—).....	+231	+17
12. Impact of this bill.....	-277	-173
13. Over (+)/Under (—).....	-44	-156

<sup>1</sup> This bill does not affect the current level of mandatory spending.

<sup>a</sup> The scoring for both the continuing and the bill include amounts appropriated for the entire year in Public Law 97-276 for SPRO, Smithsonian construction, and the Native Hawaiian Study Commission.

<sup>b</sup> Enactment of this bill would also affect the scoring of certain proprietary receipts and permanent appropriations not in the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee.

##### IV. Possible future requirements

The Budget Resolution does not assume funding for any additional programs within the jurisdiction of this subcommittee.

##### V. Credit

The First Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 1983 also contains targets for credit program amounts. As with budget authority and outlays, the Appropriations Committee is allocated amounts for credit program amounts and subdivides those amounts among subcommittees. The table below shows the additional credit assistance provided by this bill; credit assistance program levels already enacted, including action in the Continuing Appropriations Resolution;



and credit assistance programs not yet acted on. These amounts are then compared to the Appropriations Committee subdivisions.

	Direct loan obligations	Primary guarantee commitments	Secondary guarantee commitments
1. 1983 credit program limits already enacted.....	15	36	
2. Additional program limits in the bill.....	+5	-20	
3. Limits assumed in the budget resolution not acted on in the bill and other amounts not subject to annual limits.....	677	-667	
4. Possible total for subcommittee.....	697	-651	
5. Credit subdivisions.....	800	-625	
6. Over (+)/Under (-) Subdivision.....	-103	-26	

#### VI. Definitions of terms in the summary tables, section III

**Line 1.** Continuing appropriations (Public Law 97-276): This is the amount of discretionary budget authority outlays provided by that law, for programs funded by this subcommittee, as estimated on a full-year basis pursuant to congressional scorekeeping rules and GAO interpretation.

**Line 2.** This bill (H.R. 7356): This is the amount of discretionary budget authority and outlays that will be provided to the agencies in questions if this bill is enacted—in that case it would supersede the continuing appropriations.

**Line 3.** Over(+)/Under(-): Line 2 minus line 1, which is the net impact on current level of this bill.

**Line 4.** Budget resolution ceilings: These are the total amounts of budget authority and outlays in the First Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1983.

**Line 5.** Current level: This is the official estimate of total fiscal year 1983 spending, based only on existing law, including the continuing appropriations Public Law 97-276).

**Line 6.** Over(+)/Under(-): Line 5 minus line 4.

**Line 7a.** Impact of this bill: See line 3.

**Line 7b.** Enactment of this bill would also affect the scoring of certain proprietary receipts and permanent appropriations not in the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee.

**Line 8.** Over(+)/Under(-): Line 6 plus line 7.

**Line 9.** 302(b) targets: The targets for discretionary spending for this subcommittee, set by the Appropriations Committee pursuant to the Budget Act.

**Line 10.** Current level: This is the official estimate of total fiscal year 1983 discretionary spending for this subcommittee, based on existing law, i.e., the continuing appropriations (Public Law 97-276).

**Line 11.** Over(+)/Under(-): Line 10 minus line 9.

**Line 12.** Impact of this bill: See line 3.

**Line 13.** Over(+)/Under(-): Line 11 plus line 12. This compares the reported bill (H.R. 7356) with its 302(b) targets. ●

## THE HARD TRUTHS OF THE BREZHNEV LEGACY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the death of Leonid Brezhnev, there has been a great deal of speculation, and a good deal of it wishful thinking, over the future of United States-Soviet relations and of the role of Yuri Andropov. The Heritage Foundation recently released a background paper by W. Bruce Weinrod, director of foreign policy and defense studies of the foundation, on the implications of the Brezhnev legacy. I wish to insert it for the Member's attention:

#### THE HARD TRUTHS OF THE BREZHNEV LEGACY (By W. Bruce Weinrod)

The death of Leonid Brezhnev is already producing an assortment of favorable reminiscences, as well as hopeful expectations for the course of future U.S.-Soviet relations: we hear Jimmy Carter fondly recalling Brezhnev's fervent desire for world peace and Cyrus Vance stating that Brezhnev's greatest legacy is his arms control efforts.

Do these and other similar generally sympathetic comments about the Brezhnev era reflect the actual Soviet record under Brezhnev? This question is critical, for how it is answered will influence the U.S. approach to dealing with the U.S.S.R. in the immediate post-Brezhnev era. The U.S. will be ill-served by romanticizing and distorting the Brezhnev legacy.

A pluralistic world was completely unacceptable to Brezhnev. The most dramatic demonstration of this is the "Brezhnev Doctrine" of 1968. Brezhnev used this to justify the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, the invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 and the suppression of Polish liberties in 1981. This is part of the Brezhnev legacy.

The Brezhnev legacy threatens the security of the free world. Just in the past decade, the Soviets have added 733 nuclear-capable missiles (land, sea and air) and have increased their warhead supply by over 4,000. Since SALT I and the start of the so-called détente era, when the strategic equation was supposed to be stabilized, the Soviets have added, among others: several hundred later model SS-11 rockets, over 800 SS-18s, SS-19s and SS-20s; over 50 nuclear subs with about 2,000 nuclear warheads; and over 150 Backfire intercontinental bombers. Despite the well-publicized "Brezhnev freeze," in which he announced in March 1982 that the Soviets would stop further deployment of SS-20s targeted on Western Europe, deployment has continued.

The Soviets and their Warsaw Pact satellites have continued to increase what already was conventional weapon superiority over the West. In all, Brezhnev's Soviet Union is, at his death, spending roughly 40 percent more on military outlays than is the United States. And Moscow is allocating roughly 12 percent to 15 percent of its GNP to military spending; the U.S., even with current spending hikes, is only at about 6 percent of GNP. From 1971 to 1981, the U.S.S.R. outspent the United States militarily by around \$400 billion. During the past decade, Brezhnev added 10,000 new

heavy and medium tanks, 8,000 pieces of artillery and 765 combat aircraft. Just since Reagan took office, the Soviets have added 2,000 tanks, 1,350 fighters and fighter-bombers, and 4,500 fighting vehicles. This is an unavoidable hard truth of the Brezhnev legacy.

Not only did Brezhnev snuff budding liberty and pluralism in Eastern Europe, he also provided substantial aid to terrorists trying to disrupt Turkey's pro-democratic and pro-Western government and has continued attempts to exploit Iran's instability. While Americans were being held hostage, Brezhnev continued to fan anti-American fervor in Iran.

In Asia, the Soviets financed and encouraged the North Vietnamese invasion of the South, in violation of the peace agreement of 1973, and also is financially underwriting the Vietnamese occupation of Cambodia. The Soviets under Brezhnev continued to refuse to discuss the return to Japan of islands seized at the end of World War II; in contrast, the U.S. voluntarily returned Okinawa, won at the cost of bloody fighting, to Japan.

In the Middle East, the Soviets encouraged Nasser's blockade of Israel in 1967, which precipitated the Six-Day War, and subsequently supported the Arabs in the 1973 war. A Soviet-supported coup in 1978 in South Yemen has made that nation a protectorate of the Russians, and the Soviets have transferred large amounts of arms to both sides in the Iran-Iraq war, encouraging instability in that region.

In Africa, the Soviets under Brezhnev have aided the most radical and destabilizing groups, including the African National Congress and SWAPO. Moscow is aiding the Polisario guerrillas fighting against America's ally, Morocco. Further south, the Soviets brought the Cubans into Angola. Closer to the United States, Brezhnev continually sought to violate the understanding ending the Cuban missile crisis by trying to expand the Soviet submarine base at Cienfuegos.

The Brezhnev legacy is pock-marked by Soviet treaty violations. Experts can cite continuing Soviet violations of the SALT I Treaty—supposedly a symbol of Brezhnev's commitment to arms control. Moscow trains and supports terrorists from the PLO to Libya to the attempted assassin of Pope John Paul II. The Brezhnev legacy is filled with unremitting domestic repression as well.

What then are the hard truths of the Brezhnev legacy? The answer: Unremitting efforts to gain advantage at the expense of the United States and the free world and an unyielding hostility to pluralistic societies.

Can the future bring improvements in U.S.-Soviet relations? Perhaps Moscow's new leadership will seek to relax world tensions. U.S. policy, however, cannot be based upon hopes that have often proved illusory in the past.

The hard truths, learned from painful experience, teach that the United States should continue to pressure the Soviets, forcing them to make difficult choices in terms of foreign involvements and the allocation of resources. If Moscow decides to move toward genuine peace, Washington will know it soon enough. Unless and until the Soviets alter their course in a meaningful way, such as allowing independent trade unions in Poland, or permitting a genuinely independent government in Afghanistan, conciliatory gestures from the United States are inappropriate. The fundamental fact is that it is the realities of the Soviet Union

and not the individuals who develop policies which govern U.S. decisions. The burden must be on Moscow's new leaders to prove that they are not the heirs of the Brezhnev legacy. ●

**NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO  
LACKING IN FAIRNESS**

**HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 2, 1982

● Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, each year the American people pay millions of dollars in taxes to support National Public Radio. For that money people expect professionalism, quality, and fairness—most of all: fairness.

I believe that the people of this country may be getting less than their money's worth in the news department of National Public Radio. Although the quality of the programs is normally good, there may be evidence that the news coverage is sadly lacking in professional integrity and in fairness—most of all: fairness.

I submit for the attention of my colleagues the following article from the November-December 1982 issue of the Washington Guide. This article suggests that the American taxpayer and the Congress of the United States should take a closer look at the organization and reporting of our public broadcasting system.

In a time of huge budget deficits and tremendous unemployment, every program must be carefully scrutinized. In light of information such as that in this article, I believe that the public broadcasting budget bears a special burden of proof—of its necessity and its public purpose.

The article follows:

**NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO'S HIDDEN HUSBANDS**

Would the American public trust the news department of NPR if they knew about the connections to power that their correspondents have at home?

"All Things Considered" is the National Public Radio (NPR) ninety minute afternoon news program, which is broadcast by more than 250 stations throughout the United States, every afternoon.

Two thirds of NPR's budget of \$21 million is provided by the taxpayers of the United States, in whose ranks are millions of conservatives, and millions more who could be categorized as middle-of-the-road. But when asked if there are any conservatives or middle-of-the roaders among the liberal Democrats who abound on the reportorial staff on NPR, the Vice President For News, Barbara Cohen replied:

"I don't know what you're talking about."

Mrs. Cohen is the wife of Washington Post columnist Richard Cohen. But her biographical news release, issued in the NPR press kit, makes no mention of this interesting interlocking of Big Media news people in our nation's capital.

During her brief interview in her office, Mrs. Cohen also told Washington Guide:

"I would describe Walter Mondale as a middle-of-the-roader."

News Director Cohen's ability to categorize the political position of the former Vice President—but not her reporters—came about later in the interview, when she identified one of the commentators on All Things Considered as Martin Kaplan, a former Mondale speechwriter.

Among the other five commentators on general subjects, this government-subsidized program has one (1) conservative, the formerly Rev. John McLaughlin, an ex-Jesuit who married the attractive press secretary of Treasury Secretary Donald Regan.

The other people who (openly) express opinions on NPR include:

Daniel Schorr, who was fired by CBS for having leaked a classified government document to Manhattan's Village Voice.

Bob Kuttner, editor of Boston's liberal weekly, Working Papers.

Tom Noyes and Edwin Yoder, former editorial writers for the Washington Star (whose editorials, in its last years, rarely, if ever differed from the Washington Post.)

Adam Hochstein of Mother Jones magazine, a left wing periodical involved with the similarly left wing Institute For Policy Studies.

When Washington Guide asked if the lineup of reporters and anchormen and women is any more balanced than the stable of all (but one) liberal commentators, Mrs. Cohen retorted:

"We don't hire reporters for their political views. We hire them for their journalistic abilities. And I wouldn't characterize them by any political stripe."

By striking contrast to this inability (or unwillingness) to categorize her reporters, NPR has a list of 77 people, entitled: em "Partial List of 'Conservative' Commentators and Interviewees On NPR News Programs."

Included in this list of "conservatives" are Dr. Henry Kissinger and his aide Helmut Sonnenfeldt; Senators John Danforth and Nancy Landon Kassenbaum, Secretary of Defense Casper Weinberger and White House Chief of Staff Jim Baker.

By contrast to this list of "conservatives," Mrs. Cohen's reporters "don't represent political points of view, in my opinion," she said.

No one on her entire staff, she added, represents any viewpoint, liberal or conservative.

So Washington Guide asked: "Why did that extensive and attractive NPR press kit, with all those photographs and biographies, cover up the existence of "so many interesting husbands?"

News Director Cohen frowned and replied: "Your point that there is a coverup and that we are hiding our personal family connections is kind of insulting. To suggest that my views, or my approach to my job is at all influenced by what my husband writes, is quite wrong."

Does Vice President Cohen of NPR believe that it is wrong for civil courts to apply special rules regarding the testimony of a wife in a case concerning her husband, or vice versa?

"I pursue my professional career, and my husband pursues his professional career."

You never discuss anything to do with the news with your husband?

"Of course we do."

So we asked Mrs. Cohen what she supposed was the nature of such familial news discussions between her reporter Linda Wertheimer, and her husband, Fred.

Fred Wetheimer—another very notable NPR husband who is unmentioned in his

wife's biographical news release—is the head of the liberal lobby Common Cause. This is a lobby which is involved in a great many current legislative issues on Capitol Hill—from whence his wife broadcasts news reports. (Among other issues, Common Cause has opposed efforts to repeal court ordered busing, and to reform the wide-open-to-criminals, competitors, and spies Freedom of Information Act; has opposed the Reagan Budget, and the constitutional amendment for a balanced budget; favored the Voting Rights Act, the Clean Air Act, the Legal Services Corporation and strict limitations on Political Action Committees.)

In putting Linda Wertheimer on the air, at U.S. Government expense, does NPR ever identify her as the wife of a lobbyist?

Mrs. Cohen appeared slightly shaken by this question, which she answered in an almost funereal tone:

"We take great pains to make sure that Linda is never assigned to cover a subject in which Fred has any interest."

Why doesn't NPR reveal Linda's lobbying connection even in her NPR biographical news release?

"I don't think it's relevant," retorted Cohen. "We conduct our business in a professional, above-board manner. To make something out of who are spouses or parents, I find a very sexist approach."

Washington Guide then asked about the also unmentioned-husband of NPR judicial reporter Nina Tottenberg. For Tottenberg, the scourge of conservatives in the Supreme Court as well as in the U.S. Senate, is in real life Mrs. Floyd Haskell. He is the liberal Democrat who was once U.S. Senator from Colorado.

Washington Guide was able to reach Sen. Haskell by telephone. He explained that while he had left the law firm he joined after losing his bid for re-election, he is now involved with some "Non-profit organizations"—which he refused to identify.

We asked News Director Cohen if she had determined the identity of Sen. Haskell's concealed activities. But in striking contrast to her expressed concern about Linda Wertheimer's never covering anything relating to her husband's lobbying, Cohen said:

"No, I determine how Nina pursues her job."

If you don't know what Nina's husband is doing, how do you know Nina is not covering areas in which her husband is involved?

"Because people here are journalists," replied Cohen. "And they are very leary of getting involved in anything in which they could possibly have a conflict of interest."

We mentioned the current wave of journalistic liars, such as Janet Cooke of the Washington Post, and similarly fraudulent reporters at the New York Daily News, the Toronto Sun and the Stamford Advocate. But this epidemic of lying reporters apparently has had little or no effect upon News Director Cohen, and her assurance that nobody at NPR could ever be unduly influenced by a husband.

Another one of NPR's hidden husbands is New York Times reporter Steven Roberts, who is the spouse of NPR reporter Cokie Roberts. Cokie might be described as a twofor. For not only is there this New York Times connection, but Cokie is the daughter of the late Congressman Hale Boggs and Congresswoman Lindy Boggs.

Reporter Roberts' relationship with these two Democratic stalwarts in the House of Representatives, as well as the Bid Media identity of her husband, is unmentioned in her NPR biographical news release. And



when Roberts reports from Capitol Hill, NPR does not advise its listeners that her reports are the products of a Daughter of House Democrats.

This appearance of a conflict of interest is at least a conflict of family relationships, similar to a baseball umpire being married to the sister of a team manager. This would be cause for concern in some media organizations, but not at the top level of NPR.

For the President of NPR is the former aide to such strongly liberal Democrats as Senators Robert Kennedy and George McGovern. Frank Manckiewicz had to go through the anguish of being a top campaign aide to one of the most badly beaten Presidential candidates in American history. But Manckiewicz—who was not available for comment—now enjoys the satisfaction of seeing himself in control of the nation's public radio system, where he has been able

to load the staff with liberal Democrats, whose salaries are paid by the taxpayers.

Mr. Manckiewicz' Vice President For News, Mrs. Cohen, who considers Fritz Mondale to be middle of the road, has another notable impression, about another of Washington's institutions—her husband's employer:

"I think the editorial page of the Washington Post leans toward the conservative. The Post is a conservative paper.

Since Cohen contended that there is nothing amiss in NPR's not mentioning the very interesting husbands of some of its star reporters, we asked her:

"Would you, as vice president of news, be willing to put on the air a commentary by Dorothy Coble, without ever telling listeners, or ever mentioning it in your press kit, who she is?"

"I don't know who she is," replied Mrs. Cohen.

"Dorothy Coble is Mrs. Jesse Helms," we explained.

The ensuing silence was ear-splitting. Finally Cohen responded: "It would certainly depend on the context of the story. I'm very uncomfortable with getting into these hypothetical hypotheticals."

News Director Cohen may be even more uncomfortable to learn that Mrs. Jesse Helms is an experienced newswoman, with the Raleigh News and Observer.

Will Mrs. Helms be given any opportunity to try to balance the ratio of conservatives to liberals on this government subsidized radio organization? And if that ever takes place, would News Director Cohen fail to inform the listeners and the public that she is really the wife of North Carolina's strongly conservative Senator?●