

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H.M. DAUGHTRY, JR., ONE OF A
KIND

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, this is a most unique experience for me. As a matter of fact, this is the first time in my congressional career that I have brought to the attention of my colleagues personal remarks that I have made. But, as all will soon discover, H.M. would influence one to do things a little bit differently and to do them with fullest concern and effort. And, of even far more importance—to do them right.

H.M. Daughtry, Jr., my friend, passed away on Labor Day, September 2, 1985. I was honored deeply when asked by his family to deliver the eulogy in his memory. It was not easy—I tried very hard.

In further honoring H.M. Daughtry now, I do so because he so honored and cherished his country. He was a builder by profession and he was a "builder" of the American way of life.

We have all heard, at one time or another, "they broke the mold" when he was born. Well, let me assure you that certainly was the case with H.M. And, it's sad because we need more men like H.M. Daughtry. As I mentioned in my closing remarks—"I am so proud that H.M. Daughtry gave me the gift of his friendship."

EULOGY TO H.M. DAUGHTRY, JR.

We gather here together at a time of grief and sorrow but in a strange way a time of celebration and rejoicing. Our grief and sorrow are not for H.M. Daughtry. H.M., who worked so hard all of his life, was released from his pain and labors at six o'clock on Labor Day. Our grief and sorrow are for ourselves. For everyone of us in a different way has lost something very special. Our lives are emptier and poorer because H.M. is no longer with us but we are filled with beautiful memories and we are richer and better people because we knew him.

H.M. died like he lived, with strength and courage, and no complaints. He went out in a blaze of glory, showing the real mettle of man he was. He died with so much grit and grace that even longtime cancer ward nurses did something they seldom do. They broke down and cried when H.M. died. One of them summed it up: "He must have been a hell of a man." And he was!

When the end came, it came just as H.M. would have wanted it to come. His wife was holding one hand and his daughter the other. His sons and family were gathered around him, except for one son who was off doing his dad's business, making sure the job moved along. H.M. would have liked that. He would have understood that. And appreciated it. When Dan got back and they

told him the news, he was silent a moment, then he looked up and said, "Well, Dad's up there now and I'll bet he's already complaining about how they built the place." And he probably is. No one except a son who over and over went through the scrutinizing inspections of a builder who demanded nothing less than perfection could have so captured the essence of H.M.

And I suspect that if right now H.M. is up there complaining to God about how they built Heaven, that God, like his sons, sees through those complaints and that grumbling, and sees the life he lived, the homes he built, the family he raised, and I'll bet God is saying "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

So in a way we are here to celebrate that such a good man lived his life so well.

What is the measure of a man anyway? I think you measure a man by what he leaves behind. Some great men leave behind stone monuments. H.M. left behind living monuments: the beautiful homes of quality into which he poured so much pride. Even more than for profit, H.M. built for doing a job and doing it right. Of one new employee he once complained, "You know he's a good worker. If now I could just teach him that we don't cut corners when we build a Daughtry home."

Those of us who are lucky enough to have lived in a home that H.M. built know that we live in the best. It's more than the best home that money can buy because all the money in the world couldn't buy the pride and craftsmanship and experience and honesty and integrity that H.M. poured into every job that he ever did.

Of course, whatever he did, he did it all-out. He always gave it his best shot whether it was bringing the ball down the basketball court as a superb high school and Army basketball player; or later on cheering his kids in their high school games, second-guessing the referee so loudly that everybody in the whole gym knew that H.M. was there; or cheering on his beloved Redskins; or sponsoring his own basketball team; or playing a crazy wild card game that he taught me called "North Carolina Pitch." Whatever it was, H.M. did it all-out with gusto and with enthusiasm.

And yet most of the time H.M. didn't say much. He was sorta the strong silent type. He had a hard time expressing how he felt inside or putting his emotions into words. And yet in a way he didn't need to. By the life that he lived, he stated more eloquently than any words ever could how much he loved his family and how proud he was of them.

I suspect he probably didn't tell Mike or Jenny they played a good game very many times in high school basketball but he was always there. He never missed a game!

Probably didn't tell Keith that he was proud of him very often. Yet there wasn't a visitor who came to this home that H.M. didn't drag to the basement to show them the beautiful bar that Kieth had built.

And I suspect that poor Danny and Mike didn't hear to often from H.M. about the great home that they built for us. But whenever H.M. was there, he was always

showing any new visitor those terribly difficult to build towers and turrets and the impossible ceiling that "his boys had built." And then he'd go into infinite detail about how hard it had been and what a great job his boys had done.

H.M. was one of the best friends I ever had. But how do I know that? He never told me. Not once did he express his friendship for me, but in a way he didn't have to. He expressed that friendship in hundreds of acts of kindness and deeds of friendship over the years. He expressed his friendship when my car ran out of gas, or when it was stuck in a snowbank, when there was something in the house I couldn't fix, or some other emergency where I desperately needed H.M.

I remember once when Carol and I were in Europe, a burglar in the middle of the night had broken the basement window and come up the stairs and was peering in the doorway at our then little daughter Ginny sleeping in her canopy bed. Fortunately the baby sitter startled the burglar and he ran down the front steps and out the door and disappeared into the middle of the night. Who did the baby sitter call right away? H.M.! Who was there immediately? H.M.! And H.M. wouldn't go home that night. He insisted on sleeping on the couch in the den just in case that burglar came back. Then he spent days after that constructing all sorts of poles and sticks and barriers that never caught anybody in the middle of the night except me.

How do I know how much he loved our Ginny, almost like his own daughter? By the lengths he went to make sure no harm befell her in any way.

I asked Carol, "What do you most remember about H.M.?" She instantly replied, "He was *always* there when I needed him." If a friend in need is a friend indeed, then H.M. was a friend indeed. He didn't talk about friendship; he lived it. And his life spoke so eloquently of his love that maybe words weren't really necessary.

There's one thing about our relationship that bothered me just a little bit. H.M. was always doing things for me and it didn't seem as though I was ever doing anything for him in return. That's because he could do so many things that I couldn't do, I always needed him. And because he could do so many things, he never seemed to need me.

Well, H.M., I think maybe I finally caught up with you because there is one thing that I can do a little bit that you never did like to do. And that's make a speech. And so I'm going to say for you, to your friends here, what I think probably you would have said if you could have:

Thank you everybody for coming, and thank you for your friendship. It meant more to me than I ever told you.

I built a lot of things in my life and I've built them with pride and I'm proud of those things that I have built.

But the best monuments I ever built were the lives of my children. I didn't do it perfect. I made a lot of mistakes. But I did it the best that I could. Fortunately, I had the help of a woman who loved them just as

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

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

much as I did. You kids are my living monuments. What you are and how you spend the rest of your lives, how close you come to living up to the high standards I set before you by example rather than words, will determine how fitting my living monuments are going to be.

So, Mike, make sure you lay those foundations straight and don't cut any corners when you build a Daughtry house.

Danny, with your sense of reliability and responsibility, make sure those jobs get done on time and always give the client honest value for his honest dollar.

Keith, make me proud of you, boy. Make me proud of you. I know you will because you know how much I loved you. Don't let me down.

Jenny, you were always the apple of my eye. I never could say "No" to you, about anything, not even when you wanted to go out with older boys. So just stay as sweet and nice and thoughtful and living as you are. Then even when you're an old gray-haired grandmother, you'll still be "Daddy's little girl" to me. And I'll be so grateful for the joy and pride you put into my life.

And Carolyn, you were an awful mess the first time I saw you. You were a scrawny kid in pigtails. You wouldn't wash the dishes for your older sister so I could take her out on a date. But then when you grew up and I saw you again on a blind date, I thought you were the most beautiful woman I had ever seen. And I still do! I never had no truck with any other woman, once I saw you. I knew I had the very best. Thank you, Carolyn, for being my wife!

To all my friends, thanks. Thanks for your friendship that meant so much to me even though I never said so. Thanks for all the good times and we sure had a lot of good times together.

H.M.'s life said all those things so much more eloquently than I was just now able to put it into words for him. So I guess, H.M., you didn't really need me—even now.

And now H.M. will go on his way in a wooden coffin, so appropriate to a man who spent all of his life working with wood. He'll be taking with him his Timex watch to make sure the jobs run on time; and a pocketknife, which was just one of the tools that he used with those huge hands with so much magic artistry to make beautiful things.

And we, who look back at his living monuments, the friends whose lives he touched, the homes that he built, the children that he raised, I know that we can say with God, "Well done, though good and faithful servant! That's why today we celebrate a good man who lived life so well.

As I said a little earlier, H.M. never once expressed to me that I was his friend. Well, we're all kinda guilty of things like that in our lives. I never told him that he was my friend. Not once. It's a little bit late now to tell H.M. Thank God there is still time to tell you, who loved him; you who are here to honor him and to pay tribute to him, to tell you, that like so many of you, I loved that man. I am so proud that H.M. Daughtry gave me the gift of his friendship.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H.R. 3416, THE SMALL BUSINESS SUPERFUND CLEAN-UP TECHNOLOGIES RESEARCH ACT

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 24, 1985

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Monday I introduced legislation that would greatly expand the Nation's ability to research and develop new and innovative technologies for use in permanently cleaning up our Nation's hazardous waste sites.

My bill, H.R. 3416, the Small Business Superfund Clean-up Technologies Research Act, would divert just 1 percent of the Superfund for the research and development of permanent clean-up solutions at many of the country's hazardous waste sites. An office within the EPA's Office of Emergency and Remedial Response would be created to administer this program.

This bill would direct the EPA to harness the abilities of efficient and highly technological small firms within the proven and highly successful Small Business Innovation Research [SBIR] framework.

News reports detail how drinking water is being affected, basements are oozing with sludge, and property is becoming worthless. Unfortunately, affordable permanent solutions haven't yet been found and we, in the Congress, want to spend some \$10 billion more on the Superfund. Are we really going to be better off after another 5 years, Mr. Speaker?

There are many technological and financial barriers to effective cleanups and that is why we need to spend more on basic research. In the past, we have just avoided the problem by packing up the wastes, where we could and moving them elsewhere, and in turn, risking even more dangerous problems. What is needed are funds for researching new and innovative permanent solutions that are cost-effective.

A small percentage of money from the Superfund, used to fund this program is very appropriate because of EPA's failure in the past to spend adequate amounts on research directly related to Superfund cleanup technology. This is due largely to the fact that the EPA has viewed this problem as a short-term, instead of a long-term, problem.

According to the Office of Technology Assessment's recent Superfund Strategy report, EPA spends only 4 percent of its research budget on Superfund R&D while 35 percent of its total funding comes from the Superfund. Only a small percentage of that 4 percent goes toward basic research applicable for Superfund related cleanups.

With such large sums of money being considered, and the current budget constraints we have before us, it is necessary that the money come from the Superfund. Finding better and cheaper ways of cleaning up waste sites is directly related to cleanups.

While this bill is a departure from past uses of the Superfund, the funding of R&D grants devoted toward the research and de-

velopment of new and innovative technologies for hazardous waste cleanups from the Superfund is desperately needed because of the current cost of permanently cleaning up sites. Long-term benefits can be obtained at a low cost, just 1 percent of the Superfund. If we spend just a small percentage now, we can save billions in the future and ensure a clean environment for everyone. We need to look at the long-term costs. I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this vital measure.

TRIBUTE TO CARDENAS AND MENCHACA

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a special recognition that will be bestowed by the Hispanic Achievement Council of Santa Barbara County, CA, on two dedicated citizens of my congressional district.

The community achievements of Elvia Cardenas and Etelvina Menchaca will be recognized and honored on October 4, and I believe their records of service deserve our praise.

Elvia Cardenas has, for 13 years, served as director of Centro Familiar, a nonprofit child care and parent education center in Santa Barbara. This year marks her 20th anniversary of service to the community, dating back to her early work with the Jack and Jill Nursery School in 1965, and the Los Ninos Headstart Program in 1967. Ms. Cardenas has helped to build and expand the Centro Familiar into a comprehensive, uniquely successful agency focusing on the Hispanic community but also serving all local residents. Additionally, she administers children's information and resource centers in both the north and south county, an infant center, a Child Care Food Program, and through the State of California, provides child care for parents being trained through the Job Training Partnership Act.

Ms. Cardenas is a member of the South Coast Coordinating Council, Latinos for Better Government, the Santa Barbara City College and UCSB Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education. She also raises funds for Buena Nueva, a Spanish-language religious television and radio broadcasting program. Remarkably, with all these community responsibilities, she admirably fulfills her role as wife and mother of three.

Etelvina Menchaca's dedicated work in the community of Santa Barbara is a testament of numerous advances on behalf of Hispanics, particularly in migrant and bilingual education. Born and raised in Santa Barbara and the mother of nine children, Ms. Menchaca is an advocate of positive change. She has worked tirelessly to make the local and statewide educational systems responsive to the needs of migrant

workers and their families. As an advocate for social progress, she continues a long family tradition. As a young girl, she assisted her mother in work with various local Mexican-American organizations.

Ms. Menchaca has lobbied successfully on behalf of Hispanic issues in education, employment, immigration and naturalization locally, in Sacramento and Washington. She presently serves as volunteer director of CINAC, a nonprofit immigration, naturalization and legal aid agency; as vice-president of the Migrant Education Advisory Commission for region 18; as vice-president of the Santa Barbara School District's Migrant Education Advisory Board; and as treasurer for La Casa de la Raza—all in a volunteer capacity. She is also on the education committee of Latinos for better government and is active in various programs for migrant students.

Etelvina Menchaca has distinguished herself as a mother and as a dedicated community activist. She is a valued leader in our community.

**KEVIN WHEELER HONORED FOR
OUTSTANDING CAREER AS ED-
UCATOR**

HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Kevin R. Wheeler, a fine educator from my district in California who is retiring after an outstanding career, spanning nearly 35 years as a teacher, school principal, and district administrator.

In his most recent assignment, Mr. Wheeler has served for 17 years as assistant superintendent for personnel services of this Newport-Mesa Unified School District. During this period, nearly half his career in education, Mr. Wheeler devoted many hours beyond the call of duty, giving of his expertise out of a personal desire to serve the youth of our community. As a result of his efforts and commitment to quality education, the lives of thousands of students, faculty, and staff have been enriched.

Even before his current and final assignment, Mr. Wheeler spent many years in direct daily contact with students, teachers, parents, and staff members, first as an elementary teacher in Arcadia, CA, and later as a school principal and administrator in Garden Grove, CA.

Throughout his career, Mr. Wheeler extended himself well beyond the rigors of his daily work, taking on additional responsibilities with professional groups and organizations and serving on numerous advisory boards seeking to improve student success and instructional quality.

Mr. Chairman, as our Nation strives for renewed excellence in our public schools, our continued success will depend upon the strong foundation and vigorous efforts of our outstanding educators. Kevin R. Wheeler has proved himself to be one such educa-

tor and I wish him health and happiness in his retirement years.

**NATIONAL ADULT DAY CARE
CENTER WEEK**

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to applaud the fact that September 22-28 has been identified by both the House and the Senate as "National Adult Day Care Center Week." As an original cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 229, my support for these centers represents part of my longstanding commitment to improving the quality of life for older persons.

To date, there are approximately 1,000 adult day care centers nationwide, and the number is steadily growing as these centers become more generally recognized as an important community service. In my home State of Maine we currently have 14 adult day care programs serving more than 190 people. Many of these elderly individuals would be institutionalized if these programs did not exist.

Adult day care programs typically serve the impaired older person who cannot live entirely independently, but who, nevertheless, is not a candidate for a nursing home. The adult day care client tends to live with relatives or in some other form of group living and attends the day care center on a daily basis. With adult day care, family members can remain employed and still maintain responsibility for the dependent adult. Others receive respite while the dependent relative spends the day engaged in social and therapeutic activities among peers. Trained professionals provide comprehensive care during the day, allowing participants to return home at night and on weekends.

The primary purpose of such centers is to prevent premature institutionalization, to relieve families of the burden of full-time caregiving, to help families remain in the job market, to help individuals remain independent for as long as possible, and to curtail health care costs. These goals are particularly significant for caregiving families of victims suffering from congenitive disorders such as Alzheimer's disease. The course of this devastating brain disorder can last anywhere from 2 to 20 years. Adult day care centers can save institutional costs by allowing families to keep victims at home longer.

Long-term care for the elderly remains fragmented and expensive in this country. Adult day care centers provide a needed alternative to the more expensive care provided by nursing homes and other institutions. Representative dollar comparisons of day care programs and other long-term care costs are revealing. Adult day care costs range from \$20 to \$25 per day. For this comparatively small amount, a participant receives one or two meals, transporta-

tion, nursing care, various therapeutic treatment, if needed, stimulating activities and peer socialization for 6 to 10 hours per day. Further, subsidies to assist low-income families are available in many States such as through the title XX social service block grant. In comparison, nursing home care costs run between \$45 and \$75 per day. Clearly, day care does not provide the 24-hour care that these institutions provide, but it does meet the needs of many families who without day care would have to seek nursing home placement at a much greater cost.

By designating the week beginning September 22, 1985, as "National Adult Day Care Center Week," Congress has performed a valuable public service. As adult day care centers become more available in our communities, and as their services become better known, I am convinced that families will find these programs to be a welcome, affordable alternative to the long-term, and often unnecessary institutionalization of their loved ones.

**FULL EXTENSION OF EVJTA IS
NEEDED**

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the House passed S. 1671, an action I fully support. The interim extensions provided in this bill are necessary to ensure that several important programs which are facing expiration are not terminated. I do want to express, however, my disappointment in the extension provided in this legislation for the Emergency Veterans' Job Training Act [EVJTA].

On May 20, the House unanimously passed H.R. 1408, a bill to extend and improve the program established under EVJTA. This highly successful program has placed over 36,000 long-term unemployed veterans of the Vietnam era and the Korean conflict in stable, permanent jobs. In passing H.R. 1408, the House expressed its desire to provide an extended period of time for veterans to be placed in approved programs of job training and an opportunity for additional veterans to participate in EVJTA. Under S. 1671, however, only the date by which a veteran must enter employment is extended. No provision is made to allow new veterans to be certified for participation under EVJTA.

A recent in-depth report, which evaluated the operation and impact of the Emergency Veterans' Job Training Act Program, had high praise for this program, both in terms of veteran and employer satisfaction with EVJTA. Job service offices from around the country have indicated their strong support for extending EVJTA but make it clear that legislation should include an advancement of the date for new entrants as well as the date by which a certified veteran must enter training. Their reason for requesting new veterans is quite simple—the

remaining number of certified veterans is not adequate to meet employer demands. Additionally, they point out that there are thousands of eligible veterans who continue to seek employment assistance but who cannot be certified because the cut-off for new entrants was February 28, 1985.

The limited extension provided in S. 1671 is a stopgap measure which allows for the continuance of EVJTA while the other body further considers its position on EVJTA. The Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee held hearings on veterans' employment issues recently, with particular emphasis on EVJTA, and it is my hope that the testimony presented at that hearing convinced our colleagues in the other body that Vietnam era and Korean conflict veterans deserve the opportunity for assistance in their efforts to find meaningful and stable employment.

A TRIBUTE TO LEROSA
HAMPTON SMITH

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the U.S. House of Representatives to pay tribute to LeRosa Hampton Smith—an outstanding leader and pioneer of social change in the Volusia County educational system—on the occasion of her retirement. Praised widely by local educators for her many contributions throughout her 36-year association with our schools, Mrs. Smith has, herself, become an educational institution who will be dearly missed.

This Saturday evening in Daytona Beach, I will be one of many members from the community participating in "A Tribute to LeRosa Hampton Smith and her Lifetime of Service and Dedication." I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues some of the achievements for which the retiring assistant superintendent for personnel and administrative services will be honored. And I am particularly pleased to point out that Mrs. Smith and I share the same birthplace—Ocala.

The first-born daughter of Dr. Lee Hampton, a local dentist, and Dr. Effie Carrie Hampton, the first black female licensed physician in Florida, she received a bachelor degree from Florida A&M University [FAMU] and went on to earn a master's degree in personnel administration at New York University. LeRosa Hampton Smith started her career in community service as dean of students and English instructor at her alma mater FAMU.

Mrs. Smith charted a new course in 1949, when she began working in Volusia County as a guidance counselor and English and social studies teacher at Campbell High School. She quickly became active in the black education organization, the Volusia County Teachers Association, as well as civic and church groups, too numerous to mention. Once at the helm of Bonner Ele-

mentary School, she continued as a district administrator and the first black to head an integrated education association.

In 1968, as Volusia Education Association [VEA] president, Mrs. Smith gave support and encouragement to hundreds of educators and united them during the statewide teachers' walkout.

In ironing out the back-to-work agreement, Mrs. Smith demonstrated the grace, efficiency, and leadership that have been the hallmark of her career. She also chaired the VEA committee that developed the agreement leading to the first negotiated contract between an education organization and a school board in Florida. In 1970, as principal of Turie T. Small Elementary School, her diplomacy brought black and white students, parents, and teachers together for the first time.

In her role as Volusia County schools assistant superintendent for personnel and administrative services, Mrs. Smith is credited with streamlining the county employee selection process, the targeted selection of school principals and improved administrative evaluations, among other achievements.

This distinguished career of community service has earned Mrs. Smith a number of nicknames, but none is as appropriate or as telling as the title of "Mrs. Human Relations." In 1981, she was the recipient of the Volusia Educators Association's Human Relations Award, later renamed in her honor. She also received the Florida Teaching Professionals' Human Relations Award, one of only three made in the State that year.

Her encouragement, competence, and leadership will serve as a model to all who would aspire to a career in community service. I join countless others in wishing LeRosa Hampton Smith well in her retirement and in thanking her for having graced both our educational system and our community.

CUBA RESCHEDULES PAYMENTS
ABROAD

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of attention was given to the recent conference hosted by Fidel Castro to urge the debtor nations of the Third World to repudiate their foreign debts. Less attention is paid to Castro's own willingness to have Cuba repay its debts on time and to reschedule part of its foreign debt. The following report appeared in the September 20 edition of the Washington Times article. I urge my colleagues to recognize Fidel Castro for the hypocrite he is and to reject any consideration that Castro may be sincere in seeking improved relations with the West.

CUBA RESCHEDULES PAYMENTS ABROAD

PARIS.—Cuba, which has been urging Third World nations to repudiate their for-

eign debts, agreed on a rescheduling plan for some of the debt it owes to foreign banks, Credit Lyonnais said yesterday.

Credit Lyonnais, the government-owned French bank that is chairman of Cuba's debt coordinating committee, said the accord gives Cuba a six-year grace period on its medium-term debt due in 1985 and then allows repayment over the following four years.

The debt from 110 banks was equivalent to \$90 million in West German marks, Swiss francs, Canadian dollars and Japanese yen, the bank said. Cuba will have about the same amount of debt falling due to bank creditors next year.

Also covered by the accord is about \$375 million of short-term credit lines to the National Bank of Cuba that will be extended to Sept. 30, 1986, from Sept. 30, 1985. Seventy banks were involved in extending the credit lines.

Cuban President Fidel Castro has been devoting much effort to the Third World debt issue in recent months, urging others to repudiate the debts they owe foreign banks and governments.

He has said Latin America's heavy debt obligations prevent the creation of new jobs for the more than 100 million unemployed workers in the region and prevent financially strapped governments from providing health care to the sick.

Latin American leaders have ignored Mr. Castro's call for debt repudiation but have asked for concessions from their lenders such as longer payback periods and lower interest rates.

For example, an agreement to provide Argentina with \$4.2 billion in new loans has gone into effect.

DR. IRWIN J. LUBBERS

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my colleagues' attention to an important editorial which appeared in the Holland Sentinel on September 10, 1985, paying tribute to Dr. Irwin J. Lubbers who passed away on September 8 at the age of 90. These remarks serve to underline Dr. Lubbers' outstanding contribution to Hope College and the field of education. I was privileged to attend Hope College when Dr. Lubbers was president and I have counted him a good friend and teacher through the years.

The editorial is a profile of an outstanding individual and educator. I believe it captures very well Dr. Lubbers' commitment to excellence and his commitment to Hope College and its students. He will be sorely missed by all those privileged to have known him, worked with him, and learned from him.

The editorial follows:

DR. IRWIN J. LUBBERS

More than any other individual, Dr. Irwin J. Lubbers was responsible for establishing the strong town-grown relationship between Hope College and the city of Holland.

In his 18 years of directing Hope College, Lubbers instituted a philosophy of cooperative efforts between the college and the

community. Because of the seeds planted during his tenure from 1945-1963, both parties gain immeasurably.

Lubbers died Sunday at age 90.

Relations started by Hope's seventh president have been enhanced by his successors, Dr. Calvin Vander Werf and Dr. Gordon Van Wylen. Lubbers' predecessor, Dr. Wynand Wichers, wrote in "A Century of Hope" that Lubbers "was always ready to promote good relations and always willing to listen to any individual or group who had an interest in improving these relations. He himself promoted the cause by speaking persuasively to individuals and groups concerning the possibilities of the liberal arts college in the present age, and the need of larger support."

It was during Lubbers' tenure that Hope College began its new look. This ever-changing campus scene included radical departures from its pre-war appearance as Lubbers added buildings and remodeled others. Included in some of the early transition were temporary buildings and permanent structures used for a variety of purposes from classrooms to dormitories.

About the time World War II ended in Europe Hope College trustees approached Lubbers, then president of Central College in Pella, Iowa. He accepted the challenge, ready to fulfill his Ph.D. dissertation on "College Organization and Administration." When the Japanese surrendered later that summer Lubbers knew Hope would receive an influx of veterans.

Combining his talents of organization and leadership, Lubbers responded to immediate needs and established an administrative structure of deans, business manager, health facilities and alumni relations which has burgeoned into the present administrative staff.

Simultaneously, Lubbers realized a growing student body needed a larger teaching body. His personality helped lure competent instructors as he watched enrollment swell from 400 when he arrived to 1,200 in 1947, including 533 veterans. Hope's population dipped a few years later. Lubbers responded positively. He became the college's strongest personal envoy and boosted the college wherever he appeared.

Constantly recruiting and working closely with the Reformed Church in America and alumni, he saw enrollments soar. When he retired, Hope had more than 1,500 students. Perceptive, he realized Hope should encourage a larger student body and never restrict registration. Rather, he countered with necessary buildings.

Lubbers was an opportunist. After Hope was recognized in 1959 by the Chicago Tribune as one of the 10 best liberal arts colleges in the nation, Lubbers questioned, "Are we on a pedestal or on the spot?" Sage in his community, faculty and student associations, Lubbers saw to it contributions and financial grants kept Hope in the forefront. An excellent fundraiser, Lubbers instituted drives to include the Holland community, alumni, church and friends of the college.

One of his final public appearances as Hope's president emeritus occurred during the Holland visit of Queen Beatrix of the Netherlands. Lubbers had escorted her mother, Queen Juliana, 30 years before. Talking of ties between the two nations, Lubbers recalled being a farm boy "who went forth with great expectations to find his own identity." "Now, as an 87-year-old grandfather I look back in retrospect on the odyssey with deep emotion . . . and I now say with great pride and real conviction, *Ik ben een Hollander (I am a Hollander.)*"

"He was without peer in college administration and did a lot to give other church colleges new hope," Wichers wrote. "In 18 years, he had created a college of distinction."

THE SEAMIER SIDE OF THE SOVIETS

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, all of us hope that real progress will be made in the upcoming meeting between President Reagan and Soviet leader Gorbachev.

I believe, however, that the President should keep a few important points in mind.

When President Reagan sits down at the negotiating table with the Soviet leader, he should take great care to avoid getting dust on himself. You will recall that the KGB uses chemical dust to track diplomats.

It is possible that the Soviet Intelligence Service will spray the conference site with this powder so that the President's movements in Geneva could be tracked.

Perhaps the President's Secret Service contingent could liberally spray the meeting place with "Endust" and provide our President with a degree of protection from the probing Soviet sleuths.

I also understand that the Soviet Intelligence Service likes to put bugs in sensitive facilities. Perhaps our negotiating team could carry a good supply of "Raid" or "Black Flag" to put an end to the problem of being bugged.

I would also caution the President to keep his hotel windows in Geneva closed. It seems that the KGB enjoys beaming microwaves at our Embassy in Moscow. They might also try this trick in Geneva.

What disturbs me, however, is the fact that microwave radiation may be injurious to the health of the person who is being targeted.

Finally, the protection of endangered species will surely be discussed at the talks.

I might suggest that the President raise the issue of Soviet Jewry with Mr. Gorbachev. In the eyes of many, those innocent human beings are surely an endangered species in today's Soviet Union.

I wish the President good luck on his forthcoming mission to Geneva.

IN SUPPORT OF THE SAKHAROV FAMILY

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I am adding my voice to those in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 62, expressing unity with Dr. Andrei Sakharov, his wife Dr. Yelena Bonner, and their family.

For years, the Soviet Union has denied the Sakharov family their basic rights—freedom of expression, of travel, and of communication. Rights that are guaranteed by international treaties. Rights that we in the United States take for granted.

They cannot leave the Soviet Union. They cannot communicate with their children. Dr. Bonner needs medical attention available only in the West. And in order to gain his Government's sympathy for his wife's illness, Dr. Sakharov is thought to have begun a hunger strike.

In any other country the thoughts and words of Dr. Sakharov, winner of the 1975 Nobel Peace Prize, would be national treasures. In the Soviet Union, he is forbidden from speaking out. In any other country this brave couple would be honored for their contributions. The Soviets stand by and watch their physical deterioration.

In November, the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union will meet in Geneva for the first time since this courageous couple was placed in internal exile. Their plight presents a unique opportunity for both President Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev.

I urge President Reagan to protest the treatment the Sakharov's have received at the hands of the Soviets. To be effective the protest must not be sent through traditional diplomatic channels, it must be stated face-to-face and in the strongest terms.

And I urge Mr. Gorbachev to put aside his public relations campaign and demonstrate his desire to improve the relationship between our two nations. One way to achieve this would be for the Soviets to restore this couple's basic rights, allowing them to travel, receive needed medical care, and communicate with their family.

A TRIBUTE TO JOE T. DESILVA

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Joe DeSilva, a pioneer in the free trade union movement. On May 19, 1985, Joe died at the age of 81. However, his accomplishments and vision will remain with us for generations to come.

In 1937, grocery clerks worked 72 hours and only made \$15 a week. Joe DeSilva was fired from his job for trying to organize a union. By the following year, Joe had organized local 770 of the United Food & Commercial Workers International Union and got the workweek reduced to 54 hours.

Joe was a man ahead of his time in many ways. In 1947, long before the major battles of the civil rights and women's movements, Joe DeSilva asked for equal pay for women and nondiscrimination of color, race, or creed in employment. These requests, which now seem quite modest, resulted in a 2-week strike. At the end, Joe and the union emerged victorious, with nondiscrimination written into the local's contract and a \$17.50 per week raise for female clerks.

The central theme of Joe's vision was comprehensive care for people. As a result, he became known as "Mr. Fringe Benefit." However, Joe did not consider such benefits as health coverage to be on the fringe of employee compensation. In 1949, after investigating many U.S. health facilities, Joe brought the Kaiser Plan to the Los Angeles area. It was only fitting that Joe spent his last days in one of these Kaiser hospitals.

In 1959, Joe led the second major strike in local 770 history. This time the issues were dental care, unemployment and disability benefits, medical and hospital care for retirees, and psychiatric care. No one in the United States had such a comprehensive benefit package. The clerks won this package, which became a model for many community mental health programs.

Local 770 membership had grown to 24,000 by 1973. Joe DeSilva had dedicated his life to negotiating full benefit coverage for the members. After 35 years as leader of local 770, Joe retired with a legacy of accomplishments to his credit.

After retiring from the union, Joe began a second career in the field of vitamins and nutrition. He was always a proponent of preventive medicine, and he continued to work for the issues that concerned him during his union years.

My wife, Lee, joins me in commemorating the lifetime of dedication and achievements of Joe DeSilva. We hope that through his example, we will all strive to make our communities better places to live and work.

THE INTRODUCTION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS TRADE ACT OF 1985

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today designed to obtain access to foreign markets for exports of U.S. manufactured telecommunications products. This bill is similar in scope with legislation introduced earlier this year in the Senate with bipartisan support and which has received endorsement from key trade associations, labor, and leading telecommunications companies.

The seriousness of the deterioration in our telecommunications trade balance cannot be overstated. From an impressive surplus only a few years ago, deficit for 1984 exceeded \$1 billion. There are predictions that the deficit could double during this year.

This current situation is the result of numerous causes. The U.S. market which represents 45 percent of the world's demand for telecommunications technology is essentially wide open to all manufacturers of telecommunications equipment. The deregulation of our telephone system and the divestiture of AT&T have resulted in a unilateral, uncompensated trade concession

being granted to our major trading partners. Therefore, foreign manufacturers enjoy a protected domestic market while taking advantage of these developments to sell increased amounts of equipment in the United States. However, I believe that the U.S. telecommunications industry remains committed to keeping our markets open and calls for protectionism and quotas to keep out foreign products have been minimal.

The picture for U.S. exports remains discouraging. It is an economic fact of life that virtually all export markets are closed to our products—despite consumer preference, price, quality, and other features. The U.S. telecommunications industry represents state-of-the-art world-class technology. U.S. companies have made significant commitments of resources abroad as well, in an effort to develop foreign markets. However, results to date are reflected in the growing trade deficits. Since January, the United States and Japan have engaged in extensive bilateral discussions to open the Japanese telecommunications market. As a result, regulatory barriers to U.S. exports are beginning to ease. However, sales of U.S. products have not increased. The legislation I am introducing today is focused on the achievement of tangible sales results.

Japan is not the only country that has telecommunications trade barriers. Canada is more protectionist than Japan. The Canadians protect their domestic telecommunications industry with a 17.5-percent import tariff and preferential procurement practices. Most European telecommunications common carriers are excluded from the GATT procurement code which allows them to favor domestic manufacturers for telecommunications equipment purchases.

I know that many of my colleagues share my concern that Congress not take rash actions as short-term solutions which will ultimately do more harm than good to long-term trade policy. This bill offers the President a menu of policy options to be taken only when negotiations fail and leaves to him the tough decisions of selecting a remedy. Based on information on trade practices compiled after lengthy study pursuant to this legislation, the Chief Executive may select an appropriate response weighing other bilateral concerns as well. Although the President must act, and I believe this certainty of action by him to be an important tool, he is left with appropriate flexibility in discharging his responsibilities under the act.

This legislation is directed to the world market. It directs the administration to aggressively negotiate market access for the U.S. telecommunications industry to sell to all major trading partners. As a result, the U.S. telecommunications industry will remain in a position of technological leadership in the world market.

SUMMARY OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS TRADE ACT OF 1985

I. RATIONALE

The purpose of the bill is to promote the expansion of international trade in telecommunications equipment and services.

The United States telecommunications market has changed radically due to deregulation and divestiture of AT&T, and imports have increased dramatically resulting in a first-time trade deficit and a threat to employment. Foreign markets which represent considerable market potential, are essentially closed to U.S. manufacturers of competitive technologically superior products. The objective of the legislation is to grant the Administration negotiating authority designed to obtain market access and a more open trading environment abroad in a timely fashion by using the U.S. market as leverage and to enforce existing trade agreements. The economic and technological growth of the United States telecommunications industry is at risk.

II. NEGOTIATING AUTHORITY AND PROCEDURES

The President would be granted authority for three years to enter into bi-lateral or multi-lateral trade agreements for open trade in telecommunications. As positive inducements for negotiations, the President may reduce, eliminate or otherwise modify, any barriers to the U.S. domestic market. Any such agreement would be reviewed by Congress. After two years, however, the President must correct any trade imbalance which exists with countries which have not signed agreements by employing remedies available under existing law (e.g. the Trade Act of 1974), such as duty increases, restrictions on registration or certification of equipment by the FCC, government procurement practices, or other measures.

After a thorough investigation, the United States Trade Representative is authorized to retaliate immediately against any country which fails to live up to commitments undertaken, by raising duties or restricting the entrance of telecommunications products into the U.S. The USTR's investigation would focus on key markets and analyze on a country-by-country basis barriers to U.S. exports of telecommunication equipment and provision of value-added network services (e.g. computer links).

SANDINISTA NOW SPELLS CORRUPTION

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the Sandinistas came to power in Nicaragua destroying the Somoza government and the corruption it represented. Now, reports indicate the Sandinistas are themselves just as guilty of corruption as their notorious predecessor. I urge my colleagues to read the following report by Jack Anderson and Dale Van Atta chronicling the abuses of the Sandinistas in power.

SANDINISTA NOW SPELLS CORRUPTION

(By Jack Anderson and Dale Van Atta)

Are the revolutionary rulers of Nicaragua trying to surpass the late, corrupt Anastasio Somoza's record as the hemisphere's greediest dictatorship? The word we get from Managua is that the Marxist Sandinistas are making a good run for Somoza's title.

In fact, the Sandinista leaders and their cronies are so blatant about their pursuit of luxury and wealth that the long-suffering Nicaraguan people know all about it, and

some of them cynically refer to the revolution as *el engano*, meaning the trick or hoax.

From U.S. intelligence and other sources, we've pieced together this story of a people's revolution betrayed by the Marxist millionaires who stole control:

The three commandantes who dominate the Sandinista junta, Daniel Ortega, Humberto Ortega and Tomas Borge, have divided up the country's import market through two monopoly companies. What the Ortega brothers don't control, Borge does.

Daniel Ortega is the president of Nicaragua; Humberto is minister of defense and head of the army. Their key company is Alfa Comercial, which handles goods imported for the government. It is like the U.S. General Services Administration, except that the Ortegases are allowed to skim a percentage off the top of each transaction.

Rivaling their official pillage is the empire being built by Borge, the only surviving founder of the Sandinista movement. He is in charge of the police and internal security.

Borge walks with a pronounced limp, a souvenir of torture in the same Somoza prisons where his enemies are now mistreated. Borge was liberated in 1978 during the dramatic takeover of government buildings in Managua by Eden Pastora, now an embittered foe of his old Sandinista comrades.

Borge's import company, H M Corp., imports whatever goods the Ortegases don't.

Like the Ortegases, Borge has his own elegant private restaurants, off-limits to everyone but the Sandinista leaders and their guests. The government pays the tab. Borge also owns the Mau Mau, a discotheque in Managua that is the favorite of U.S. Embassy Marine guards.

Borge and the Ortegases flaunt their nouveau riches. Each owns more than half a dozen houses in the capital, according to competent sources. The Ortega family has nine beach houses in the San Juan del Sur resort.

Mansions that once were Somoza's also are available for the Sandinista leader's use. They are known as "protocol houses" in a transparent attempt to make them look official.

This is the tragedy of the Nicaraguan revolution. A popular uprising after years of repression and exploitation has been totally corrupted. The people still live in poverty.

FOOTNOTE: A spokeswoman for the Nicaraguan Embassy denied "absolutely" that Borge and the Ortega brothers owned any houses other than the ones they live in. She also maintained that only one company imports goods used by the government and it is state-owned. All of the restaurants in question, she added, are owned by the state.

ANATOLY SHCHARANSKY AND THE SUMMIT

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare for the upcoming summit meeting between President Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, some people tend to forget the basic values and principles which set American democracy and Soviet communism so far apart. Perhaps the suffering of one Soviet citizen, Anatoly

Shcharansky, offers a grim reminder of these immutable differences.

Even as we in the West prepare for the November summit, the Soviet Government continues to deliberately and tortuously crush the life out of this hapless individual—in open defiance of the West. This disdain for the life, liberty and basic human rights of Anatoly Shcharansky should not be lost on us, particularly not at a time when some here in the United States would have us believe that the Politburo is now made up of reasonable people, not much different than ourselves.

For this reason I would like to insert in the RECORD a statement made by Avital Shcharansky in the New York Times. This sad plea by the wife of a man the Soviets have in essence condemned to a slow and tortured death is well worth reading as we prepare for the summit.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 24, 1985]

SPEAK UP FOR SOVIET JEWS

(By Avital Shcharansky)

Some 400,000 Jews, among them my husband Anatoly, are being held hostage in the Soviet Union. Will any of these thousands ever taste the bright air of freedom in their ancient homeland, Israel? The American public and its officials might usefully put this excruciating question to the Soviet Foreign Minister, Eduard A. Shevardnadze, during his visit this month to the United States—for its answer lies entirely in the hands of his barbaric Government.

Tyrannies of all sorts have been known on earth, but until our day it has been virtually unheard of for any regime, no matter how despotic, to deny that most elementary of all political alternatives, the right to leave. Even Nazi Germany in the years before World War II grudgingly allowed free emigration—to say nothing of Russia under the Czars or South Africa under apartheid. In places where whole classes of citizens have been denied the right to vote or the right to a free press or to freedom of religion, they have been given the right to emigrate. Not, however, in the Soviet Union.

Yet Moscow did in fact put its signature 10 years ago to the Final Act of the Helsinki conference. It thus conceded, among other things, that "everyone has a right to leave any country, including his own, and return to it." It is in accordance with this provision and with internal Soviet regulations that 400,000 Jews have asked to emigrate by requesting invitations from Israel. Yet last year only 896 were permitted to leave (and only 702 through August 1985), while leaders of Soviet Jewry languish in prisons and work camps.

To the charge of barbarism, then, we may add the charge of violation of an international agreement. In flouting this covenant, the Kremlin mocks the values on which civilization itself must rest. Does this not cast the darkest doubts on Moscow's present diplomatic efforts to impart an image of sweet reasonableness and moderation? Should this not put into question the Soviet Union's right to be admitted into the comity of nations?

Anatoly Shcharansky was refused a visa in 1973, but like many others he placed his hopes in the Helsinki covenant. In the mid-1970's, he served as a prominent member of a group that took it upon itself to monitor Soviet compliance. It was on account of these wholly legal activities—and not for the spurious crime of spying with

which he was charged—that he was arrested and imprisoned more than eight years ago.

His fate since then is a macabre commentary on the brave words of the Helsinki accords. In 1977, he was sentenced to three years in prison and 10 years of hard labor. After transfer to a work camp, he was placed in solitary confinement for 90 days as punishment for lighting Hanukkah candles and reciting the Hebrew Psalms. While there, he was kept alive on a diet of bread and water, the bread on alternative days only. In November 1984, he was again isolated in the camp's internal prison.

My husband's health has deteriorated dangerously. He suffers from severe pains in his chest and eyes. Months pass when he is not heard from, when no one is allowed to visit him. For him, as for Iosif Begun, Dan Shapiro, Yuli Edelshtein, Alexander Kollmiarsky and countless other Soviet Jews, this has been the meaning of the Helsinki accords.

These are days of high hopefulness in the West. Talks between the superpowers are proceeding apace, a summit meeting is in the offing and the democracies, yearning for peace, bend with eager pliancy in the direction of Mikhail S. Gorbachev's smile. The Soviet leader, eager to derail the Strategic Defense Initiative and acquire Western high technology, is desperately seeking accommodation and normalization. Can it be too much, in this season of expectation, to suggest that one unequivocal demand be made of those who have so systematically trampled on the rights and the lives of countless human beings begging for nothing but release? Is it too much to ask that before we seek or trust its signature on future treaties, the Soviet Government be required to honor the Helsinki accords—the most easily implementable of agreements?

Ultimately, the question is for Mr. Shevardnadze's Government to answer. But it is up to the West, particularly the United States, to ask. My husband and the Jews of the Soviet Union wait upon the word.

OTA BMD REPORT HIGHLIGHTS IMPORTANT ARMS CONTROL IMPLICATIONS OF SDI

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, OTA released yesterday a report on "Ballistic Missile Defense Technologies" that reinforces many of the points made in the House Foreign Affairs Committee's "Interim Report on the Administration's Space Arms Control and Defense Policy" released in May 1984. Namely, the OTA report reinforces the point that U.S. pursuit of a vigorous BMD research program could stimulate an offensive and defensive arms race between the superpowers.

The OTA report further shows that the success of the President's strategic defense initiative [SDI] depends on Soviet cooperation. At the present stage of United States-Soviet arms control negotiations in Geneva, the Soviets have made clear their unequivocal opposition to the SDI. However, it appears that some Soviet softening on their opposition to SDI research may be immi-

ment. At any rate, the OTA report points out that prospects for a cooperative transition look dim.

No one, the OTA report explains, has offered a viable plan that would reduce offensive missiles, make the transition to defense dominance cooperative, while at the same time preventing the United States and the Soviet Union from developing BMD systems before such a transition plan can be negotiated. Advanced development of these systems before a transition can be negotiated would increase instabilities and defeat the purpose of the SDI.

It is clear from the OTA report that there are many unanswered questions surrounding the SDI Program ranging from defining just what the SDI is, to technical feasibility questions, to questions regarding its impact on arms control.

Moreover, it is evident from the report that without arms control reductions a successful SDI is impossible. In other words, if the United States vigorously pursues SDI research, and the Soviets do the same, and both superpowers continue to upgrade their offensive arsenals to better penetrate each other's upgraded defensive systems, we will have worsened the strategic balance between the superpowers.

The OTA report also clarifies an important bone of contention among opponents and proponents of the SDI concerning United States and Soviet BMD capability. The report states that:

In terms of technological capabilities, the United States clearly remains ahead of the Soviet Union in key areas required for advanced BMD systems. . . . The Soviet Union does not surpass the United States in any of the 20 basic technologies that have the greatest potential for significantly improving military capabilities in the next 10 to 20 years which were surveyed by the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering

Along these lines, the OTA report comments on an assertion made in the White House pamphlet on "The President's Strategic Defense Initiative" released last January. The administration pamphlet states that in the next 10 years, the Soviets will be able to deploy a nationwide ABM defense system and that if they do, "deterrence would collapse," and we would have no choices between "surrender and suicide." OTC counters this by saying that "Although any defense deployable by the Soviets in the next 10 years would certainly complicate United States targeting, the available offensive countermeasures technologies make it extremely unlikely that we could be forced to choose between surrender and suicide." In other words, our offensive countermeasures would more than likely be adequate for penetrating Soviet defense.

While most everyone would agree that some level of ballistic missile defense research is advisable and necessary, we must be careful to conduct this research within the bounds of the ABM Treaty. If we are not careful, OTA warns, and we "allow the ABM Treaty regime to erode, and then find out at the end of our BMD research program that the new BMD technologies did

not fulfill expectations, we could end up with the worst of both worlds: no arms control to limit BMD, Soviet BMD deployment, no effective United States BMD, and, quite possibly, asymmetrical Soviet offensive forces intended to overcome an anticipated United States BMD.

If our goal is to maintain the ABM Treaty, OTA explains that we must conduct our research program in such a way that we do "not either prematurely compromise the ABM Treaty by encouraging Soviet exploitation of technical ambiguities, or stimulate the Soviets to begin deploying BMD and enhanced offensive forces at a time more advantageous to them than to us." This may mean that some of the planned SDI demonstration projects, some of which will definitely raise ABM Treaty compliance questions, should be delayed in the interests of preserving the ABM Treaty regime. These and other issues will most assuredly be addressed by the Congress in the months ahead.

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO
COMMISSIONER JULES D. BARNETT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor one of Long Beach's most distinguished and prolific citizens. Retired Superior Court Commissioner Jules D. Barnett soon will be vacating his position as professor of law at California State University at Long Beach.

Jules' dedication to community betterment has been made evident during his many diverse careers. Not one to shy away from the front line of municipal service, he has been a patrolman in New York City. He was also an assistant U.S. attorney in Los Angeles before becoming a superior court commissioner in Los Angeles County. It is fitting that I point out, on the eve of this final retirement, the selfless concern for the welfare of the public which has so illuminated his life. The knowledge and guidance he has bestowed on his many students during his tenure as professor of law will most certainly be missed by future students after his departure.

Jules' educational achievement rivals his public service in its comprehensiveness. He received his B.A. from New York University in 1936, his LL.B. from New York University Law School in 1938, and his LL.M. from the University of Southern California in 1963. He has numerous legal articles to his credit.

A life such as this indicates that he will continue to make a significant contribution to society during his retirement years, and southern California will continue to benefit from the endeavors of one of its exemplary citizens, Jules D. Barnett. My wife, Lee, joins me in wishing Jules, his wife Claire and their sons Bob, Jeff, Fred, and Dan all the best in the years to come.

NATIONAL ADOPTION INFORMATION
CLEARINGHOUSE ACT

HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce the National Adoption Information Clearinghouse Act, which amends title X of the Public Health Service Act, the Family Planning Program.

For far too long, family planning has meant only preventing pregnancy, limiting family size, and spacing pregnancies. We must change our focus to emphasize positive family planning—that is the formation of families through adoption for those who would otherwise not be able to establish families.

Across this great Nation, interest in adoption is running high. This concern encompasses both infant adoption and special needs adoption, which involves children who are older, handicapped, members of a minority, or in sibling groups. I am greatly encouraged by this intense interest. There are few things we can do more important than finding permanent homes for needy children.

The National Adoption Information Clearinghouse Act amends section 1001 of the Public Health Service Act to authorize family planning projects to offer adoption services. This amendment would not require that these services be offered, it simply states that adoption services may be offered by recipients of family planning funds. By doing so we would acknowledge that adoption services, along with natural family planning methods, and infertility services are an important aspect of family planning.

In addition, this legislation directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a national adoption information clearinghouse. The clearinghouse will collect data and information on both infant and special needs adoption, and maintain up-to-date directories of information concerning emergency pregnancy services, shelters, and residences for pregnant women, educational programs on adoption, licensed adoption agencies, State laws relating to adoption, statistics on adoption, and any other services relating to adoption for pregnant women, infertile couples, adoptive parents, unmarried individuals who want to adopt children, individuals who have been adopted, birth parents who have placed a child for adoption, adoption agencies, social workers, counselors, or other individuals who work in the adoption field. Most important, the clearinghouse will provide the American people with current and complete information relating to all aspects of adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware that adoption and foster care have generally been under the jurisdiction of the States. I would be the last Member here to suggest that we should impose the Federal Government's jurisdiction over an issue that prop-

erly lies with the States. It is essential that we have reliable national data. Only then can we properly assist in bridging the gap between children in need of a permanent loving home and individuals wishing to establish a family.

We have established clearinghouses through the Department of Health and Human Services to provide information on arthritis, cancer, drug abuse, and smoking and health—just to mention a few. Surely, finding homes for children deserves no less attention.

President Reagan has repeatedly advocated increased support for adoption—both in public speeches and private meetings. In his Father's Day address last year he said:

We want to see fewer abandoned, handicapped or underprivileged children left in foster care; and we want to see the unborn child given his or her chance to love and to know the joys of life. Adoption is often the best option. Too often, it has been the forgotten option.

Adoption has been called "the loving option." I urge my colleagues to support this effort to ensure that adoption is not the forgotten option.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the National Adoption Information Clearinghouse Act of 1985 be printed in the RECORD.

H.R. 3426

A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish the National Adoption Information Clearinghouse.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Adoption Information Clearinghouse Act of 1985".

SEC. 2. (a) Title X of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"NATIONAL ADOPTION INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE

"SEC. 1010. The Secretary shall establish, either directly or by grant or contract, a National Adoption Information Clearinghouse. The Clearinghouse shall—

"(1) collect and synthesize data and information obtained from studies, research, and reports by public and private agencies, institutions, or individuals concerning all aspects of infant adoption and adoption of children with special needs;

"(2) compile, maintain, and periodically revise directories of information concerning—

"(A) emergency pregnancy services;

"(B) shelters and residences for pregnant women;

"(C) training programs for counselors who work with pregnant women;

"(D) educational programs on adoption;

"(E) licensed adoption agencies;

"(F) State laws relating to adoption;

"(G) statistics on adoption; and

"(H) any other services relating to adoption for pregnant women, infertile couples, adoptive parents, unmarried individuals who want to adopt children, individuals who have been adopted, birth parents who have placed a child for adoption, adoption agencies, social workers, counselors, or other individuals who work in the adoption field; and

"(3) disseminate the most current and complete information regarding adoption,

including the directories compiled, maintained, and revised pursuant to paragraph (2)."

(b) Section 1001(a) of such Act is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "Such projects may also offer adoption services."

FIGHTING FOR FREEDOM IN
AFGHANISTAN

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, unlike so many courageous but ill-fated Eastern European and Baltic peoples, the Afghans have never before felt the crush of Red Army occupation. For 6 years now, they have resisted fiercely. Their pride and their religion are two firm guarantees that they wish to continue to do so. But even a holy war cannot be fought without weapons.

The news reports and interview materials which reach us suggest that American aid to the freedom fighters arrives in markedly inadequate amounts. The Mujahadeen do not ask us to fight their war for them. Like Winston Churchill in the first stages of the Second World War, they say to a distant and reluctant American Government only this: "Give us the tools, and we'll finish the job." They need ammunition especially, as well as weapons, clothing, and medicine in order to continue the battle against the strongest army on the face of the Earth.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the following report from Peshawar by Christina Dameyer. It indicates why the war in Afghanistan can still be won by the Afghans, who have survived so many other would-be conquerors before.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 6, 1985]

IN AFGHANISTAN, SOVIETS FIND REPLACING
ISLAM WITH COMMUNISM ISN'T EASY

(By Christina Dameyer)

Peshawar, Pakistan.—The devout Afghan belief in Islam is proving a major obstacle to the Sovietization of Afghanistan.

Ninety-nine percent of Afghanistan's population is Muslim, and the Afghans practice their religion diligently. The element of atheism in communist doctrine has thus provoked instinctive hostility, and resisting Afghans rallied around the banner of Islam—the only belief system that unites Afghanistan's diverse ethnic and linguistic groups.

Even before the Soviet invasion in 1979, the Afghan government had tried to promote an acceptance of communist ideology among the Afghans, according to Afghan refugees in Pakistan. The regime of Nur Muhammad Taraki tried direct methods to spread its Marxist message through the mosques. However, the mullahs (religious leaders) usually refused to read the communist propaganda at prayers, and when they did, the congregation would walk out.

When the Soviets invaded, they switched to less direct tactics. Prof. Rasul Amin, former dean of social sciences at Kabul University, says that although they officially support Islam, the Soviets are in reality pursuing a policy of "de-Islamization".

Government-run Kabul Radio broadcasts proclaim that Islam and socialism are in reality the same thing, and that Afghans are free to practice their religion.

But government actions suggest otherwise. For instance, religious content in schoolbooks—traditionally a major element of education in any Islamic country—has been greatly reduced, and anything Islamic is regarded as antigovernment.

Afghans have become fearful of praying in mosques because of surveillance by undercover government agents, Afghan refugees say. Increasing numbers now pray only in their homes.

Under the guise of supporting Islam, the Soviets are also infiltrating the ulema (college of Islamic religious scholars and clergy) to win control of it. Afghan refugees say. The Soviets seem to be aware of how much influence the mullahs and religious scholars have on the average Afghan. They have reportedly imprisoned or forced out anticommunist religious leaders and replaced them with a supreme council of ulema considered to have close ties to the Afghan secret police.

To ease suspicions that communism will destroy the Islamic system, groups are invited to visit the Muslim Soviet Central Asian republics and, occasionally, Moscow. About four times a year delegations of 50 to 100 religious figures, accompanied by members of the Afghan secret police, take these tours. They are conducted by undercover agents of the Soviet secret police, Professor Amin says.

The visitors are taken to both functioning mosques and ones under renovation. Abdul Majid Mangal, the former deputy to the Afghan ambassador to the Soviet Union, saw what he called "frameup prayer meetings" at a Moscow mosque. Some 150 Uzbeks and Tajiks had been imported from Central Asia, he said, to pray alongside the Afghans in the otherwise seldom used mosque.

"The Soviets select the oldest and poorest mullahs from rural areas to go, to impress them with the Soviet standard of living," says a Peshawar University professor who studies the Afghan situation. "They don't understand that all of it is being arranged for them."

In addition to ulema groups, many other Afghan delegations are invited to the Soviet Union every year to witness firsthand the virtues of the Soviet system.

Peasants visit Soviet collective farms, laborers visit model factories, judges and lawyers meet their Soviet counterparts, Afghan Communist Party and youth league members meet their parent organizations, and sports teams play matches. One hundred tribal elders are sent each year; according to Abdul Tawab Hikmat, a recent defector from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Also, a few hundred of the most industrious workers are rewarded each year with vacations to Soviet bloc countries.

But apparently not all the Afghan visitors are taken in by these actions. A former Afghan government official who met, many of the returnees said, "The ones interviewed in the Kabul airport after a trip proclaim for TV that yes, Soviet Muslims are allowed to pray. However, others secretly admitted to me that they had concluded that the Soviet government is against Islam."

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF
IRWIN CLOTHING CO.

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of Irwin Clothing Co. in Sacramento to acknowledge an exemplary business that has demonstrated the true meaning of American entrepreneurship.

Sometimes, in the search for a healthy profit, it is easy for a business to lose sight of some of the virtues of business enterprise that have made this country the greatest free Nation on Earth. Irwin Clothing Co. has become an integral part of the Sacramento community providing a sense of stability and business security. Mr. Irwin Weintraub, the owner of Irwin Clothing Co., has always strived to provide a warm personal service, an exceptional quality to survive the competitive pressure of large, impersonal chain stores.

Most of all, it is the importance that Irwin's has given to good, honest business practice that I would like to commend today. Such an example to the community is in true American tradition. It has shown over the past 25 years that it is possible to retain high standards and values in business without losing profit.

Such business integrity is part of the moral substance of capitalism, and deserves special recognition. I extend my personal congratulations on behalf of the community of Sacramento to which Irwin's has made such an outstanding contribution, and offer my best wishes for many more years of successful trading.

NEGOTIATING WITH THE PLO IS
WRONG

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to my colleagues' attention an op-ed piece by Jeane J. Kirkpatrick entitled "The 'New' Mideast Peace Process," that appeared in the September 23 Washington Post.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 months the administration has been signaling its interest and willingness to meet with individuals who are closely involved in, if not members of, the Palestine Liberation Organization. Doing so would violate both the spirit and letter of U.S. law. I authored a successful amendment prohibiting negotiations with members of the PLO until they recognize Israel's right to exist, accept U.N. Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, and renounce the use of terrorism. The U.N. resolutions state that Israel would give up certain land in exchange for peace with its neighbors, to be worked out through direct negotiations of the parties. But, as Kirkpatrick

writes, present administration efforts have taken a different path:

The catch is that a very different "peace process" is now being proposed. Instead of negotiations between Israel and Jordan, there are to be negotiations between the United States and a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation that would include the PLO, followed by negotiations at an international conference at which Israel and the Soviet Union would be present . . .

For the U.S. government to follow the course now urged upon us would require that we break our promise to Israel not to deal with the PLO unless it has accepted Resolutions 242 and 338 and renounced terrorism (it has done neither), and to do so without any commitment that even then Jordan would enter direct negotiations with Israel. Accepting the proposal would also require giving the Soviet Union a new role and new influence in a vital area.

Kirkpatrick also writes that the reason Israel's neighbors have refused to negotiate under Resolutions 242 and 338 is that:

The prospect of tangible gains has not been as compelling as the intangible satisfaction of denying Israel's existence.

Ms. Kirkpatrick's article succinctly states the problems and pitfalls of present administration policy with respect to Mideast peace. I hope my colleagues will read it. The text follows:

THE "NEW" MIDEAST PEACE PROCESS

(By Jeane J. Kirkpatrick)

The opening of the United Nations General Assembly provides an opportunity for U.S. government officials to hear another round of complex and subtle arguments about the dispute between Israel and her neighbors and to observe the "new" Arafat and the "new" PLO.

Americans like negotiations. We believe parties to a dispute ought to sit down together, hear each other out, make mutual concessions, compromise their differences. It is the American way. It works well for us in domestic affairs. We don't see why it shouldn't work for everyone, everywhere. So our government keeps trying to get disputants to the world's conflicts to a table even when they would rather fight than switch. Nowhere does our government try harder than in the Middle East where the U.S. Department of State has once again been engaged in complicated negotiations about negotiations between Israel and her neighbors.

The U.S. goal is to get the "peace process" launched at Camp David, going again. That "process" is based on Resolutions 242 and 338 passed by the United Nations Security Council in the wake of the 1967 and 1973 wars against Israel. Those resolutions embody our favorite recipe: negotiation and compromise. Israel is to give up territory won from neighbors who made war against her in 1967 and 1973. The neighbors are to give up war. There are to be secure boundaries for all. It is to be worked out through direct negotiations of the parties.

For more than a decade this "land for peace" formula has been the basis of a largely unsuccessful U.S. diplomacy. Why has so patently reasonable a solution been so hard to work out? Complicated explanations are offered, but the answer is discouragingly simple. The reason no start has been made in implementing Resolutions 242 and 338 is that Israel's neighbors—Jordan, Syria and Lebanon—have refused to negotiate with Israel even though they know they

could regain lost territories by doing so. The prospect of tangible gains has not been as compelling as the intangible satisfaction of denying Israel's existence.

In the United Nations, some Arab countries will not even pronounce Israel's name, calling her instead the "Zionist entity." Obviously a country that does not exist cannot be a negotiating partner. Not negotiating with Israel became the litmus test of Arab solidarity. Men have been murdered just for suggesting it. When Egyptian President Anwar Sadat broke ranks and negotiated peace with Israel's Prime Minister Menachem Begin (under the helpful eye of President Jimmy Carter), for Egypt the reward was return of the Sinai, for Israel the reward was peace, for Anwar Sadat the reward was death at the hands of Moslem fanatics.

So far Israel's other neighbors have refused negotiations for peace, either because they fear their own extremists or because they have been unwilling to accept Israel's existence. The most implacable enemy of Israel, peace and negotiations has been the Palestine Liberation Organization, which steadfastly denies that Israel has any legitimate borders.

The PLO National Charter makes their position clear. It defines all of Israel as part of Palestine. It describes "armed struggle" as "the only way to liberate Palestine," and asserts that participation in the armed struggle is the first priority for Palestinians. It describes Israel as Zionist, racist, illegitimate, and its founding as null and void. It asserts that the Palestinian people "reject all solutions which are substitutes for the total liberation of Palestine and rejects all proposals aiming at liquidation of the Palestinian problem." "Camp David" was such a proposal. The PLO fought it with vehemence and violence.

In diplomatic circles it is said that the PLO leadership no longer holds these views, but it has not renounced the covenant. However, the organization has undergone various other changes. Hammered first by Israel, then by Syria, its territorial base was smashed, its forces scattered, its leadership divided.

The result, we are told, is a new, more "moderate" Arafat. Certainly he's keeping more moderate company. The governments of Jordan and Egypt are working to bring the "new" PLO into the "peace process."

The catch is that a very different "peace process" is now being proposed. Instead of negotiations between Israel and Jordan, there are to be negotiations between the United States and a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation that would include the PLO, followed by negotiations at an international conference at which Israel and the Soviet Union would be present.

Jordan's King Hussein and Egypt's President Mubarak—both good friends of good faith—urge the U.S. Department of State to take a chance on the new initiative. The PLO, they urge, should be put to the test. Deal with it, and it will consider dealing with Israel . . . in the company of its Soviet friends and patrons.

For the U.S. government to follow the course now urged upon us would require that we break our promise to Israel not to deal with the PLO unless it has accepted Resolutions 242 and 338 and renounced terrorism (it has done neither), and to do so without any commitment that even then Jordan would enter direct negotiations with Israel. Accepting the proposal would also re-

quire giving the Soviet Union a new role and new influence in a vital area.

So far, the only visible effects of these proposals have been to refurbish Arafat's reputation as a major actor, to create anxiety in Israel, and to speed the reintegration of Egypt into the Arab world—Morocco invited Egypt to a conference; Jordan restored diplomatic relations.

At the brand-new session of the U.N. General Assembly one hopes that U.S. officials will remember that negotiations should be the means and not the ends of the process, and remember, too, that while we hope for peace, we are not parties to the conflict.

RECIPIENTS HONOR THEIR MERRILL BENEFACTOR

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, as life and education have changed at Notre Dame University over the last 58 years, one thing has stayed the same. Each year, four students from Merrill, WI, have attended Notre Dame as a result of the generosity of a Merrill pioneer, the late Leonard N. Anson.

With a gift of \$100,000 in 1927 Mr. Anson established a trust which awards an all-expenses-paid scholarship to Notre Dame each year to a student from Merrill High School. These unique scholarships, worth an annual \$11,000 each in today's dollars, cover tuition, room and board, books and fees, and other living expenses.

The Leonard Anson Memorial Scholarship has given 58 students from Merrill an opportunity, which many of them might otherwise never have had, to reach their full potential by financing study at one of the best universities in the world.

Recently, former scholarship winners paid tribute to the Anson family. They presented a plaque to Leonard Anson Donoghue, grandson of Leonard Anson.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article and an editorial from the Wausau-Merrill, Wisconsin Daily Herald and commend them to my colleagues.

RECIPIENTS HONOR THEIR MERRILL BENEFACTOR (By Jim Elliott)

MERRILL.—It's been 57 years since the Leonard N. Anson Memorial Scholarship was established.

And every year since 1928 a Merrill high school graduate has been selected to attend the University of Notre Dame, with all four-year expenses paid by the scholarship trust.

Monday, three of the scholarship recipients met in Merrill for a testimonial thank you to descendants of Anson, a Merrill lumber baron, businessman and one-time mayor.

"The purpose of this event is to take time out of our busy schedules to reflect on the generosity of the Anson family," said Dr. George M. Krembs, West Hurley, N.Y., the 1952 winner.

Krembs, who has traveled the world as an engineer for IBM, said he's never heard of a better scholarship anywhere.

"This is truly an outstanding, if not the most outstanding, scholarship that I'm aware of," he said.

Frank Plano, retired, Daily Herald publisher and the 1957 winner, said the generous nature of the scholarship tells a lot about the type of people the Ansons were.

"It was given to persons unknown. Most were not even born at the time the gift was made," Plano said. The Ansons were known as the "backbone" of the community and helped finance construction of Holy Cross Hospital in Merrill, he said.

Robert Savaske, a 1946 scholarship recipient who is now president of M&I Citizens American Bank in Merrill, said the scholarship trust was established with \$100,000.

"That was a lot of money then, and it's a lot of money now," he said. If the investment had been allowed to continue with no withdrawals, it would now be worth more than \$2.75 million, he said.

The scholarship covered all expenses, from room and tuition right down to laundry. In 1928 it cost about \$1,250 to send a student to Notre Dame, but now it costs \$11,000. And there are four Merrill students there every year.

"It would take a minimum of \$744,000 to establish such a trust today," Savaske said. "We all have a lot to be thankful for."

Leonard Anson Donoghue, grandson of Leonard Anson, said he wished his ancestors were alive to see the results of their gift.

"By giving the gift of education to the young men of Merrill, they were able to give fulfillment of my grandfather's dream. It was always the wish of my family to give back partial payment for all Merrill has meant to them."

The scholarship continues in perpetuity, thanks to a contract with the university, which selects the winner from a list of eligible candidates from Merrill High School.

GIFT IS HIS LEGACY

There are two kinds of endeavors: those we do for ourselves, and those we do for others.

In the end, we will be judged for the latter.

And in that analysis, Leonard N. Anson won't be found wanting.

Anson, of lumber fame, established a scholarship in perpetuity with a \$100,000 gift to Notre Dame University in 1928. Every year since, a Merrill High School graduate has received what some students call a "free ride."

The Anson scholarship is the most prestigious gift given to any graduate in the Merrill district, which probably has among the largest per-student payout for scholarship of any school in the nation each awards day.

Generosity befits Merrill, and Anson leads the way.

The Leonard N. Anson Memorial Scholarship pays for books and tuition, worth about \$11,000 a year. In any given year there are four Merrill High School grads at Notre Dame, each benefitting from the generosity of Anson.

Merrill people also should be grateful to Anson, even those whose sons and daughters have not received the scholarship. The mere existence of such a generous award in a district challenges students to do their academic best.

Why did Anson give the \$100,000 gift, the one that would be worth about \$2.75 million if it had been left to earn interest over the past 57 years?

Leonard Anson Donoghue, grandson of Leonard Anson, put it this way: "By giving the gift of education to the young men of Merrill, they were able to give fulfillment to

my grandfather's dream. It was always the wish of my family to give back partial payment for all Merrill has meant to them."

Granted, Leonard Anson has been handsomely rewarded in the lumbering business. One does not have \$100,000 to give in 1927 unless he has accumulated a substantial amount of money. That's a lot of money now and was even more then.

But Anson could have taken his money and run. He didn't. His legacy is a future of quality higher education for some select Merrill graduates.

In so doing, he guaranteed a steady supply of leaders in business, education, medicine, law, and industry, all of whom will share two things—the values inherent in having been raised in a small, caring community and a degree from one of the nation's top colleges.

That bodes well for the future and speaks well for Merrill.

An aside: The Anson Scholarship pays the freight, but it is the academic preparation and the individual's ability that make the whole equation work. If Merrill students were not bright, talented young men and women who have had the kind of an education an exemplary school system offers, all would be for naught. Merrill's Anson scholars not only have persevered, they have excelled, both at Notre Dame and in later life.

The community can be justly proud of them, and of itself.

When some Anson scholars got together at Merrill High School earlier this week to pay tribute to the man who had founded the scholarship that was the turning point in some families' lives, they were doing something that Anson would have understood.

This time they were giving back partial payment for all Anson's gift had meant to them.

May we all do the same, to our communities and our benefactors, some day.

THE SIMULTANEOUS NUCLEAR TEST BAN ACT

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, in April I introduced the Simultaneous Nuclear Test Ban Act (H.R. 1834) that challenged both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to declare a moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons beginning August 6, 1985, the 40th anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima. On July 29, Soviet Leader Mikhail Gorbachev met that challenge and announced a 5-month unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests. Fifteen minutes before the Soviets officially announced their moratorium, the Reagan administration rejected the Soviet offer and instead invited the Kremlin to monitor a single American nuclear weapon test.

The administration says they are going the "extra mile in order to get some results in arms control discussions." By rejecting the Soviet offer President Reagan surrendered the moral high ground. The Soviets gave the mile and the President took an inch.

In response to the Soviet moratorium, 34 of my colleagues are joining me in introducing a revised Simultaneous Nuclear Test Ban Act. The bill, in recognition of the Soviet moratorium, calls for the President to declare a moratorium on testing nuclear warheads by January 1, 1986. If the President does not initiate a moratorium then Congress would cut off the use of funds for testing nuclear warheads for a 6-month period as long as the Soviets continued their moratorium.

The people of this country recognize the opportunity we have to work toward a peaceful coexistence. If the President will not seize the opportunity then it is the responsibility of Congress to act by using the power of the purse strings.

JOB CORPS WORK OFFSETS COSTS

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share an article from the Ravalli Republic, a newspaper in the district I represent, on September 16, 1985. This article relates the findings of a study released by the U.S. Forest Service on the civilian conservation corps centers of the Job Corps as they relate to the centers in my district.

FOREST SERVICE: JOB CORPS WORK OFFSETS COSTS

The nation's Job Corps Centers have been assailed Reagan budget makers in recent months as a costly program that's not worth the expense.

But the U.S. Forest Service has come out with a report that defends two of the centers, including Trapper Creek Job Corps south of Darby and the Anaconda Job Corps Center near Anaconda.

The agency says that in the past year, the two Job Corps Centers contributed more than \$2 million worth of work in the National Forests and other public properties.

Mission of the centers is to educate and train young men and women. And the Forest Service says Job Corps enrollees at the center last year put in 2,265 work months in accomplishing \$2,083,600 of work on public lands and facilities in the National Forests.

Work included maintenance and upgrading the Center's facilities. Men and women enrollees did welding, carpentry, concrete work, bricklaying, operated heavy equipment, and did maintenance work.

The Forest Service says the Job Corps centers contributed work only on projects with inadequate funds for completion. Contributed Job Corps work, under federal rules, cannot displace workers or contractors and the project, says the Forest Service, must provide "meaningful training and work experience."

A total of 233 men and women are enrolled at Trapper Creek while 229 men and women are enrolled at the Anaconda Job Corps Center.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GETTING TOUGH ON NERVE GAS

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the editorial entitled "How To Get Tough With Nerve Gas" in yesterday's New York Times captures the sound foreign policy, arms control, defense, and budgetary reasons why a bipartisan majority in the House has opposed the production of binary nerve gas chemical munitions.

In addition, persistent test failures and technical deficiencies continue to plague the binary Bigeye bomb. This fact was reaffirmed just last week in the General Accounting Office report to Congress in which GAO again recommended that Congress should not fund the binary production program in fiscal year 1986. This GAO report concludes that the binary funding request is premature because "the Bigeye bomb has not met the established minimum chemical requirement for chemical purity and numerous critical technical issues are unresolved."

This is sound counsel and advice which I hope will be affirmed as we appropriate defense levels in fiscal year 1986.

The New York Times editorial follows:
[From the New York Times, Sept. 25, 1985]

HOW TO GET TOUGH WITH NERVE GAS

Nerve gas is a hideous weapon, but as long as Soviet troops are equipped with chemical munitions, American troops cannot be denied an effective response. That's why the Defense Department's plan to build a new generation of chemical arms—so-called "binary" weapons—is so dismaying. Never mind their vast extra cost, their stabilizing effect on NATO or the initiation of a new race in chemical arms; the new binary weapons will be less effective.

Every new weapon has defects, often serious, which field tests may remedy. Binary weapons surely have their share, but these as-yet-unknown flaws remain undetected because Congress has restricted field tests. No soldier should be asked to fight with untested weapons. And the Bigeye bomb, one of the proposed binary weapons, is still plagued with manifest design flaws.

Advocates say binary weapons will be safer to handle, since the nerve gas is not generated until two chemicals are mixed, in flight, in the delivery shell. Maybe, but the present shells and bombs have a long and excellent safety record, without a single serious accident. Why fix a non-problem? Advocates of binaries contend the present stockpile has sprung leaks. Yes, there are minute leaks—in 0.0006 percent of artillery shells. All other stockpiled shells are usable.

The only practical reason for moving to binary weapons would be evidence that the present stockpile might later deteriorate beyond use. That's an answerable technical question. A blue-ribbon panel appointed by the Department of Defense is conducting aging tests. Why rush to start making binary weapons, costing \$2.3 billion over five years, when these tests may well show the present stockpile has a long life ahead?

What truly needs fixing is not chemical offense but defense. The Pentagon has so

far failed to institute advice by the Defense Science Board to remedy gaps in manpower, training and equipment. The Army has no medical products in the field for care of chemical casualties, no proper decontaminants of equipment and no antidote against the standard Soviet nerve gas. Commanders offer subvert training requirements, such as showing troops how to eat in a contaminated environment, according to the General Accounting Office.

Maintaining deficient chemical defenses, and replacing effective weapons with unproven ones, is hardly the best way of deterring the Soviet Union from first use of chemical weapons.

For the last three years the House has refused to allow production of binary weapons. This year, under the shadow of the hijacked Americans taken hostage in Lebanon, it mistakenly changed position, but required that production not begin until NATO requests that binary weapons be stored in Europe. Since several NATO countries are highly unlikely to allow present stockpiles to be replaced with binaries, the condition is highly desirable insurance. Yet it was surrendered in conference with the Senate.

The House has a chance to redress its error next month as it writes the Pentagon's appropriations bill. Binary weapons are a bad buy, and there's no good reason for the House to abandon its longstanding distrust of them.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM R. CLARK

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my distinguished colleagues some of my thoughts on one of my outstanding constituents from Williamstown, MA. It is always a pleasure for me to have an opportunity to honor a devoted and professional man such as Dr. William R. Clark who is retiring from the teaching profession after over 36 years of strong commitment to the education of children. Dr. Clark has dedicated his life to the education of the young, and Williamstown has indeed been most fortunate to have had Dr. Clark teach its children since 1955 when he came to Massachusetts from Virginia.

We have all had in our past teachers who have inspired and motivated us to excel in various ways, whether it is in the classroom or on the sport's field. Dr. Clark is one of those teachers who has been the spark for so many of his students. His flame will continue to burn brightly for them for many years to come providing warmth, inspiration, and imagination.

Our children have learned not only important historical lessons and facts from this dedicated professional, but they have observed firsthand Dr. Clark's high moral character and integrity. His students have always come first and he has worked diligently to creatively challenge and channel this vast and valuable resource. His tireless work has touched everyone in some way in

the Williamstown area and we are truly the beneficiaries of his many talents. We thank him for the years he has given us and we wish him many, happy years of retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to be able to represent such a dedicated person in Congress and am extremely pleased to share with you the reasons for this well-deserved recognition.

SECONDARY SCHOOL
RECOGNITION PROGRAM

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend two schools in my district which have received the Secondary School Recognition Program Award given by the U.S. Department of Education. Out of 509 nominations for the award this year, 2 of the 217 schools awarded this honor were E.T. Richardson Middle School and Strathaven High School in Delaware County, PA. After sending in their respective resumes to the National Secondary Board, these schools were selected to have an onsite visitor for 2 days to observe their programs and speak with the staff. These two schools were selected to receive the award because of their obvious outstanding qualities in the areas of curriculum, activities, and staff.

E.T. Richardson Middle School, which includes grades 5 through 8, should be congratulated for its excellence in teacher effectiveness, administrative leadership, community support and its unique curriculum. The team teaching program practiced there, where four teachers work closely together and plan projects focused on a single theme, is superior. E.T. Richardson should be applauded for the effective implementation of this innovative program.

Strathaven High School's achievements in the areas of teaching, leadership, discipline, community support, and curriculum are particularly impressive since this high school has really only existed for 2 years. In 1983, two area high schools were redesigned to form Strathaven High School which incorporates the very best qualities of both of the original schools. Strathaven is very proud of its highly individualized program which allows students the opportunity to reach their educational goals and expand upon their talents and interests.

I firmly believe the future of our Nation is dependent on the investment we make in young Americans. The needs of our society are changing rapidly; we should not remain passive, but instead work to meet these needs and attempt to foresee the demands of the future. Schools like E.T. Richardson and Strathaven have gone a long way toward achieving these goals. May they be a source of encouragement and inspiration to educators everywhere.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO
FATHER PAT MCPOLIN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I rise today to recognize and commend Father Pat McPolin on many years of outstanding service to southern California.

Born in Chicago's South Side, Father Pat began his studies for the priesthood, first at Quigley, and then in 1933, he continued his studies at St. Jude's Seminary of the Clarelian Fathers at Mornence, IL.

Finished with his studies, Father Pat's first assignment was to Our Lady of Guadalupe Church in south Chicago. That same year, he became a police chaplain for St. Jude's League. Throughout these years, Father Pat devoted long hours to the citizens of Chicago. Whether it was to answer sick calls in the middle of the night, officiate at a wake, or organize a counseling session, you could count on Father Pat being there. It was also during this same period that Father Pat began his great work with youths in the Mexican community. It was through his insistence that countless Hispanic youths continued their education, obtained a good job, and became concerned and productive members of the community.

By appointment from Rome in 1965, Father Pat became the provincial of the Clarelian Fathers at their western headquarters in Los Angeles. Although it would be impossible for me to name all of Father Pat's accomplishments in my area, there is one that deserves special attention. It was through Father Pat's guidance and supervision that the Dominguez Rancho Adobe was restored. This, of course, was the family home and headquarters for California's first Spanish land grant belonging to the Dominguez family.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, Father Pat is one of those unique individuals that have made America great. His spiritual and emotional guidance has inspired thousands across this great land, and for that, we are grateful.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating Father Pat McPolin on a tremendous job over the years. His contributions to the betterment of society are many, and you can be sure that his efforts have not gone unnoticed. We wish him continued success and happiness in all his future endeavors.

FIREWOOD FOR SENIOR
CITIZENS AND HANDICAPPED

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide an exemption for senior citizens and handicapped individuals from paying fees for obtaining fire-

September 26, 1985

wood for personal use from National Forest System lands.

Mr. Speaker, fuel wood cutting in the national forest continues to be very popular with the public. In 1983 a minimum charge of \$10 per permit was established to provide consistency within Forest Service fuel wood programs and to be in step with sale practices of other public agencies and private forest landowners.

The initiation of a charge for personal use firewood has been received with mixed emotion by different segments of the public. Most importantly are the 38 million senior citizens and 43 million handicapped with this bill will provide an exception.

I have had discussions with the Forest Service and their original intent when they began the charge program was to permit exceptions for senior citizens and handicapped persons to insure access to Federal programs for these individuals. The Forest Service requested their Office of General Counsel to review the various Federal laws as to the propriety of this approach. I have been advised that there are no authorities available to the Forest Service to permit this type of preferential treatment.

This legislation does not change the definition of handicapped as defined in the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 nor does it change the term senior citizen as defined in the Older Americans Act of 1965.

Mr. Speaker, the Forest Service manages and protects 191 million acres of the National Forest System land of which 87 percent are in the Western United States. The guiding principle for use of these lands is the greatest good to the greatest number in the long run. I believe that this bill which provides an exemption to senior citizens and handicapped individuals from paying fees for obtaining firewood for personal use, will be the greatest good to the greatest number.

I am placing the bill in the RECORD as follows:

H.R. 3445

A bill to provide an exemption for senior citizens and handicapped individuals from paying fees for obtaining firewood for personal use from National Forest System lands.

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

SECTION 1. EXEMPTION.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall exempt senior citizens and handicapped individuals from paying fees for obtaining firewood for personal use from National Forest System lands.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "handicapped individual" has the same meaning given such term in section 7(7)(B)(i) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 706(7)(B)(i)); and

(2) the term "senior citizen" has the same meaning given the term "older individual" in section 302(10) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3022(10)).

SHOULD WE REPEAL THE
PRIVATE EXPRESS STATUTES?

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I received a copy of the following letter from Postmaster Janice Yabes of Eldorado Springs, CO, which she sent to the Daily Camera newspaper editor. I believe my colleagues would appreciate hearing some of the arguments against repealing the private express statutes.

HOW MANY MAILS?

EDITOR: If people think the breakup of AT&T is a mess, just wait and see what happens if the U.S. Postal Service is broken up.

Everyone and his brother will be able to deliver mail; you won't know who will be delivering mail to your home. You may have a half-dozen people a day bring mail to your home.

The United States has the best Postal Service in the world and the least expensive. It has its faults, but what company doesn't?

Just stop and think: if a letter doesn't show up, where will you go to complain? You will have to contact the person who mailed the letter to find out which company was used. Have you ever tried to contact UPS in Boulder? Impossible; you have to call Denver.

Sure, they might deliver mail within the city for 10 or 15 cents, but will they deliver the same letter across the country for 10 cents? No way!

What if they don't deliver to rural towns, farms, ranches, mountain towns? Then you're back to the U.S.P.S.: they deliver everywhere for 22 cents.

Will they pick up your letters everyday at your home, or just when they happen to deliver them?

Are you going to keep stamps for each company, so you can use each one? Will you drive all over looking for a company mail drop?

When you move, you will have to notify each company and hope for the best. Do you think they will forward your mail free for 18 months, like the U.S.P.S. does? No way! You will be charged for forwarding. You bet!

Has your phone bill gone down since the breakup of AT&T? No way! If business is taken away from U.S.P.S., the price of a postal stamp will go up much faster. The other companies might start out a few cents cheaper, but they will have to increase their rates. Just like MCI, Sprint, etc.

Remember the old saying. "The check is in the mail?" Now you will have to say, "which mail?"

Companies will be able to deliver pornography right to your door, whereas now you are protected from that by the U.S.P.S.

These are just a few things to consider. I could go on and on. Stop and give this some real thought, and contact your Congressman soon.

You can't buy a candy bar for 22 cents, but you can get a letter across the U.S.A. for 22 cents. Yes, we have our faults, but we are still darn good.

J. YABES,

Postmaster, Eldorado Springs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TAX REFORM SHOULD NOT DESTROY THE DREAM OF HOMEOWNERSHIP

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, in 1973 the South Dakota State Legislature created the South Dakota Housing Development Authority [SDHDA] to sell tax-exempt bonds to finance low-interest housing loans. These bonds are sold on the national market and the money is loaned at a slightly higher rate to offset the cost of administration. The SDHDA does not receive any State or general fund tax dollars.

Using proceeds from the bonds which it has issued, the SDHDA provides below-market mortgage financing for first-time home buyers who otherwise would not qualify for conventional financing to purchase a home. Since 1974, the dream of homeownership has been transformed into solid reality for thousands of South Dakota families as the South Dakota Housing Development Authority has provided mortgage financing for more than 19,000 single family homes. In addition, the SDHDA has used the proceeds from tax-exempt bonds to provide construction and financing for the production of more than 2,700 new and rehabilitated multifamily rental developments.

To fully appreciate the importance of this type of financing, it is relevant to note that 33.5 percent of the total mortgage originations for single family owner occupied homes in South Dakota last year was provided by the South Dakota Housing Development Authority. Since its creation, an estimated 6,084 worker-years of employment have been created, \$63 million in construction wages have been earned, and property tax revenue has been increased by more than \$19 million as a direct result of the mortgage financing provided by the South Dakota Housing Development Authority.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress may soon have the opportunity to vote on tax reform legislation. Among the proposals included in the tax plan unveiled in May by President Reagan is a severe restriction on the use of proceeds from bonds sold by State and local governments and public agencies like the South Dakota Housing Development Authority. If this proposal is adopted, the mortgage financing program of the SDHDA would be terminated and the use of State and local bonds as a source of financing would be virtually eliminated.

Creating a more simplified and equitable tax system is a goal which few oppose. However, not all changes in current tax law proposed under the banner of tax reform are deserving of our support. Tax reform should not destroy the dream of homeownership.

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE
CELEBRATES BIRTH OF ITS
FOUNDER, MARY LYON

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very special woman who was the founder of one of the finest colleges for women. Mount Holyoke College in South Hadley, MA, was the first school in the country devoted to the higher education of women.

Mary Lyon was born on a farm in Buckland, MA, 188 years ago. It was from this farm that Mary Lyon became inspired to channel her energy and resources into establishing this outstanding educational institution.

Mary's dedication to this dream became a reality in 1837 when she and 4 teachers accepted 80 students into Mount Holyoke College in South Hadley. These 80 students were the select few who became the pioneers in the establishment of a women's college dedicated to higher education.

Because of Mary's undaunted will and faith in herself and in her dream, she attained her goal. She braved uncharted waters for future generations in order to bring an educational institution to Massachusetts which is now a symbol of excellence. Mount Holyoke College stands today as a strong vehicle not only for women to become educated citizens, but free, self-reliant, and responsible members of the community to which they belong. One needs only to observe its students and alumni in order to discover that Mount Holyoke is continuing today to instill in its students the search for excellence.

I congratulate Mount Holyoke today on its celebration of the birth of its founder, Mary Lyon, and I salute this college for the legacy it continues in her memory. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to share with you a true pioneer in the education field.

CELEBRATING THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION WITH A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

HON. KEN KRAMER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on September 17, 1787, the Convention of the Constitution of the United States adjourned with a document ready for ratification by the States. In 2 years we will celebrate the bicentennial of this event. What better way to celebrate than to finally ratify a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, forcing Congress to put its fiscal house in order.

That is why today, along with Senator WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG, I have reintroduced the Balanced Budget Amendment Constitutional Convention Convening Resolution. When Senator ARMSTRONG and I initially introduced this resolution last Congress, it marked the first time a resolution had been introduced calling for the convening of a constitutional convention for a specific purpose.

This resolution is designed to force Congress to approve a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. In effect, it gives Congress an ultimatum—either pass a balanced budget amendment now or have a constitutional convention automatically convened for that purpose if two more State petitions are received calling for a constitutional convention.

In the months since the 99th Congress convened, we've heard a lot about the perils of deficits. Unfortunately, there is a tremendous gulf between rhetoric and reality.

Earlier this summer, the House waived budget requirements in order to pass appropriations bills. The congressional budget process is coming apart at the seams, and we're even starting to hear rumblings of a tax increase as the only solution to our deficit crisis. A tax increase—after 49 of the 50 States resoundingly rejected that approach at the polls last November!

Meanwhile, 81 percent of the constituents who responded to the questionnaire I sent out this summer indicated they do not have faith that Congress will act to significantly reduce deficits. This skepticism is justified in light of the budget Congress adopted August 1 which projects a deficit of \$171.9 billion—and that figure is very optimistic. When the House passed the budget resolution, it also voted to put the debt ceiling over \$2 trillion.

The message is clear: Unless we act now to halt this exponential growth, we will see a return to days of high inflation, high interest rates, and high unemployment. No matter how much we in Congress might will it otherwise, huge deficits mean the Federal Government must either print or borrow money. This in turn causes inflation or high interest rates, or both.

President Reagan pointed out the seriousness of the problem in his budget message to Congress this year:

At some point the question must be raised: "Where is the political logrolling going to stop?" At some point, the collective demands upon the public Treasury of all the special interests combined exceed the public's ability and willingness to pay. The single most difficult word for a politician to utter is a simple, flat "no." The patience of the American people has been stretched as far as it will go. They want action; they have demanded it.

To solve this serious problem, the President reiterated his support for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution during his State of the Union Address this year.

In 1983, Missouri became the 32d State since 1975 to petition Congress to call a national constitutional convention for the purpose of drafting a constitutional amendment mandating a balanced budget. This is

just two shy of the number of States required under article V of the Constitution in order for a constitutional convention to be convened. Michigan narrowly missed becoming the 33d State earlier this year and another vote there is expected this fall. In addition, the measure has passed one house in several other States.

Let me emphasize that I would prefer to see Congress act before 34 States take the matter into their own hands. In fact, the chief purpose of this resolution is to force Congress to adopt a balanced budget amendment by eliminating any doubt about the validity of the 32 petitions already received and setting up an automatic mechanism that would expedite the convening of a constitutional convention upon receipt of petitions from two additional States. Briefly, this measure would:

Declare the 32 States petitions already received to be valid and contemporaneous under the terms established in article V of the Constitution;

Establish an automatic mechanism for determining the validity of any new petitions;

Clearly limit the scope of the convention so it could only deal with the subject of drafting a balanced budget amendment;

Call for the balanced budget convention to be convened in Philadelphia within 180 days after the 34th application is determined valid;

Provide for selection and compensation of convention delegates and describe their duties;

Limit the duration of the convention to 120 days;

Provide for ratification by State legislatures.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, we have not had a constitutional convention since the Founding Fathers drafted the Constitution in Philadelphia in 1787. Article V, which spells out how the Constitution is to be amended, stipulates that an amendment can be proposed by either of two methods—a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress or a national constitutional convention called at the request of two-thirds of the State legislatures. Yet, to date, all amendments have been proposed by the first method.

Thus, the convening of a constitutional convention admittedly would be a bold step. However, I would argue that, given the prospects of continued out-of-control Federal spending and congressional paralysis in dealing with the situation, bold action is not only justified, but demanded, particularly if Congress continues to ignore the best interest of the Nation and fails to propose an amendment on its own.

In No. 43 of the Federal Papers, James Madison, widely regarded as the Father of our Constitution, gave these reasons for article V:

That useful alterations [in the Constitution] will be suggested by experience, could not but be foreseen. It was requisite therefore that a mode for introducing them should be provided. The mode preferred by the Convention [in 1787] seems to be stamped with every mark of propriety. It guards equally against that extreme facility

which would render the Constitution too mutable; and that extreme difficulty which might perpetuate its discovered faults. It moreover equally enables the general and State governments to originate the amendment of errors as they may be pointed out by the experience on one side or on the other.

Indeed, in 1787 who could have predicted \$200 billion annual fiscal deficits?

During the 60-year period between 1789 and 1849, the Federal Government ran a budget surplus of \$70 million. In fact, the general rule of thumb until about 1930 had always been to balance the budget except in times of emergency, such as war. For example, after piling up \$22.9 billion in deficits during World War I, the Federal Government ran a budget surplus in each of the next 10 years. In 1930, the total Federal debt from the first 140 years of our Nation's existence stood at \$16.2 billion, nearly all of which was attributable to World War I. In 1945, at the end of World War II, the total national debt had risen to \$259 billion. However, it was not until the Great Society programs of the 1960's, combined with the cost of financing the Vietnam war, that the debt began to increase by geometric progression. The last time we had a budget surplus was in 1969.

As our former colleague from Illinois, the late Senator Everett Dirksen, was fond of saying, "A few billion dollars here and a few billion dollars there and soon we're talking about real money." Although this statement facetiously illustrates what many perceive to be the prevalent attitude in Washington, it is also true that the numbers have become so big that they are difficult for the average American to comprehend.

Therefore, let me offer the following examples which help explain the gravity of the problem of our national debt:

A \$2 trillion national debt represents a 186 million mile stream of \$1 bills—long enough to stretch to the Sun and back;

A \$2 trillion spending spree, at the rate of \$1,900 per minute, would last 2,000 years;

A debt of \$2 trillion is a \$8,500 liability for every man, woman, and child in the country;

If a small business were formed at the time Jesus was born, and spent money at the rate of \$1 every minute throughout history, the total would be approximately \$1 billion, which would be enough to run our current Federal budget less than one-half of 1 day.

On numerous occasions the last couple of decades, both Congress and Presidents have sought to restrain spending and limit deficit spending—each time without success. Most notable of these attempts were: First, five separate proposals to limit Federal spending which Congress approved between 1966 and 1973; second, the impoundment battles initiated by President Nixon; third, congressional adoption of the 1974 Budget Act, which proponents argued would give Congress the necessary tools to put its financial house in order; fourth, the series of spending vetoes by President

Ford; and fifth, passage of the Byrd amendment of 1978, which statutorily provided that outlays shall not exceed receipts, beginning in 1981.

Although perhaps it can be argued that the first four of these examples may have prevented the deficit problem from becoming even worse, there is no doubt that Congress blatantly ignored the Byrd amendment. Despite the statutory requirement to balance the budget, the deficit for 1981 was \$57.9 billion, making it the third largest deficit at that point in our Nation's history.

Clearly, there is a spending bias inherent in the legislative process, which has been accentuated by built-in increases in the budget of the last couple of decades. Members of Congress win praise, and often votes, for "bringing home the bacon" in terms of projects for their districts and programs which benefit their constituents. Conversely, those who try to hold the line on expenditures, or attempt to cut major spending programs, often incur the wrath of effected voters. As author Allen Schick, who has analyzed the Federal budget process in some detail, observed.

The process of budgeting comes to be "whose ox is to be fattened," a much more agreeable task than deciding "whose ox is to be gored."

Given these facts, it becomes apparent that a constitutional amendment is the only feasible way of achieving a balanced budget. This fact was underscored by Senator STROM THURMOND, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, when he stated during debate over a balanced budget amendment:

Congress has violated its own laws in recent years in enacting Federal budgets that are not balanced. * * * A constitutional amendment is the only way. Congress must obey the Constitution.

Without doubt, public opinion is far ahead of Congress on this issue. Since 1979, a number of polls have been conducted by highly respected research organizations such as Gallup, the Harris survey, the Roper organization, New York Times-CBS News, and the Associated Press-NBC News. All have consistently shown strong support for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, with support ranging from approximately 2 to 1 better than 3 to 1, depending upon when the particular poll was taken.

I would also point out that 15 States, including my home State of Colorado, have a balanced budget requirement written into their State constitutions. By and large, these amendments have been highly successful in forcing legislators to set spending priorities based on incoming revenues, just as every American household must do.

Grassroots lobbying finally forced Congress to take up a balanced budget amendment in 1982. However, even though the Senate approved a balanced budget amendment on August 4, 1982, by a vote of 69 to 31, the House Judiciary Committee successfully kept the issue bottled up in committee until the last day of the 97th Congress. Although supporters were successful in using a discharge petition to force it out of com-

mittee, the measure was brought to the floor with only a couple hours notice. Even though a majority of the House—236 to 187—voted in favor of the amendment, it fell short of the two-thirds vote necessary to send the amendment on to the States for ratification.

The combination of this congressional inaction and deficits that continue to soar has led many people to wonder if anyone in Washington is minding the store. As a result, the time is fast approaching when the American people will take the issue out of our hands.

Were that to happen, a number of questions arise on what would happen upon receipt of the 34th State application for a convention since article V does not provide these details. Anticipating this, the American Bar Association did a thorough analysis several years ago to resolve some of the uncertainty surrounding a constitutional convention. Although I would commend the ABA's report to anyone seriously interested in this issue, space here does not permit me to reproduce this report in its entirety. Therefore, let me summarize the report's most important conclusions:

Citing the constitutional convention debate history over article V, as well as the Federalist Papers, the ABA concluded that a national constitutional convention can be limited to a single subject;

Congress does have the power to establish procedures governing the calling of such a convention consistent with this single purpose, but any standards requiring that State applications be identical in wording would be improper; and

Congress' duty to call a convention whenever two-thirds of the State legislatures have concurred on the subject matter of the convention is mandatory.

Thus, as former Senator Sam Ervin, who was a widely recognized constitutional expert on this subject, stated:

The fear of a runaway convention is just a nonexistent constitutional ghost conjured up by people who are opposed to balancing the budget, because they want to be able to promise special groups something for nothing out of an empty pocket.

Mr. Speaker, the time to enact a balanced budget amendment is now. I suggest it is very appropriate that we should celebrate the bicentennial of our great Constitution by finally ratifying such an amendment to preserve the fiscal health of our Nation and the economic welfare of all Americans.

In closing, let me recall the wisdom of Justice Joseph Story, who wrote in 1826:

A government which * * * provides no means of change * * * will either degenerate into a despotism or, by the pressure of its inequities, bring on a revolution.

A CONGRESSIONAL TRIBUTE TO DR. EVA A. JESSYE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Dr. Eva A. Jessye, who is being honored from September 14 to October 4 by California State University, Long Beach, with a symposium on authentic North American music. The symposium is entitled "Eva Jessye's America: The Legacy of Porgy and Bess."

Eva Jessye was born in 1895 in Coffeyville, KS. For more than 70 of her 90 years, she has struggled to keep authentic North American music alive through professional choruses, especially the Eva Jessye Choirs. In addition to performing, Eva has also arranged and published rare folksongs, established collections of North American music and memorabilia at such institutions as the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and Pittsburg State University, Pittsburg, KS, and she continues to give lectures and workshops on American music.

Two great American composers have chosen Eva to train the choruses for their operas. In 1934, Virgil Thompson had her audition and train the chorus for his production of Gertrude Stein's "Four Saints in Three Acts." The following year, George Gershwin chose Eva to train the chorus for the premiere performance of "Porgy and Bess." She was the only black member of the directing staff for this "all-black opera," which has also been called our national opera.

During the 1920's Eva and her Dixie Jubilee Singers were regulars at the Major Bowes Capitol Theater, where she met her violin teacher, the late Eugene Ormandy. On the Major Bowes Family Radio Hour, Eva's choir backed up such singers as Paul Robeson, Rudy Vallee, and Lawrence Tibbett. Conductors Leopold Stokowski, Arturo Toscanini, Alexander Smallens, and Eugene Ormandy have directed the successor to the Dixie Jubilee Singers, the Eva Jessye Choir.

Eva is also a poet and commentator on a broad range of social, political, and racial issues. In 1923 and 1927, Robert Kerlin published three of her poems in "Negro Poets and Their Poems." Eva has had more than 50 poems published, some of them award winning. During the symposium, Eva will read her own and Langston Hughes' poetry. She has also been named Kansas Ambassador for the Arts.

In her hometown of Pittsburg, KS, Eva built a yellow brick road to her house that is now a historical site. My wife, Lee, joins me in wishing Dr. Eva Jessye and her 100-year-old aunt Celie continued success on their stroll down the yellow brick road of life.

STUDENT FINANCIAL AID
EQUITY ACT INTRODUCED BY
WILLIAMS

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today my colleagues and I are introducing the Student Financial Aid Equity Act. This bill is designed to meet the needs of the older, so-called nontraditional student who constitutes an ever-increasing proportion of today's student body. The census reported that the proportion of students over 30 years of age has doubled in the last 10 years and much of the growth has come from women returning to school. Today, 40 percent of our student body is over 25 and half the students are going to school part time; 82 percent of part-time students are working for pay. These older, part-time students tend disproportionately to be women who enter school with fewer resources and the responsibilities of family and work. Over two-thirds of the students over 34 are women. Women are twice as likely as men to be self-supporting when they enter college. The financial pressure on these nontraditional students and their families is enormous. While only making 60 cents on the dollar, women have faced the 60-percent inflation in college costs. Currently, our financial aid policies do not reflect the dramatic changes in our student body nor the needs of these students. Education policy analysts and school administrators have identified the three biggest factors to eliminate sex-related differences in financial aid and thus access to quality education. They are: providing dependent care expenses, opening up financial aid to less than half-time students, and increasing information available about eligibility for financial aid.

This bill deals with all three of these issues.

It opens up all student financial aid to less than half-time students, providing needy students with aid for education related expenses. Currently, there are 1.3 million students attending college less than half time, yet in 1933 part-time students received less than one-tenth of 1 percent of all Federal student financial aid. Only 1,000 students received assistance because most programs do not allow their participation and several are capped at 10 percent. The bill also requires that college work study funds pay wages consistent with the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The bill allows for student financial aid to adjust current allowances for transportation and for dependent care to reflect actual expenses. The allowance for dependent care also for the first time includes both child care and care of older family members and covers lab, library, and field time as well as class time. This bill provides for loan payment deferment for a year's parental leave, if the person is in school. The bill mandates that the Department of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Education implement the independent student provisions established in the 1980 education amendments. These provisions recognized that independent students with dependents have greater financial burdens than other independent students and should not be expected to make the same kinds of financial contributions to their education. These are all measures which help families.

The bill directs the Secretary of Education to develop and disseminate information about student financial aid for nontraditional students. The Department of Education has cut back information efforts in the last 5 years by over a third—eliminating such things as a brochure targeted to nontraditional students and a brochure for Spanish speaking students—just when such resources would be most needed. The bill also authorizes the fund for the improvement of postsecondary education to fund projects which establish innovative programs of student assistance information and dissemination, focusing particularly on the needs of nontraditional students. The Secretary will also conduct a survey of student financial aid recipients so we have the necessary information for future policymaking.

Finally, many nontraditional students are caught in a catch-22. AFDC recipients and other Federal assistance recipients who want to go back to school often face the choice of reduced benefits if they receive financial assistance for tuition, books, et cetera. Clearly, this is a shortsighted policy and has resulted in a cycle of poverty with only 2 percent of AFDC recipients returning to school. This bill would count Federal assistance as income in determining eligibility for financial assistance but would prohibit recipients from being thrown off assistance by receiving student aid.

I believe that this bill is an important step in reducing the barriers that nontraditional students, particularly women, face in going back to school. I want to commend the leadership that the AAUW and the Coalition of Women and Girls in Education have shown in moving these issues along. I believe that the introduction of this bill will further the discussion of these important changes in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act this year. Through the reauthorization hearings and our discussions with education groups and our constituents all of us are aware of the changing needs for student financial assistance. I look forward to working for passage of these provisions.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF
THE YANKEE ATOMIC ELECTRIC
CO. IN ROWE, MA

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in the young adulthood of our nuclear age, I would like to commemorate a landmark in nuclear

September 26, 1985

power safety. This year marks the 25th anniversary of the oldest operating nuclear powerplant in the United States, the Yankee Atomic Power Co. in Rowe, MA.

Over the last 25 years, the Yankee powerplant has enjoyed an excellent operating record. Credit for this record is awarded to its experienced operators, five of whom will soon be honored by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the American Nuclear Society, for 20 years of service at the plant. This anniversary is also celebrated by a 17-month performance audit of the plant, which shows Yankee with a perfect rating in 7 of 10 categories.

The birth of the plant was inexpensive and efficient. Its conception to operation took only 5 years—compared with the minimum of 6 to 14 years for other plants—and cost 40 percent less than had been budgeted. Since the beginning of operation, \$45 million has been spent on improving and upgrading the plant but it has not been necessary to replace any major components. As well, the plant boasts of an operating efficiency far superior to that of all oil-fired power and even other more recently constructed nuclear powerplants, like Seabrook in Seabrook, NH.

In June, the American Nuclear Society meeting commemorated the 25th anniversary of the Yankee Rowe plant by featuring speakers at the annual meeting from both the Yankee Atomic Power Co. and the plant's construction company, the Stone and Webster Engineering Group. The popularity of this anniversary is visible around the country, and was even mentioned by Willard Scott on the NBC "Today" show.

The building of the plant in 1960 was obscured by the fear of nuclear bombs, and overlooked because of ignorance of nuclear powerplants. There were no protests of the construction, no labor disputes, and uninterrupted construction was quickly completed in 3 years. There was no negative attention brought to the plant during that time, and it continues to represent a favorable model for the industry.

This plant is one of seven plants which compose a "fleet" to power one-third of New England's electricity. This saves the use of millions of barrels of foreign oil. It is because of these advantages, and the productivity which has helped improve our country to make it more efficient and clean, that I honor the anniversary of this plant and its success.

AIRPLANE CRASHES—THEY ARE
BECOMING AN EVERYDAY
HEADLINE

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, almost as regular as my morning cereal, orange juice, and the Washington Post are headlines of "near misses," airplane crashes and the tragic deaths that are the result.

Two days ago, the crash that made the headlines of the Post was a Henson commuter plane with 14 persons aboard. At the time the plane was scheduled to arrive at the airport, the peaks of surrounding mountains were enveloped in fog, an electronic beam at the field that should have guided the plane to a safe landing was malfunctioning. The skies were overcast yesterday, with a cloud cover, but most aviation experts said that should not have been a problem if the localizer beam were working.

Yesterday the headlines read, "Pilot Averts Collision at National." Fortunately no one was injured during the jet's aborted takeoff, although the crowded Eastern Air Lines shuttle had reached takeoff speed. Apparently, both the Eastern Air Lines jet and a helicopter had been cleared for takeoff, but their takeoff courses intersected. Perhaps skill, perhaps luck, enabled the pilot of the jet to slam on the brakes and narrowly avert a collision with the helicopter. In any case it was too close a call.

Last week, Secretary of Transportation Elizabeth Dole stated that she will add about 1,000 air traffic controllers and 500 safety inspectors to the Federal Aviation Administration to make the system safer. I commend her for this action. But, as this is the worst year ever in civil aviation history, with more than 1,430 deaths worldwide from nearly 20 accidents, I feel that even stronger action is needed.

Legislation I introduced in January calls for a study that includes, but is not limited to, the need for additional radar warning equipment in aircraft of various sizes; the need to adjust the minimum and maximum altitude requirements at which radar transponders must be used; the correction of inadequacies in the computer and radar equipment in the control towers and the safety and practicality of visual flight rules [VFR] as the number of flights and airplanes increase.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of this Congress to act constructively and quickly on these tragic occurrences. I encourage Members to examine and lend their support to House Joint Resolution 66, my legislation which would help deal with these catastrophes. We in Congress have a responsibility to see that air traffic is carried out in the safest possible manner.

A COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN CAN BE VERIFIED

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, within the next few days, the House will take up consideration of House Joint Resolution 3. This resolution calls upon the President to submit the Threshold Test Ban [TTBT] and Peaceful Nuclear Explosion [PNE] Treaties for Senate ratification, and to propose to the Soviet Union the immediate resumption of negotiations toward the conclusion of a

mutual and verifiable Comprehensive Test Ban [CTB] Treaty.

One of the arguments frequently used against a CTB is that it would not be adequately verifiable—that the Soviets might somehow be able to conduct clandestine nuclear tests that would escape detection and give the Soviet Union a military advantage over the United States. If true, this would indeed be a devastating argument against our entering into a Test Ban Treaty.

But it is not true. Scientists have met the fundamental technical problems of verifying a CTB, and an overwhelming majority agree that a CTB would be verifiable with a high degree of confidence down to explosions of very small size and doubtful military significance. Political considerations are what stand in the way of such an agreement, and verification concerns are being used as an excuse by those who want to continue nuclear explosive testing in order to develop new generations of nuclear warheads.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of our colleagues, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point two articles on the verification of a Comprehensive Test Ban, one an address by Columbia University Seismologist Lynn Sykes, and the other a San Francisco Chronicle article summarizing the findings of seismic verification experts at the U.S. Geological Survey.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Feb. 9, 1985]

EXPERTS SAY A-TEST CHEATS WILL FAIL

(By David Perlman)

New earthquake-detecting techniques are so sensitive that they can identify extremely small blasts from secret underground atomic tests, a team of American scientists has concluded.

The seismic experts at the U.S. Geological Survey in Menlo Park, maintain that even if the nuclear explosions are hidden in deep caverns designed to muffle shock waves, they can still be identified with enough confidence to thwart Soviet bomb-testers, trying to conceal them.

The findings contradict earthquake specialists at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, who insist that even networks of American quake-monitoring stations on Soviet territory could not identify every clandestine test the Russians might use to develop atomic weapons.

The Livermore scientists published their conclusions last month in the journal Science. Now the geological survey seismologists have developed a mass of data rebutting their claims.

The controversy is particularly important as American and Soviet negotiators prepare to bargain again next month on slowing the buildup of offensive nuclear missiles.

A ban on all nuclear weapons testing underground is not on the Geneva agenda, but "public interest in such a test ban is widespread," the Livermore scientists noted. Political pressures are strong from many American arms-control specialists, who see a comprehensive treaty barring all underground tests as a major step toward stopping the arms race.

If underground testing were completely brought to a halt, many specialists reason, it could end all development of atomic weapons by both sides. This is because each new

weapons system must undergo test firings, and if it cannot be tested, there is no point in developing or building it.

It might then become far more feasible to negotiate reductions of existing arsenals, which now total more than 50,000 warheads on both sides. Such a cutback, leading eventually to the abolition of all superpower nuclear weapons is President Reagan's avowed goal—although the president has argued that his so-called Star Wars defense is the more realistic route to atomic disarmament.

Treaties between the United States and the Soviet Union ban all nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere in the oceans and in space. A 1974 treaty that was signed but not ratified limits underground weapons tests to a yield of 150 kilotons. Both sides have agreed to abide by the 150-kiloton limit.

A 150-kiloton bomb releases as much energy as 150,000 tons of TNT—more than 10 times the explosive force of airborne weapons that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Today's intercontinental missiles—both American and Soviet—carry warheads with yields measured in the millions rather than the thousands of tons. Tactical atomic weapons designed for battlefield use may have yields smaller than a kiloton.

Recent intelligence reports claim the Russians have already cheated on the 150-kiloton limit. The Livermore scientists insist that American ignorance about the behavior of seismic waves inside Soviet territory would also allow the Russians to cheat on any new agreement to lower the testing limit.

Reports just completed by Jack F. Evernden, a U.S. Geological Survey research geophysicist, together with Edward Cranswick of the geological survey and Charles B. Archambeau of the University of Colorado, offer technical arguments to dispute those claims. Evernden has also worked with Lynn R. Sykes of Columbia's Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory to back the conclusions with more data.

These seismic experts contend that years of earthquake analysis have given American scientists detailed knowledge of the nature of the Earth's crust throughout Soviet Union—solid enough knowledge to understand exactly the way seismic waves from quakes or blasts would travel through Soviet terrain.

Underground explosions and earthquakes touch off four types of seismic waves—two that move swiftly through the Earth's crust and its deeper region of viscous semi-molten rock and two that ripple over the surface. The waves can be detected over vast distances.

Evernden and his colleagues note that improved seismic detectors can analyze distant shock waves in the Earth at extremely high frequencies. The instruments can differentiate a natural quake from an underground blast as small as half a kiloton at least 95 percent of the time, Evernden's group maintains. Older seismographs can analyze shock waves only at much lower frequencies and are far less discriminating, they say.

The seismic signals of explosions and quakes also differ in other ways: shock waves from underground blasts radiate with equal strength in all directions, but waves from earthquakes—caused by the sudden release of strain along faults—radiate with different strengths in different directions.

Today's seismic detectors can also distinguish these subtle differences, according to Evernden and his colleagues.

Because quakes almost invariably originate at far greater depths than shafts and tunnels can be dug to house underground explosions, even classic seismographs can pick out those differences, the geological survey experts note.

In the arguments over detecting Soviet weapons tests underground, it is assumed that the Russians would agree—as they have in the past—to the installation of at least 15 unmanned American seismic monitoring stations at Russian sites where the complex shock waves from blasts and quakes could be quickly identified and distinguished. The Americans, in turn, would allow Soviet instrument networks on U.S. soil.

The Livermore group has argued that the Russians might cheat on a tightened test-ban agreement by timing their hidden blasts within seconds of large earthquakes that generate huge and confusing seismic signals. They might also use "microseisms"—the tiny earth movements caused by storms and pounding surf—to conceal tests, say the Livermore scientists.

Given today's state of the seismic art, Evernden dismisses these scenarios as absurd. He and his colleagues maintain that the newest high-frequency seismographs are so sensitive that they can be programmed to ignore the unique frequencies and shapes of any earthquake shock waves. The instruments can also reject any interfering signals from microseisms, according to Evernden.

If the Russians wanted to cheat on a new agreement that lowered the permissible threshold of underground tests from 150 kilotons to a single kiloton or less, Evernden said, they would have to hide them in huge excavated caverns to muffle the shock waves.

But the only feasible place to build such caverns is in salt formations just north of the Caspian Sea, the geological survey scientists maintain. The Russians have long pursued an active program of "peaceful" underground nuclear blasts for mining and excavating in that region and elsewhere.

An array of only three unmanned seismic stations in the Caspian area could identify every test explosion—even the muffled ones—down to a kiloton or less there, according to Evernden, so the risk of being caught cheating would be too high to make it worthwhile, he maintains.

He said that a network of 25 detectors in Soviet territory and 15 additional stations outside the Soviet Union would, with 95 percent accuracy, detect explosions with yields down to half a kiloton anywhere in the country.

That is why Evernden, speaking as a scientist and not as a government official, is arguing for a U.S.-Soviet agreement lowering the test-ban threshold on underground tests from 150 kilotons to one kiloton.

That threshold in reality would have the same effect as a comprehensive test-ban agreement, Evernden and Sykes argue, because tests of such small-yield weapons would serve no purpose in developing additions to superpower arsenals.

VERIFICATION OF A COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY, SOVIET COMPLIANCE WITH THE THRESHOLD TEST BAN TREATY AND TESTING OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

(By Lynn R. Sykes)

INTRODUCTION AND MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

I am addressing you today as a scientist who has been involved in research related to verification of nuclear test ban treaties for the past 24 years. I was a member of the

U.S. delegation that negotiated the Threshold Test Ban Treaty with the Soviet Union in 1974. I have been a member of several U.S. Government panels that have examined questions of verification of atomic testing. Seismology, my main field of expertise, provides the main tools for verification of a Comprehensive Test Ban and for ascertaining if the Soviet Union has detonated explosions above the 150 kiloton limit of the Threshold Treaty.

In my presentation I would like to make the following major points:

1. A Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is verifiable with high reliability down to explosions of very small size. Recent advances in seismology ensure that clandestine cheating will be even easier to detect than was thought only two years ago.

2. There is a growing preponderance of scientific opinion that the Soviet Union has not violated the 150 kt limit of the Threshold Test Ban Treaty. Both the USSR and the United States have tested repeatedly near the limit since the treaty took effect in 1976.

3. The main impediments to a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty are not scientific or technical but rest on the notion that U.S. security is best enhanced by continued testing and development of new atomic weapons.

4. A Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty or a very low yield threshold treaty with a limit of about 1 kt would put an end to the testing of a so-called third generation of new atomic weapons like the x-ray laser.

VERIFICATION OF A COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

A Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is one of the longest running items on the arms control agenda. Active interest in it now goes back more than 30 years. Most seismologists who have been involved in test ban research, like myself, believe that the main technical and scientific impediments to verifying a comprehensive treaty were solved by 1968. Since that time the capability to detect small explosions and to identify or discriminate their signals from those of small earthquakes has improved steadily. The United States has spent about one-half billion dollars in this area over the past 25 years; more than a billion dollars has been spent worldwide.

Extensive negotiations towards a comprehensive treaty were conducted among the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union from 1977 to 1980. All of the long-contested aspects of verifying such a treaty were resolved, at least in principal, by 1980 including a moratorium on the testing of peaceful explosions, provisions for U.S. seismic monitoring posts within the USSR, international exchange of seismological data and on-site inspections of the challenge type. Those negotiations have been in abeyance since 1980.

Enough experience has been accumulated in operating arrays of seismic detectors so there is no longer serious disagreement that explosions of 0.1 to 0.2 kt in hard rock would be detected and identified with high confidence. Those sizes of explosions are, of course, well below the yields of weapons deployed on strategic systems and well below the 5 to 10 kt limit cited in unclassified congressional testimony a few years ago as the size of weapons testing that would be of military significance.

There is greater disagreement among experts about the sizes of weapons that might go undetected if the Soviet Union tries its best to cheat by detonating explosions in

ways that would muffle their seismic waves. All seismologists involved in this problem conclude that the most serious evasion possibility is that of detonating explosions in large cavities—the so-called Big Hole or decoupling theory. Scientists from the weapons laboratory usually assume that the Big Hole decoupling will work near the maximum theoretical limit and that such attempts to cheat will not be verified by satellite surveillance.

I think that Big Hole evasion has been seriously overrated for a number of reasons. The volume of rock that must be excavated to fully decouple an explosion of about 8 kt is equivalent to the volume of the largest Egyptian pyramid, a fact that pessimists usually forget to tell you. Experience with the one atomic explosion that the U.S. detonated to test this idea and theory both indicate that muffling is not as strong at high frequencies. In the last two years it has been recognized that high frequency seismic waves propagate readily across large parts of the Soviet Union. Using a high-frequency capability and with seismic monitoring posts in the Soviet Union, it is possible to verify even the most strenuous attempts to cheat at a level of 1 kt and larger.

It is clear that arguments will continue to be put forth that the testing of very tiny nuclear explosions would be of significant military advantage, whether that is case or not. Thus, a serious alternative to a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty would be a very low yield threshold treaty with an agreed upon limit of about 1 kt.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE THRESHOLD TEST BAN TREATY

Allegations that the Soviet Union has violated the Threshold Test Ban Treaty by testing above the 150 kt limit have formed a critical component of the case now being made by the United States Government that the Soviets have cheated repeatedly on arms control agreements. Two years ago this was described as definite cheating. In the statement released by the White House on February 1 that allegation has now been reduced to a "likely violation." That change in language has, I believe, resulted from strenuous objections by the seismological community over the past two years.

I and many others have long argued that the United States Government is not using the correct formula for converting the sizes of seismic waves generated by Soviet explosions into yields. It is now universally accepted that the correct methodology for estimating yields must take into account the geological and geophysical properties of the upper 100 miles of the earth directly beneath various testing areas. All of the main Soviet testing areas are on old geological terrains while the U.S. data come mainly from Nevada, a region of recent earth movements and volcanic activity. If these differences are not accounted for correctly, the estimated yields of USSR tests are too large. Several years ago the U.S. Government moved in the direction we advocated. Nevertheless, they did not move far enough and the methodology still leads to serious overestimates of the sizes of Soviet explosions. For too long we have seen an obsession with trying to justify the largest possible yields that cannot be absolutely refuted rather than adopting a formula that gives the most likely estimate of yield.

Two of us organized a major symposium for the American Geophysical Union almost two years ago. About 500 people heard presentations on whether the Soviet Union was

likely to have cheated on the Threshold Treaty and how well a Comprehensive Test Ban could be verified. About 15 experts presented their findings. Only two of them, scientists from the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), believed that the Soviet Union had cheated on the Threshold Treaty. There was a strong consensus among the participating experts, those attending the symposium and in press coverage of the symposium that the U.S.S.R. had not cheated. This was indeed surprising since most of the scientific experts receive major funding from DARPA. Other U.S. Government agencies, scientists from the Lawrence Livermore Weapons Laboratory and scientists from the United Kingdom and Sweden also do not think the Soviet Union has cheated.

NEED FOR AN INDEPENDENT REVIEW

As I outlined above, there is a heavy weight of scientific opinion in the United States, in several U.S. Government agencies and among knowledgeable scientists abroad that the Soviet Union has not cheated on the Threshold Treaty and that the United States has been using an incorrect formulation for estimating yield. Here is a classical case where bureaucratic infighting and the opinions of a few have dominated policy. There is a strong need for an independent review of scientific and technical capabilities for the verification of the Threshold Treaty and a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. I recommend that the Congress ask the U.S. National Academy of Sciences to conduct such a review. Another possibility would be a major review by the Office of Technological Assessment. It must be remembered that the weapons laboratories will strenuously object to a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty as a threat to what they see as their essence and reason for being. Major hearings by Congress on these matters are long overdue.

PATTERNS OF ATOMIC TESTING BY THE U.S.S.R.

The United States has paid a heavy price for following a methodology that overestimates yields of Soviet explosions and assigns those yields a large uncertainty. This price is twofold: (1) in the area of arms control agreements and (2) in intelligence about Soviet capabilities.

Figure 3 shows histograms of the numbers of explosions (vertical axis) of various sizes as a function of a measure of size, the short-period seismic magnitude m_b . Our best estimates of yields in kilotons are shown for the pronounced peaks in the histograms. There are many explosions of nearly the same yield, and most explosions are confined to a few pronounced peaks.

There is a very pronounced peak near 500 kt for tests at Novaya Zemlya for the period before the Threshold Treaty took effect in 1976. The peak at 500 kt probably represents the size of the weapon carried by the SS-18. Its yield is often assumed to be considerably larger. Overestimates of this type can lead to exaggerated estimates of the total megatonnage carried by Soviet ICBM's and to overestimates of the yield for a given weight. Thus, it is certainly not in the best interests of the United States to have the Soviet Union test lighter weapons of say 500 or 1000 kt. They have not done so since 1975. Ratifying the Threshold Test Ban Treaty would prevent them by treaty from doing so again.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The Soviet Union has not violated the 150 kt limit of the Threshold Treaty as alleged. It is in the best interests of the

United States that the Soviet Union not test above the 150 kt limit.

2. A Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty can be verified down to explosions of very small size, about 1 kt. An alternative to a comprehensive treaty would be a low yield threshold treaty with a limitation of about 1 kt.

3. The major impediment to a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is the notation that the United States should continue testing new weapons to keep ahead of the Soviet Union. As in the past, the U.S.S.R. can be expected to develop similar weapons a few years later, resulting in an increasingly dangerous world.

ROBERT STRAUSS OFFERS SOUND ADVICE ON CURRENT TRADE CRISES

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Democratic Task Force on Trade, which you appointed earlier this year, I have been privileged to work with many in this Nation who are concerned with the current trade deficit. We are faced with an enormous problem—one which affects the very underpinnings of the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, there is perhaps no one man in this country who holds as much respect and consideration as a problem solver than Bob Strauss. Bob has been sought out by Presidents over the years for his advice on a range of issues which would overwhelm a lesser man. His success with those issues have marked him as a man whose advice should be listened to.

Last week Bob Strauss delivered a speech before the Economic Club of New York. In it, the former Ambassador for Trade Negotiations for President Carter offers a well thought out and convincing plan for America to follow. I offer this entire speech for inclusion into the RECORD for all Members, on both sides of the aisle, to consider. Bob Strauss is internationally known for his insight and pragmatism. All will discover, after reading this speech, that those trademarks are still firmly in place.

Mr. Speaker, the speech follows:

ADDRESS BY ROBERT S. STRAUSS

I want to depart from the usual perspective of statistics and clichés relating to our trade problem, and begin my remarks tonight by putting the alarming trade posture of this country into a political perspective, because it is in the political arena, and from political pressures that the current economic situation will be addressed by the Administration and Congress.

Within the last 48 hours, the press has reported Senator Bentsen, a Democrat with a long free trade posture, saying: "When the president won't do anything, the Congress has to look at its options and stop the hemorrhaging of the industrial base of this country." And Senator John Danforth, Republican and Chairman of the Senate Trade Subcommittee, saying: "I don't like the idea of Congress managing trade policies, but we have no alternative." John Heinz, Chairman of the Republican Senatorial Committee

and an influential lawmaker on the trade issue saying: "I think the Administration is becoming more practical. There is growing realization at the White House that many of the issues the Administration has had on the back burner or even didn't know were cooking in the kitchen, like trade, will not go away." Roger Stone, a Republican political strategist said that the stakes are high in terms of controlling the agenda and also said: "Reagan was an activist president in his first term. He cannot afford in his second term to be a stand-pat political figure. He can't just say, 'I'm a free trader, and that's the end to the trade problem.'" And finally, Fred Bergsten, Democrat and Director of the Institute for International Economics has stated: "There is a mistaken impression in Congress that changes in the trade policy would turn around the deficit." Bergsten estimates that ending other countries' unfair trade practices and protecting some American industries would shave only \$10 billion from the \$150 billion trade deficit.

This is the political climate Ambassador Yeutter faces as he attempts to guide U.S. trade policy—and I don't envy him. While obviously some of our problems have been beyond our control, the truth is, we are responsible for much of the dreary trade picture. The complex relationships between domestic and international goals have been either misunderstood, ignored or both. The White House primarily, and to a lesser extent, the Congress, have failed to appreciate that domestic economic policy has a direct effect on the United States' external position.

So let me begin my remarks by next listing a few givens so far as trade is concerned.

1. An open trading system is absolutely essential.
2. There is no real open trading system today. What we call an open trading system is just not working—it's broken—so we better try to fix it.
3. The GATT is weak, and in many ways ineffective, but it is essential and must be strengthened. But if we rely on the GATT alone, we won't make it.
4. It's hard to find a sector or industry where free trade really exists. It doesn't exist in copper, and it doesn't exist in wheat, it doesn't exist in autos, and it doesn't exist in corn. It doesn't exist in steel, or textiles and it doesn't exist in telecommunications—to name a few.
5. More and more, trade is government managed. Our industries and farmers compete with governments, not people and companies.
6. If we don't come to grips with the present deteriorating situation, the forces of protectionism will substantially close the doors on world trade as we have known it for 40 years.

To those givens, I would add, that in my judgment, there are no simple, easy or quick answers. As a matter of fact, we haven't identified any hard and difficult answers. But there are strategies to be put in place to begin the long and arduous road to a better trade climate for the free world.

Today's trade problems are entirely new and different from those cast against the background of World War II. This is not 1944 in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire. Simply stated, the world has changed and the United States, through Republican and Democratic administrations alike, has not adapted to that change.

The country's trade problems cannot really be solved until we understand the

global impact of our domestic policies, put our economy on solid ground and live within our means. Moderate progress in highly visible areas such as inflation, while significant, is masking a basic erosion of our economic strength. Let me offer an example.

The Administration recently announced that unemployment has been reduced to 7 percent—an encouraging development, but not surprising given the Keynesian economic policies the Reagan Administration has been pursuing. However, with each passing day, one reads stories in the press of Fortune 500 companies deciding to close modern plants in the United States and transfer production abroad. How long can it continue—where will it end? There is no question that the merchandise trade deficit, if not corrected and corrected soon, could have long-term consequences for the U.S. economy. In recent days the Administration has announced that it will work the Congress to develop a new trade legislative package. I hope this effort is successful, but we must recognize that it is no substitute for a set of economic policies aimed at solving our basic problems. Domestic policy can't be made in a vacuum in the United States, Europe or Japan. What each does at home has dramatic impact abroad.

While closed markets and predatory practices have taken their toll and must be addressed, there are three additional and fundamental causes of the merchandise trade deficit. First is the differential growth rates which have distinguished the United States from its slower growing trading partners, particularly Japan and Europe; second, the huge debt of developing countries which has significantly impaired their ability to purchase our exports; and finally, the massive overvaluation of the dollar.

The single most important thing we can do to restore equilibrium to exchange markets is to reduce our budget deficit. To do so in today's political climate requires budget cuts and increased taxes, and both seem unlikely in the light of Administration policy and Congressional attitudes. Nevertheless, there are certain things the Administration could be doing to begin to talk the dollar in off the ledge, including but not limited to creditable statements to intervene in exchange markets where appropriate, pick up on Secretary Baker's initiative regarding reform of the monetary system and more vigorously encourage the Japanese to adopt policies aimed at gradually reducing the massive capital outflows which should appreciate the yen and lower the dollar. In addition, the Administration should pursue its plans with respect to trade legislation and continue to urge multilateral trade negotiations. This sort of program is doable, is not pie-in-the-sky and gets closer to attacking the fundamental causes of our trade problems and would help quell the protectionist fires now raging in Congress.

Let me now change the thrust of my remarks a bit and look at a few specific situations, beginning with Japan. Frank Gibney, in his superb new book, makes the point well that since World War II, the Japanese have continued to think of themselves as a vulnerable, semi-developed and resource-poor country pushing intensely to keep up. And further, that Japan has nurtured a semi-dependent attitude toward the United States that sacrifices a great deal in the relationship in return for American tolerance of Japanese marketing successes. Japan obviously is willing to pay a high political price for continued U.S. economic indulgence.

Gibney points out America's self-images are no less illusory. That we have appointed ourselves the world's arbiter in all fields and have been so impressed with our position and importance that we have neglected the hard work necessary to stay in that position. We live in the memory of a world that no longer exists and we have totally overlooked the unraveling of our economic position. Now we find ourselves, by virtue of neglect and self-indulgence, debtors instead of creditors. This, combined with Japan's policies, has brought on the Japan-bashing over trade imbalances that could easily destroy a relationship we both need.

Our theory seems to be when in trouble, spend and consume, and theirs just the opposite, when in trouble save and produce more for export. Japan must stimulate domestic demand through increased private and public spending.

We are familiar with tariff and non-tariff barriers, unfair trade practices and other actions standing in the way of free trade. Something must be done about them. We must really toughen up in dealing with our partners. But few in the business or political community seem to understand that while attacking the problem of closed markets and predatory trade practices is absolutely essential, it will only marginally reduce our trade deficit if we don't simultaneously deal with the basic underlying causes.

I'm not trying to make an excuse for the protectionism embedded into the Japanese system. They deserve a great deal of the public criticism they get, but they are not alone. And we surely can't expect them to disrupt their economic structure to appease our political forces. A long-term solution requires that their economy be operated with sensitivity to its impact on the economic and political relationship with this country, just as our policies must be made with recognition of their impact not only at home, but in Japan, Europe and the rest of the world.

My purpose tonight is not to pass judgment on where we have been. There's plenty of blame to go around. The revival of our national spirit accomplished by President Reagan has not and will not solve our critical trade problem caused by neglect. To do that, the President must take the lead in forging a real debate which results in a policy for this country that will lead us forward with a meaningful, effective, hard-hitting, progressive trade posture for this country and indeed the free world. It's absolutely essential that the free world leadership, led by Ronald Reagan with his popularity base, address itself to global solutions. Together, the U.S., Japan, the EC and Canada, with sensitivity to the needs of the Third World, as well as to their excesses, must strike a major global bargain and enter into a compact. A compact in which the parties agree to take the kind of steps that are politically impossible for any one of them to make alone. Out of such a trade summit must come a simultaneous, long-term commitment for action with each of the four putting enough on the table to make it politically viable for the others to go along. It isn't going to be easy, and it's only the beginning of a process. The domestic politics are dramatic and the policy changes take years to implement.

The U.S., among other things, must be prepared to commit itself to take some of the steps we've discussed tonight. The EC must agree, among other things, to deal with the agricultural mess their subsidies are creating around the world. And the Jap-

anese must take the actions mentioned, including dealing aggressively with their industrial procurement policies and other non-tariff barriers. President Reagan has the popular support and he should spend it here.

And now in closing, let me be clear that these criticisms of the world trading system are not partisan, nor are they an argument for protectionism. It's a frank recognition of the problems we face and a call for the beginning of an effort to avoid an almost certain course of protectionism that will have a devastatingly negative impact at home and abroad. There's much more than just dollars involved. A free world mired in protectionism and trade wars is not a healthy world in which to keep peace. The poison spills over into all of our other international relationships.

As long ago as 1844, Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote a few lines about trade and America that are pertinent for all of us today. He said: The philosopher and lover of man have much harm to say of trade, but historians will see that trade was the principle of liberty, that trade planted America and destroyed feudalism, that it makes peace and keeps peace, and it will abolish slavery.

AL HUNT OF WALL STREET JOURNAL ON HOW PROTECTIONISM IMPERILS U.S. LEADERSHIP AND PROSPERITY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the new idea Democrats are centering their hopes for a renaissance of the Democratic Party on a protectionist philosophy. But I wonder if they realize they are taking up the mantle of the old time Republicans who brought on the 35-year eclipse of the Republican Party and helped precipitate the Great Depression?

In 1929 Republican Congressmen lead the fight for the disastrous Smoot-Hawley tariff, which most experts believed helped instigate the Great Depression. Not only did Smoot and Hawley lose the next election, but their tariff caused the Republican Party to become synonymous with austerity and tax increases for many years.

Now Democrats are doing their best to assume the role as the Party of trade barriers, isolationism, and withdrawal. I say you're welcome to it. But austerity will not win you any elections.

But won't protectionism allow Democrats to reclaim the high ground of patriotism? Not likely. The American people know that protectionism has nothing to do with patriotism or affirming U.S. leadership. In fact protectionism is the abdication of U.S. world leadership, borne of the belief that our international leadership is a burden rather than an awesome privilege and advantage.

Protectionists don't believe in America "standing tall and proud," they believe that America is declining, in retreat from its ideals and leadership, insecure of its own faith. They would have us fail our own people and the hopes of the world. How

else can one describe policies that would close the gates on imports and punish our allies, including Third-World nations reeling under heavy debt, with beggar-thy neighbor policies?

We need more active U.S. leadership, not a hunker down mentality. We can and should do more to force foreign nations to open up their markets to the U.S. goods; we should dispense with the floating exchange rates which have caused chaos and instability in world trade and investment; we should stop the deflation which is wrecking havoc on agriculture, mining, and other basic industries. We should encourage other countries to lower their tax rates to spur world growth and U.S. exports.

But the United States is not at economic war with Japan or Asian nations as some have suggested. We don't need a stick in the closet, we need a partnership for world progress and growth. We cannot separate ourselves from the world community—even if we wanted to. The world economy is simply too interdependent. The world community can and must prosper together because it can't prosper separately as the following article suggests.

I encourage my colleagues to read Albert R. Hunt's insightful Wall Street Journal article, September 24, 1985, "No Democratic Majority in Assailing Imports" because it sends our Congress a clear message: protectionism is bad economics but even worse politics.

I hope all my colleagues read Mr. Hunt's outstanding article and reflect on the lessons of history.

NO DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY IN ASSAILING IMPORTS

(By Albert R. Hunt)

This seems to be the age of espionage, so here's a new spy theory: Jim Chapman is a Republican mole.

Mr. Chapman is the newest member of the House of Representatives, elected, as a Democrat, in a special East Texas contest last month. He frustrated Republican hopes of winning that seat, conventional wisdom here says, because of the trade issue, thus giving many dispirited Democrats visions that protectionism may be a key to their political salvation in the 1980s.

To be sure, other factors are fueling the protectionist tide, which President Reagan is trying to stem with a tough speech yesterday and plans to intervene in the world's financial markets to lower the value of the dollar. More than 300 trade bills have been introduced, protecting everything from textiles and shoes to roses and water beds. As the trade deficit soars to \$150 billion and the U.S. becomes a net debtor nation for the first time in 71 years, the business community is turning more protectionist, and anti-Japanese sentiment, in particular, is on the rise.

It's not only Democrats who're clamoring for action. Top GOP lawmakers, such as Sen. Robert Dole and Rep. Robert Michel, returned from the August congressional recess demanding some tough measures to correct the burgeoning trade deficit.

DEMOCRATS MAY BE MISCALCULATING

But it's the Democrats, following Jim Chapman's win, who see big political dividends. "There is no question we won the Texas election as a result of trade dominat-

ing the debate . . ." gloats House Democratic campaign chief Rep. Tony Coelho. Three of the party's heavyweights—House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dan Rostenkowski, Rep. Richard Gephardt and Sen. Lloyd Bentsen—are proposing to impose stiff tariffs on imports from Japan and a few other nations if their trade situation with the U.S. doesn't improve.

These Democrats, however, may be making a major miscalculation. Two of the party's smartest poll takers, with different perspectives—Greg Schneiders, a top adviser to Sen. John Glenn's presidential campaign, and Patrick Caddell, the party's enfant terrible and adviser last year to Sen. Gary Hart—reach similar conclusions about the protectionist issue: It's an ill-fated, backward-looking attempt to revive the party's old coalition, and is full of risks.

"The Democrats simply equate trade with jobs, while the Republicans better understand that values are the driving force here," worries Mr. Schneiders. "I can see Reagan going on the offensive, talking about restoring traditional values, such as hard work, commitment to excellence and international competitiveness, and leaving the Democrats behind."

Mr. Caddell sees the protectionist pitch as "extremely defensive and negative, as opposed to fashioning a positive, activist high ground." This approach, he fears, is bound to turn off young voters "who constitute the Democrats' single biggest problems."

Moreover, the Democrats may be misreading the reasons behind Jim Chapman's election. Trade became an issue when the Republican candidate, Edd Hargett, said that he didn't understand "what trade has to do with jobs in East Texas." That added to the perception that Mr. Hargett, a former Texas A&M football player, was a brighter light on the gridiron than in the political arena.

But GOP polls suggest the Republican's identification this summer with curbing Social Security benefits was the real factor. Right before the election, only 9% of the voters agreed that Mr. Hargett didn't "understand issues related to jobs," which is how the Democrats presented the trade issue. But 2½ times as many voters, or 22%, thought the GOP aspirant was "soft" on protecting Social Security.

"Trade paled in importance next to Social Security," says Lee Atwater, the top GOP strategist who directed the Hargett campaign.

Indeed, public opinion on protectionism is elusive. There is no doubt that public awareness and concern over trade has grown recently, but the depth of protectionist sentiment is very uncertain.

Kevin Phillips, one of the shrewdest political analysts in America, thinks trade protectionism may be the most important emerging political issue of this decade. But, as this paper's Art Pine reported on a recent foray to Tennessee, the deeper the conversation about trade the less clear-cut the views. Asked about foreign imports, one man replied: "You know, they don't force us to buy these things; people buy them because they want to." Any measure that increases prices or restricts market choices usually doesn't meet with strong public support.

So why did all these lawmakers return from their summer sojourns proclaiming the public is demanding tough action on trade? Mainly it reflects pressure from selected business interests. "All the talk about protectionism is coming not from their con-

stituents but from their campaign contributors," ventures public-opinion expert William Schneider of the American Enterprise Institute.

There already are indications that the closer politicians get to protectionism the more apprehensive they become. For example, Rep. Marcy Kaptur, a liberal Toledo, Ohio, Democrat, discovered that a big umbrella company in her district imports metal frames and that a surcharge would send the price on those umbrellas soaring. "For a community like mine, which depends on both imports and exports," Rep. Kaptur told Congressional Quarterly, "I could see a [protectionist] bill hurting my district."

This isn't a new phenomenon. A dozen years ago the Burke-Hartke protectionist trade bill was given a serious chance of enactment; it never even got serious consideration. A few years ago, domestic-content legislation protecting the auto industry was hot; it then fizzled. Presidential candidates John Connally, a Republican, and Walter Mondale, a Democrat, tried to parlay tough trade talk into the Oval Office; both faltered badly.

This doesn't mean the Reagan administration isn't vulnerable on the trade issue. Contentions that the administration has taken the high road on trade or that the public is squarely behind the president are naive nonsense. This administration has either been inconsistent—talking free trade while bowing to piecemeal protectionist pressures from textile, steel, auto and motorcycle lobbyists among others—or tepid and tardy in its response, such as last weekend's vow to intervene in the international currency markets. Vice President Bush's threat of "no more Mr. Nice Guy" on trade provokes only sneers and laughter.

This leaves plenty of room for Democrats to pursue a more activist role, convincing a confused public that they're serious about the issue while steering clear of the economically and politically bankrupt road of massive tariffs and quotas. Two of the party's more future-oriented politicians, Sens. Bill Bradley and Gary Hart, are doing exactly that, calling, not surprisingly, for a much stronger government involvement.

Sen. Bradley wants the Federal Reserve to automatically intervene in international exchange markets and put together a strategic capital reserve whenever the U.S. trade deficit exceeds \$50 billion; he also advocates a modest import surcharge to finance retraining and job insurance for workers adversely affected by imports. Sen. Hart is calling for a new international monetary accord, more trade preferences for debt-ridden developing countries and expansion of the International Trade Commission's authority to act on unfair trade practices. These palliatives may or may not make sense, but politically they avoid the pitfalls of a pure protectionist approach.

The Democrats should avoid simple import-bashing, warns poll taker Greg Schneiders. "If the economy remains relatively strong throughout 1986, it's going to be exceedingly difficult to convince the public that their well-being is threatened by the trade deficit. But if there's a recession in 1986, any number of issues will work for the Democrats and many will work more powerfully and simply than protectionism."

Pat Caddell says the protectionist approach is very shortsighted. "You can win congressional districts with this and maybe even make a difference in some Senate elections," he notes. "But there is no national majority here."

So if the Democrats want to struggle to put parts of their old coalition together for individual elections, such as Jim Chapman's, trade may be their issue. But if they want to reclaim their role as the governing party in America, they should be wary of heeding the example of that GOP mole. For, just as in the world of espionage, those who follow moles in politics can find themselves relying on disinformation.

OPERATION EAGLE

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, this country has always believed that every individual can make a difference. It is one of the founding concepts of our democracy, and has made America the unique society that it is. When the Boeing Co. began to look for ways to increase productivity and cut down on waste, they returned to this basic principle, and launched Operation Eagle, a contest to get the best suggestions on increasing productivity at Boeing facilities from the people who really know—the individuals in their plants.

On Friday, September 27, the winners from each of Boeing's facilities will be here in Washington to be honored for their participation in Operation Eagle. I am pleased to have the opportunity to share with you the winning essay from Boeing Vertol written by one of my constituents, Donald J. Harris of Glenolden, PA. Mr. Harris' thoughts on how an individual can make a difference are truly winning ideas.

The essay follows:

BOEING VERTOL COMPANY

(By Donald Harris)

My idea on how the individual can make an even greater contribution to increasing productivity is as follows:

Whatever our job might be, we approach it each day in very much the same manner as our co-worker. The large majority of workers try to "do their best" as the saying goes. Unknowingly, they follow certain guide lines in turning in a productive day.

I believe every employee should sit down and list the guide lines they follow. With deeper thought, everyone could make additions to those guide lines. Any additions would certainly contribute to increased productivity. Maybe, some additions can be found from the following suggestions. Completely examine the next task prior to undertaking it. Know exactly what you're trying to accomplish.

Look for shortcuts in your tasks without sacrificing proficiency. These shortcuts may lead to good suggestions for others.

Find system to recheck yourself in almost everything you do. Show your enthusiasm for your job. Amazingly, it will rub off on others. Be on lookout for items and events that do not appear correct. You could help prevent errors or accidents.

Learn to communicate. Get your point across clearly to others and be certain you understand them.

Tactfully cut short long-winded conversations, even though work related.

SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT REINFORCES APARTHEID

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday in the New York Times, distinguished columnist Anthony Lewis discussed in his column the intensification of repression by the South African Government at home and military aggression abroad.

In his usual hard-hitting style, Mr. Lewis analyzes the South African Government's response to international efforts trying to force them to dismantle apartheid. I submit Mr. Lewis' article for the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 23, 1985]

SOUTH AFRICA SAYS NO

(By Anthony Lewis)

BOSTON.—After a period of seeming indecision, the South African Government has given its answer to demands for political change. The answer is to intensify repression at home and military aggression abroad.

That policy has been made devastatingly clear by events of the last two weeks. Internally, the Government has taken an increasingly tough line, using the whip and the bullet and the detention cell to silence its opponents. Externally, it has admitted for the first time, without regret, supporting terrorist campaigns against neighboring governments.

The use of violence by the white minority regime to maintain its monopoly of political power is nothing new. But the reported police brutality in recent weeks has been shocking in its scale and indiscriminate character.

A 3-year-old girl named Concilia Ngobeni was playing in her front yard in the black township of Saulsville, near Pretoria, on Sept. 10. According to local residents, a police van with three white policemen in it drove into the quiet neighborhood. A shot was heard, and Concilia died of a rubber bullet in the head.

On Sept. 18, police killed a 10-year-old boy in Elsie's River, a colored township near Cape Town. Witnesses said eight black policemen with whips, accompanied by two white policemen carrying rifles, assaulted residents in their homes and gardens.

Large numbers of children, as young as 7, have been taken in by the police in sweeps through townships. Often parents are not notified, and have to travel around to police stations and hospitals looking for their missing children.

The cruelty and violence of the police are not secrets. A study at Cape Town University reported this week that political detainees are tortured "systematically." U.S. diplomats have started to express concern at misconduct by soldiers and police since an emergency was declared on July 21.

Nearly 3,000 people have been detained under the emergency regulations, including most of the leaders of the United Democratic Front, a multiracial organization seeking nonviolent change. A key figure in the U.D.F., the Rev. Allan Boesak, was released last week but charged with subversion for, among other things, urging withdrawal of foreign investment from South Africa.

Those are just a few of the indicia of internal repression. What they add up to is not in doubt. The Government has decided that appearance is less important than power. Even its best friends must have trouble arguing any longer that it is on course for change. Can Jerry Falwell describe as "reformist" a regime that kills children?

The same disregard for outside opinion is evident in the Botha Government's policy toward Mozambique and Angola. Its admissions last week that it had intervened in both countries were unapologetic.

The Mozambique affair was a crude slap in the face of the Reagan Administration. It scored a triumph last year—or thought it did—when it helped to arrange the Nkomati accord between South Africa and Mozambique, each agreeing to respect the other's territorial and political integrity.

But South Africa went right on supplying the terrorist group Renamo, which has ravaged Mozambique. Suspicions to that effect were confirmed when a Renamo headquarters was captured. Last week the South African Foreign Minister, R. F. Botha, admitted that his Government had built a landing strip for Renamo, made air supply drops, and taken Renamo officers in and out by submarine. He called those "technical violations."

As to Angola, South Africa admitted giving military aid to the Unita, the rebel group headed by Jonas Savimbi. Like the Mozambique rebels, Mr. Savimbi uses terrorist tactics; his forces have shot down civilian planes and taken foreigners as hostages.

Here again American diplomacy is given the back of the hand. The Reagan Administration has worked for four years to arrange a peaceful settlement of the conflicts involving Angola, South Africa and neighboring Namibia. As in Mozambique, it relied on South African promises, one of which was to withdraw all forces from Angola.

Will it work, can South Africa's white government once again defy the majority of its own people, and outside opinion, and work its will by force?

No one should underestimate the power of Pretoria. It can roll over its neighbors and put endless thousands of South Africans in prison. But there is a difference this time: The economic system that has given white South Africans so much is not going to keep working—not, at least, if the outside world uses the levers of influence that it now knows it has.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY ENLARGEMENT SEEN HURTING U.S. EXPORTS

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, if you think we have agricultural trade problems now, wait until the European Community completes its enlargement next January to include Spain and Portugal.

I would like to include in the RECORD a description of the problems which will be created for American agricultural exports to Europe. It is an article by H. Peter Dreyer which appeared in the Journal of Commerce and which I found reprinted in

the magazine Europe, September/October 1985, a publication of the EC Commission.

I would, Mr. Speaker, take the article's closing paragraphs with a large grain of salt—and even if true, the question for American farmers is "What about the next few years?"

For the reasons mentioned in the article, I have introduced a House joint resolution urging that the administration explain to the Congress, now, what it is going to do to prevent injury to America's trading interests once the enlargement occurs. We do not need a repetition of the Greek enlargement experience, where our trade fell dramatically.

The article follows:

E.C. ENLARGEMENT SEEN HURTING U.S. EXPORTS—GRAIN SHIPMENTS FACE PRINCIPAL THREAT WHEN SPAIN, PORTUGAL JOIN

(By H. Peter Dreyer)

On January 1, 1986, Spain and Portugal are to join the European Community. This is an event which the United States unreservedly favors. It is, after all, fully in line with the European policy objectives the United States has pursued throughout almost four decades now and which have made Washington a staunch champion of European integration since the days of the Paris and Rome treaties establishing the E.C. and of the extensions which followed.

In this particular case there exists one more weighty reason for U.S. approval. While it is too early yet to evaluate the prospects for the Spanish referendum next year on the country's membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)—which the United States was most anxious to secure—there can be no doubt whatever that those prospects would be much gloomier had Spain failed to get into the E.C.

But if the political vistas of the forthcoming enlargement of the E.C., as perceived by Washington, thus are clear and positive, that is not the case at all on the economic side. For one thing, uncertainties seem to prevail. For another, according to present expectations, the impact may be distinctly negative. And last but not least, it is only too likely that the negotiations which must follow Spanish and Portuguese accession will add one more to the long list of irritants, not to say areas of potential confrontation, now characterizing the U.S.-E.C. relationship.

Why the uncertainties? They are not perhaps all that surprising. The membership negotiations were only completed in early June. Only then was it possible to start assessing the effect which a host of specific terms and understandings finally agreed on may have on dealings with the outside world.

Just as obviously, this effect was not and could not have been expected to be a major matter of concern to the negotiating parties during their protracted and wearying efforts to hammer out the ultimate accord. Countries which had reason to fear that Spain's membership in particular might pose a threat to vital export opportunities, like Israel and Morocco, may have made protesting noises all along, but there was little more they could do until now.

It is only at this stage—that is, after the conclusion of the negotiations—that the E.C. Commission has turned to the problem (and plans to send appropriate proposals to the E.C. Council of Ministers in early fall) of how to maintain at existing levels the

flow of trade of such produce as citrus fruit, tomatoes, potatoes, olive oil and wine from countries around the Mediterranean to the E.C. For it is afraid of the adverse social and eventually political consequences to be excluded from the E.C. market on which they depend so largely.

Naturally, no comparable situation exists with respect to future U.S. exports or, for that matter, other industrial nations like Canada or Japan once Spain and Portugal are inside the E.C. Were they to be jeopardized, there is surely no reason to assume that there would also be a matching social and political fallout.

But does the United States stand to lose? Are American exports to Spain and Portugal, which last year (on an f.o.b. basis) totaled respectively \$2.6 billion and just under \$1 billion, at risk now? U.S. observers answer these questions unhesitatingly in the affirmative. Furthermore, they are convinced that as a result of the enlargement, U.S. exports will be exposed to other (actual as well as potential) adverse impacts as well, and that such commercial benefits as may also develop will not be sufficient to offset the anticipated minuses.

The principal threat is that facing American grain shipments—corn to Spain, wheat and corn to Portugal—plus other agricultural sales to those two countries which add up at present to around \$2 billion annually. They are not expected to disappear overnight, but a certain erosion is likely to set in right away.

Both Iberian peninsula countries, as they gradually adjust to the E.C.'s Common Agricultural Policy, are certain also to follow the process well under way in E.C. countries where some corn is still imported for starch, but no longer for feed purposes. Other cereals, notably barley, are now substituted. Within a few years, therefore, the two new members probably will import French barley rather than American corn.

Theoretically, it would be possible for Spain and Portugal to step up their purchases of U.S. soybean products, thereby compensating for the anticipated reduction of cereal imports. It is not, however, very probable that they will. On the contrary, fears clearly persist that an oils and fats tax—which has been talked about in the E.C. for many years and which would deal a severe blow to U.S. soybean sales to the Community—might move several steps closer to reality and realization in the 12-member E.C.

There will be losses elsewhere, too. The United States currently ships about \$500 million a year worth of nuts, fruit and a variety of other fresh and processed horticultural products to the E.C. Yet, in future, it is bound to be Spain which will sell such goods to its then E.C. partners.

Nor is the outlook all that encouraging when it comes to industrial products. The central element is that as Spanish and Portuguese customs duties which currently are mainly on the high side gradually adjust to the E.C.'s Common External Tariff, they should come down a little and thus bestow benefits also on exporters from third countries. It is quite possible therefore that American suppliers may discover new or additional opportunities in areas where competition from firms in the Community is weak.

But where competition is strong, the shoe is very much on the other foot. After the transition period is over, products from E.C. countries will have duty-free access to the Iberian peninsula market, whereas those

from the United States will remain confronted with a tariff wall. This comparative disadvantage may well make itself felt even during the transition years, if the case of Greece is anything to go by. Imports there from other E.C. countries have increased since Greece joined the Community, while those from the United States has receded.

Here again uncertainty reigns within the E.C., work is still proceeding—and not expected to be completed before some time in the fall—on the line-by-line drafting of a new Common External Tariff which ideally should represent a trade-weighted combination of the existing E.C. tariff and Spanish and Portuguese tariffs. Only after that has been done will it be ascertainable where the United States and other third countries would post gains or losses. This process, in turn, is the precondition for the opening—perhaps in April 1986—of the required negotiations under Article 24 (5) and (6) of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT].

As matters stand even now, and in the light once more of what has happened with Greece where those negotiations still have not been brought to a harmonious end, this situation contains the seed of still another U.S.-E.C. conflict. The GATT rules, stating that the duties applied by an enlarged E.C. should not on the whole be higher than the duties applicable before, are obviously not very concise.

In these circumstances, E.C. negotiators not only are certain to insist that their new Common External Tariff is not more restrictive than the pre-enlargement state of affairs. They may go further even and claim, or so U.S. officials suspect, that on balance the new Common Extended Tariff will benefit the United States which therefore owes the E.C. a credit, to be "paid off" conceivably in the form of raised E.C. duties on, say, some U.S. agricultural products. Such a conclusion—as yet, of course, hypothetical—the United States would view as both illegal under GATT and generally unacceptable.

What all this adds up to is that, as far as it can be ascertained at this stage, the effect of the E.C. enlargement on U.S. commerce will produce little cheer. Yet for the longer term there may well be a silver lining to this cloud, too.

Throughout the E.C.'s history, and somewhat contrary to original assumptions, the European integration process and the growth of prosperity it brought with it have paid handsome dividends overall to American business. The expanding activities of U.S. firms in Europe have been a vital part of this. Hence the thought is surely neither unrealistic nor unreasonable that, should the Spanish and Portuguese economies achieve "quantum leaps" through E.C. membership, American enterprises ought to be among the ultimate beneficiaries once more.

THE CTB AND MEGATONNAGE FEVER

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, in an op-ed piece that appeared in yesterday's Washington Post, the distinguished gentleman from

Illinois [Mr. HYDE] made an argument against negotiation of a comprehensive test ban treaty that took my breath away. He stated that a CTB would actually "feed the arms race by increasing, or at least maintaining, U.S. megatonnage, precisely at a time when we are trying to minimize this aspect of our strategic forces through defense research and development as well as arms control efforts in Geneva."

I thought I had heard most of the arguments that CTB opponents generally use: Arguments over verification, the need for reliability testing, and the possibility of Soviet cheating. But never before have I heard that a CTB is a bad idea because it will fuel an arms race in missile megatonnage.

I see little support for the gentleman's contention that "we are trying to minimize this aspect of our strategic forces through research and development as well as arms control efforts at Geneva." On the contrary, as a result of our current research and development efforts, the yields of U.S. strategic warheads are now increasing, not decreasing. From what I can tell, the Geneva arms talks have focused on reducing numbers of warheads and launchers, which would indirectly reduce the overall megatonnage of both sides' arsenals, but have little impact on the yield of individual warheads in the arsenal.

The gentleman from Illinois is correct in suggesting that the older heavy megatonnage warheads would have caused a great deal of "collateral damage" in a nuclear war, but forgets to mention that both sides have been moving toward more accurate warheads with high yields that will make them much more lethal and destabilizing "counterforce" weapons. The new warheads do not seem to have been designed to minimize collateral damage to populations, but to maximize their capability to pulverize the opponent's military forces. And that is going to cause a lot of casualties, for there is no such thing as a "surgical" nuclear strike.

The distinguished gentleman also has forgotten to mention that in the absence of a comprehensive test ban, the Soviet Union will be free to develop and test smaller warheads with improved yield-to-weight ratios (the maximum yield that can be obtained from a warhead of a given weight). If the Soviets are allowed to develop and test warheads with the yield-to-weight ratios of their American counterparts, they could take advantage of the high throw-weight of their missiles to dramatically increase the number of warheads deployed in their arsenal. I doubt very much that the gentleman would like to see such a development.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues that the overall yield of the U.S. nuclear stockpile peaked in 1960, and then declined as we replaced inaccurate high-yield single warhead missiles with more accurate, lower-yield MIRV'ed missiles. At the same time, we phased out many of our older high-yield, bomber-delivered gravity bombs. The yield of our weapons is now on the rise again, as succeeding generations of warheads are developed, tested, and de-

ployed with improved yield-to-weight ratios.

According to the Congressional Research Service, the Minuteman I ICBM was first deployed in 1962 with a single 1-megaton W59 warhead. The Minuteman II was initially deployed 2 years later with single 1-2-megaton W56 warhead. Five years later, the Minuteman III became operational with three 170-kiloton W62 warheads. By 1979, technological improvements permitted the United States to replace these warheads with three 375-kiloton W78 warheads. The first MX missile will be deployed in 1986 with 10 W87 warheads, each possessing an estimated yield of 300 kilotons. CRS reports that the follow-on Midgeman missile is expected to be deployed in 1992 with a warhead having a yield of 300-475 kilotons.

Our sea-based strategic forces have undergone similar changes over the years. When the Polaris SLBM's were initially deployed in 1962, they were armed with a single 800-kiloton W47 warhead. When the Polaris was MIRV'ed in the mid-sixties, it was armed with three 200-kiloton W58 warheads. The Poseidon SLBM, first deployed in 1971, was armed with an average of 10 40-kiloton W68 warheads. More recently, SLBM warhead yields have been on the increase. First, the Trident I missile became operational in 1979 with eight 100-kiloton W76 warheads. Now, the administration plans to deploy a follow-on Trident II missile with eight W88 warheads that reportedly will have a yield of 475 kilotons apiece.

The Soviet nuclear arsenal has also moved away from large single warhead missiles to MIRV's of increasing explosive yield. For example, the SS-18 (Mod 1) was first deployed in 1974, armed with a single 24-megaton warhead. The most recent modification of this mammoth missile—Mod 4—provides the SS-18 with 10 500-kiloton warheads.

Both sides are introducing more accurate MIRV'ed missiles with warheads of increasing yield because both want weapons with the combination of high-yield and accuracy that gives them a capability to destroy hardened targets such as missile silos and command control centers. Though I share the gentleman from Illinois' concern over the indiscriminate destructive power of high-yield nuclear warheads, I am somewhat skeptical that in a nuclear war, the detonation of thousands of nuclear warheads—each with a yield of hundreds of kilotons—is going to be very clean or discriminate. Moreover, I think we should all be concerned that the improved counterforce capabilities such warheads provide will threaten strategic stability.

A CTB would actually slow the arms race and prevent the Soviets from taking advantage of the greater throw-weight of their missiles to put larger numbers of more accurate MIRV'ed warheads on missiles such as the SS-18. As John Pike argues in an article in this month's Federation of American Scientists Public Interest Report, this would preserve the U.S. advantage in light-weight, efficient warheads. I would think that both the gentleman from Illinois and

the administration would see some value in preserving the American advantage in this area.

The gentleman from Illinois assumes that the Soviets will be forced to continue to rely on bigger, more destructive warheads, and fears that under a CTB, the Soviets may be unable to test smaller, less destructive warheads. Fortunately, others are not so sanguine about the military consequences of continued Soviet testing. Perhaps that is why the distinguished chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee recently argued in favor of a CTB by reminding his colleagues in the other body that a comprehensive test ban treaty would stop menacing Soviet developments while preserving the technological edge the United States enjoys in their nuclear warheads.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to insert in the RECORD the op-ed piece by the gentleman from Illinois and the aforementioned article by John Pike:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 25, 1985]

TEST BAN FEVER—WITH AN EMPHASIS ON
IMAGE, NOT SECURITY
(By Henry J. Hyde)

Recently, one of my colleagues from the Senate, Democrat Carl Levin of Michigan, made a plea for the revival of Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban talks with the Soviet Union [op-ed, Sept. 19]. While he offered several reasons for a resumption of these talks, his bedrock argument was that if we failed to do so, we would almost certainly receive a "diplomatic black eye from our closest friends," thus "embarrassing us" on the eve of the Reagan-Gorbachev summit.

The linkage between political considerations and national security policy is perhaps inevitable, but I fail to see the wisdom of advocating—at this critical pre-summit juncture—what has been a Soviet propaganda proposal for years.

President Reagan has stated repeatedly that he will not resume negotiations on a Comprehensive Test Ban (CTB) Treaty at the present time for one very important reason: our nation's security. Levin says we should continue, but for public relations reasons, which he somehow finds compelling. In any weighing of national security concerns against public relations considerations, the scales had better tilt toward security.

This entire issue, the banning of all nuclear testing, has grave consequences for our nation's security, not merely for our image abroad. Moreover, although Levin believes that our allies may reject our unwillingness to immediately negotiate a CTB, it is worth remembering that these same allies depend upon a credible, U.S. nuclear deterrent. Nuclear testing plays an essential role in maintaining this deterrent in view of the massive and ongoing Soviet nuclear force modernization, as well as a lack of substantive Soviet nuclear arms reduction proposals at Geneva.

Overall, it is cause for worry that some prominent political figures have seized upon this issue, politicized it and treat it as a soft "confidence building measure," which it certainly is not. This attempt to decouple nuclear testing from national security is demonstrated by the fact that House Democrats have placed a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty resolution on the legislative fast track. Talk about "friends and allies" trying

to embarrass the president on the eve of the summit! It seems that our armchair arms controllers have decided to take that upon themselves, at a time when bipartisan support for the president and our Geneva negotiators is imperative.

The Democrats' proposal, H.J. Resolution 3, will probably be before the House in early October. It is composed of two parts. Part one calls upon the President to submit the unratified Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty (PNET) and Threshold Test Ban Treaty (TTBT) to the Senate for ratification. The second part calls upon the President to resume immediately negotiations with the Soviet Union on a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Many experts, including our chief negotiator of PNET and TTBT, Ambassador Walter Stoessel Jr., seriously question whether either of these treaties can be adequately verified. In fact, in recent public testimony before Congress, Dr. Donald Kerr, the director of the Los Alamos National Laboratory, pointed out that on at least one occasion a Soviet test, which we knew about, was not seismically detected.

H.J. Resolution 3, by demanding that the United States resume immediately negotiations with the Soviet Union on a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, overlooks some recent history—namely, that it was Jimmy Carter, not Ronald Reagan, who cut off CTB negotiations with the Soviets for several reasons, among them the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The Democratic leadership seems to prefer political opportunism over common sense in this instance. Clearly a nuclear test ban is a logical follow-on to an arms reduction agreement, not a prelude to one. As an editorial in *The Post* Aug. 1 appropriately stated, "why give away through a test ban what the Soviet Union should be expected to pay in arms reductions. This is why a ban cannot be treated as a separate option distinguishable from the proposals on the table in Geneva."

Test ban proponents would have you believe that the best reason for a ban on all testing is that, as time passes, weapons makers simply won't trust their old systems and at the same time won't be able to test new ones. So, following this line of thinking . . . Voila! No more nuclear weapons, no more arms race. Unfortunately, the opposite will be the case.

Additionally, we must keep in mind that under a comprehensive test ban the nature of Soviet society and government would permit the Soviet Union to keep its most skilled technical people in their weapons program, whereas many U.S. experts would leave for more professionally active fields.

Nuclear testing is very significant for a number of reasons, but one of the most important is that it allows us to move away from large nuclear weapons with indiscriminate destructive power to smaller weapons designed to accomplish their military tasks more efficiently and with less collateral damage. A ban on testing will make this type of megatonnage reduction impossible, but it won't stop production. All nuclear weapons experts agree that the basic ability to build large, "dirty" nuclear weapons—able to accomplish their goals by brute destructive force—may always be available, without further testing.

So ironically, a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty—which has not been preceded by an arms reduction agreement—could well feed the arms race by increasing, or at least maintaining, U.S. megatonnage, precisely at a time when we are trying to minimize this

aspect of our strategic forces through defense research and development as well as arms control efforts in Geneva.

Furthermore, in the absence of an arms reduction agreement limiting warheads, yet in an environment in which both sides are tied down by a testing ban, the United States could find itself forced to build larger, more destructive and unsafe warheads in order to insure a continued strategic balance. At the same time, the Soviets, who already rely on bigger and more destructive warheads, will be forced to continue to do so, since they may be unable to test smaller, less destructive warheads. In essence, it could spark an arms race in megatonnage.

As congressional test ban advocates frame it, this issue turns the world on its head. For the Soviets it is merely a propaganda exercise of unilateral challenges and "moratoriums." For the United States, it is a matter of vital security. But one thing it is not—it is definitely not, as the Democratic leadership would have us believe, an innocuous confidence-building measure designed to save us "embarrassment" and show our "goodwill."

[From American Scientists Public Interest Report, September 1985]

MILITARY ADVANTAGE OF THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) would provide one military advantage for the United States that has been generally overlooked in the CTBT debate. The CTBT would preserve the continuing American lead over the Soviet Union in light-weight, efficient warheads. In the absence of a CTBT, the Soviets could significantly improve the yield-to-weight ratios (the maximum yield that can be obtained from a warhead of a given weight) of their warheads.

If the Soviets were to achieve the yield-to-weight ratios of American warheads, this could result in an effective doubling or tripling of the number of warheads on their missiles, without adding a single missile to their arsenal.

The United States had traditionally concentrated on small, solid-fueled missiles with limited payloads. Thus American weapons designers have had the incentives to improve yield-to-weight ratios in order to increase the number of warheads that each missile can carry, and to reduce the weight and cost of each missile. The Soviets until recently were content with large liquid-fueled missiles, and their warhead designers were not compelled to seek significant improvements in yield-to-weight ratios.

WHY YIELD-TO-WEIGHT RATIOS MATTER

Some Administration officials, including Paul Nitze and Richard Perle, have sought to make limitations on total missile payload (or throw weight) the principal objective of the current arms control talks (the total throw weight of American ballistic missiles today is about 2,000,000 kilograms; the Soviet figures is several times larger). They argue that payload is the best measure of the lethality of a missile. This might be true if Soviet and American yield-to-weight ratios were the same, but they are not.

Advocates of throw-weight limitations argue that if the Soviets were to take advantage of their substantial lead in throw weight they could achieve militarily significant advantages. Substantial increases in the number of Soviet warheads could improve their prospects for the destruction of

fixed land-based missiles. Perhaps even more important, additional warheads could also be used to barrage bombers, mobile missiles, and submarines, raising the spectre of new "windows of vulnerability." They could also be used to overwhelm an American anti-missile system designed to protect missile silos or cities.

CTBT AND THE PRESERVATION OF THE AMERICAN LEAD

In the absence of negotiated deep reductions in Soviet ballistic missile throw weight, the most direct means of preventing the Soviets from taking advantage of their current lead in missile throw weight would be by preventing them from improving the yield-to-weight ratio of their missile warheads. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is the best, if not the only, way of achieving this.

Improving the yield-to-weight ratio of a warhead is a difficult task, requiring the use of novel components and materials fitted together with very exacting tolerances. These improvements require extensive testing to verify that the design innovations work together as planned. Unlike stockpile confidence testing, which typically involves only the low-yield fission primary of a weapon, testing of an improved design requires testing at full yield, or at some significant fraction (perhaps 25 percent to 33 percent) of the full yield.

Limitations in Soviet warhead fabrication and manufacturing capabilities seem to have discouraged them from attempting the sophisticated and exacting designs that characterize American nuclear weapons. However, in the absence of a CTBT, there is nothing to preclude them from doing so in the future.—*John E. Pike.*

COMPUTERS AND CONGRESS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report for Wednesday, September 25, 1985, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COMPUTERS AND CONGRESS

Computers are one of the great stories of our time. They are the subject of press reports and conversation everywhere. I am fascinated to see how quickly they have become the dominant machine in offices in southern Indiana. The computer has changed the way we work and revolutionized the economy. It promises even greater changes. Computers have also changed the way Congress writes the federal budget, watches the executive branch, and deals with constituents and special interest groups.

The computer has drastically changed my work as a Congressman. Messages from constituents who call my Indiana office are relayed to me in Washington instantaneously. My schedule is set on the computer. I use a terminal to find out what bills will be voted on, and what amendments are under consideration. I can tap into the Library of Congress system for information ranging from the latest economic statistics to quotations from speeches on the House floor.

My computer also helps me prepare responses to constituent inquiries and re-

quests. The new technique of "direct mail" lobbying, in which interest groups prompt hundreds of voters to send cards and letters to Congress, initially overwhelmed many congressional offices. In 1973, Congress received 40 million pieces of mail. By 1984 that figure topped 200 million. In 1981, when the President asked voters to give Congress their views on the budget, the appeal produced 1.2 million letters. The new volume of correspondence forced members of Congress to turn to computers.

Computers help me take a more active part in local community development projects. I use my computer to track local projects and issues in the 21 counties of the 9th District, from water supplies to housing. A data base available from House Information Systems provides information and filing deadlines for federal grants.

Members of Congress use computers to keep track of Congress and its committees. Congress uses a service called LEGIS to track the 10,000 bills Congress considers each year. Updated daily, LEGIS is a valuable source of information on the status and content of pending legislation. The LEGIS office is contacted by phone over 1,000 times a day, and by direct computer link an uncounted number of times.

In 1970, Congress spent only \$732,000 on computers, mostly for payroll and book-keeping. Congress now owns about 7,500 computers, costing some \$30 million each year. Most committees and subcommittees in Congress, as well as the vast majority of members' offices, use them. My office is no exception.

By improving Congress's ability to monitor the Executive, computers have made the Congress a more competent partner in government. For example, computers help Congress prepare the federal budget with better and more accurate information. Each year the President delivers to Congress a budget and an Economic Report. These complex documents are debated throughout the following year as Congress works to develop a plan for federal spending. That debate has become better informed in recent years due to another item delivered to Congress: a copy of the Budget Office's computer tape, which has more detailed figures than the written budget. The tape is used to break down budget items by committee jurisdictions, quickly compare the President's budget with alternatives, and make independent judgments on its economic effects. Computers are also used to project the effect of changes in federal aid formulas or in tax law. They produce sophisticated reports on federal programs and how they are affected by different budget plans.

Congressional support agencies also rely on computers. Finding a book in the Library of Congress is now done at a terminal, as are research tasks like finding articles and reports. Before the introduction of computers, the card files used to catalogue the world's largest collection were so heavy the floor was in danger of collapsing. The creation of a nationwide network of cataloguing computers centered at the Library of Congress prevented this catastrophe and also spared 25,000 U.S. libraries the job of cataloguing new books.

Computers also aid the thousands of private groups whose task it is to watch Congress. At least three commercially-offered data bases designed to assist these groups monitor Congress. They provide lobbyists with valuable information on pending legislation and the voting records of members of Congress. As a result, voters across the

country have more information about the records of their representatives.

Congress still lags behind the private sector in computers. A group of businessmen visiting Congress in 1983 found office automation inferior to that in business. "We never saw anything that was state of the art," said one manager. The report blamed small office budgets and high staff turnover for the backwardness. The market's small size also discourages computer companies from designing systems for congressional use.

The computer does not solve all our problems. It even creates a few. Their effective use depends on people using them properly, something that happens less often than it should. Much of the new information goes unread. Computers are not cheap, and costs are frequently underestimated. Software programs can be inadequate, and learning to use a computer takes time. Each office uses a separate microcomputer. This makes computerizing Congress more expensive, and prevents the exchange of information between offices. But the alternative, one central computer for the whole Congress, would make information less private and secure. Separate computers also allow offices to tailor computer services to their needs.

Despite the problems, I expect the use of computers in Congress to accelerate. Their potential for strengthening communication between representatives and constituents is unlimited. I hope that in years ahead we will use computers to strengthen representative government itself.

THE POLITICS OF SUGAR

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, Mr. DOWNEY and I will be offering an amendment to H.R. 2100, the Food Security Act of 1985. Our proposal is to reduce gradually the price support for sugar over a 4-year period through a reduction in the nonrecourse loan rate. Yesterday, the Cincinnati Post published an editorial regarding the current sugar program. I urge my colleagues to consider the arguments of the Post as we take up the farm bill.

[From the Cincinnati Post, Sept. 23, 1985]

THE POLITICS OF SUGAR

In 1981, when the public's eye was on tax cuts, Congress passed a bill to support sugar growers in their accustomed style. To put the case starkly, the bill has cheated consumers out of billions of dollars a year, destabilized friendly nations in the Caribbean and built Soviet influence in a region President Reagan regards as vital to this country.

Congress insisted that the government lend growers 18 cents for every pound of raw sugar they produce. If the domestic price falls below that figure, the producers can forfeit the crop and not pay back the loans.

To keep unsalable sugar from weighing too heavily on the budget, the government maintains strict quotas on sugar imports. The system pushes the U.S. price for raw sugar to more than 20 cents a pound; the world price is below 5 cents.

For the benefit of only 11,000 domestic cane or sugar beet producers, consumers of

soft drinks, candy and bakery goods thus pay a huge hidden tax, one that boosts their cost of living.

For poor nations of the Caribbean Basin and Latin America, the quotas are devastating. Sugar, a vital commodity to them, is being pushed out of the American market, exacerbating poverty, joblessness and unrest. Dangerous rioting in the Dominican Republic and Jamaica in recent months can be attributed to sugar woes.

As U.S. sugar imports drop from 5 million tons in 1981 to an expected 1 million tons next year, the Soviet Union has more than tripled its sugar purchases from Caribbean countries other than Cuba. If one thinks those buys are made without political ambitions, one is being naive.

The sugar bill that did so much harm expires this year, and Congress is writing a new one. Given Congress' record, the bill will be bad. The public and the White House ought to demand phasing out of the unjustifiable price-support program, and the president should be brandishing his veto pen.

It would be far cheaper to pay sugar producers to shift to crops that can be grown efficiently here than to send foreign aid, and possibly troops, to prop up Caribbean democracies we are helping to undermine.

NEW SUPPLEMENTAL EXTRADITION TREATY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of concern expressed among my constituents regarding the new supplemental extradition treaty between the United States and the United Kingdom. The primary effect of this treaty, presently before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, would be to eliminate the political offense exception which protects against the use of American courts for the extradition of political fugitives whose crimes consist of authentic political dissent or rebellion. I share their deep concern that the U.S. Senate not act in haste in their deliberations and that the U.S. Government continue to facilitate a peaceful, workable solution toward achieving a unified Ireland.

The United States is party to upward of 100 bilateral extradition treaties. The governments of the countries to which these treaties apply range from constitutional democracies to repressive autocracies. Whatever the character of the particular foreign government however, every bilateral extradition treaty to which the United States is a party contains a provision excepting political offenders from extradition. Clearly the renegotiation of the extradition treaty between the United States and the United Kingdom to exclude the political offense exception is a matter of grave concern and deserves a long, careful study prior to any action by the Senate.

By analogy, if a similar treaty had existed 200 years ago between the United States and the United Kingdom, private United States citizens could have been extradited

to England and imprisoned for their part in America's war for independence from British rule.

In my capacity as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have for some time now been monitoring the tragic conflict in Northern Ireland. Having had the privilege to visit that troubled land, I was able to see first hand how persons being held for political crimes against the British Government are treated not as political prisoners, but as common, hardened criminals. I share the reluctance of many of my colleagues in Congress to permit the extradition from this country of persons accused of political crimes in other countries into a situation where these persons will be treated as criminals. Please bear in mind that the treaty currently in force between the United States and the United Kingdom addresses and permits the extradition of persons found guilty of violent crimes.

I was pleased to note that the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has announced that his committee will hold an additional day of hearings; bringing the total to 3. As I noted in a letter sent to Chairman LUGAR by myself and several of my colleagues here in the House, "the fact that the treaty establishes so many new precedents warrants that it be given full and careful consideration. It is interesting to note that this Supplemental Treaty is being considered within a time period just over 1 month. The original Extradition Treaty, signed in London on June 7, 1972, required 4 years to negotiate." I appreciate the time and care the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is taking in reviewing this vitally important matter.

I am offering for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and for the construction of my colleagues a letter sent to me by Hon. Andy O'Rourke, county executive of Westchester County, which lies within my district, discussing the new Supplemental Extradition Treaty. I believe Mr. O'Rourke provides a thoughtful analysis of the many issues surrounding the new Supplemental Extradition Treaty and I commend it to my colleague's attention:

WESTCHESTER COUNTY,
White Plains, NY, August 27, 1985.

HON. BENJAMIN GILMAN,
Member of Congress.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GILMAN: The New Supplemental Extradition Treaty between the United States and the United Kingdom is currently before the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. This treaty ought to be a matter of grave concern to all Americans who believe in the rule of law and in the Constitutional principle of separation of powers.

The immediate purpose of this proposed treaty seems to be to overturn the political offense exception, upheld in recent judicial decisions (E.g., U.S. District Judge John Sprizzo in December 1984 found that the case of Joseph Doherty, a member of the Irish Republican Army, presented "the political offense exception in its most classic form," and denied extradition to "Northern Ireland."). The proximate issue may be the continuing Anglo-Irish conflict in those six of the divided Irish Province of Ulster's nine counties known as "Northern Ireland," but

the ultimate question involves two heretofore exceptionless norms, principles if you will, of American diplomatic practice (i.e., the political offense exception to extradition) and of Constitutional law (i.e., judicial review).

The political offense exception protects against the use of American courts for the extradition of political fugitives whose alleged "crimes" consist of authentic political dissent or rebellion. It does not cover criminal anarchists, Sikh terrorists, the "Black Liberation Army" or the various so-called "Red Brigades." Neither does it cover any act which violates international law or is inconsistent with international standards of civilized conduct. What it is is an aspect of the humanitarian practice of granting political asylum in deserving cases.

The New Supplemental Extradition Treaty would in effect deny access to the judicial process for political offense extradition cases and instead substitute the political judgment of the State Department. Once the principle is violated in this one instance, the door is then opened to other foreign governments to demand the return of their political dissidents and/or rebels. Will Marcos of the Philippines come asking next, or the Communist Chinese? The same principle protects the Nicaraguan "Contras" and their supporters and protected Benjamin Franklin and John Adams in France during the American Revolution. Once violated, the principle will no longer be inviolate.

I urge you to visit the grave of Thomas Addis Emmett in the churchyard of Saint Paul's Chapel in New York City. Thomas Addis Emmett was a lawyer of international reputation, admitted to the New York Bar by acclamation. He was the first Attorney General of the State of New York. Thomas Addis Emmett was also the brother of the martyred Irish patriot, Robert Emmett, who led an ill-fated rebellion against English rule in Ireland in 1803. Upon learning that a warning has been issued for his arrest, Thomas Addis Emmett escaped to the United States, where he found political asylum. Had the proposed New Supplemental Extradition Treaty been in effect in 1803, Thomas Addis Emmett would have been extraditable to in all probability share his brother's fate of being "hanged, drawn and quartered."

It should be obvious, upon reflection, that any proposal to tamper with the principle of judicial review of political offense extradition cases must not be accepted in haste or in secret, but rather must be fully scrutinized and publicly reviewed before even the consideration of bringing the same to the full Senate. I therefore urge you to insist that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's hearings on the New Supplemental Extradition Treaty be full and open to the testimony of all interested parties. These hearings must consider the nature of the ongoing Anglo-Irish conflict and its current tragic manifestation in "Northern Ireland." The interest of the United States lies in the establishment of political, economic and military/naval stability in a part of the world which lies immediately beside the jugular vein of commerce and communication between North America and the rest of the North Atlantic community. Our foreign policy should actively seek a just and lasting peace for all Ireland and the corollary reconciliation of the "British" and Irish peoples.

Our primary concern must be the preservation of the principle of judicial review of political offense extradition requests.

Your expertise, developed generally through service on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and specifically with the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs, recommends your testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations committee.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of any assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

ANDREW P. O'ROURKE,
County Executive.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues I am placing in the RECORD today a letter I recently wrote to the Director of the National Science Foundation [NSF] concerning academic freedom and the use of supercomputers.

It has come to my attention that consideration is being given to imposing restrictive Federal controls over the supercomputers funded by the NSF and established at various universities. The academic freedom issue is over whether the universities should be policing the use of these machines by persons properly residing in this country.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE
AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, September 10, 1985.

Mr. ERICH BLOCH,
Director, National Science Foundation,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BLOCH: I have noted with some concern that consideration is being given to imposing restrictive federal controls over access to those supercomputers which have been established at various universities within the NSF program. In my view, and assuming that published reports are correct, this restriction on access to university supercomputers is contrary to the spirit of academic freedom.

I believe, firmly, that if we have information or processes that should be kept protected for the defense of the nation, they should be classified as such. We should guard the material carefully. On the other hand, if material is not to be classified, then universities should proceed in the time-honored tradition of openness and free inquiry. Above all, universities should not be put in the awkward situation of having to monitor or investigate the users of this equipment.

I trust that you, in your position, will be able to ensure that the traditions of academic freedom are maintained in the operation of the supercomputer centers. Please keep me informed if problems develop on this score.

Sincerely,

DON FUQUA,
Chairman.

THE INTRODUCTION OF A
HOUSE RESOLUTION RELAT-
ING TO VERTICAL RE-
STRAINTS GUIDELINES

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution today expressing the sense of the House that the vertical restraints guidelines published by the Department of Justice on January 23, 1985, do not have the force of law, do not accurately state antitrust law, and should not be considered by the courts of the United States as binding or persuasive. I am taking this step to provide the House Judiciary Committee and the House of Representatives with an alternative way to proceed in this matter.

Except for the change of form, the text of this House resolution is identical with House Concurrent Resolution 128, which I introduced on April 24 of this year. Even the 17 cosponsoring Members, including many who serve on the Judiciary Committee and its Monopolies and Commercial Law Subcommittee, are identical on both resolutions. While identical legislation—Senate Concurrent Resolution 56—has been introduced in the other body by Senators RUDMAN and METZENBAUM, its schedule has not been announced. Accordingly, we may choose to proceed by House resolution rather than by a resolution requiring the concurrence of our friends across the Hill.

I was encouraged recently by the adoption of a resolution similar to my own by the National Association of Attorneys General, meeting in July at Colorado Springs. This is now the official policy position of that organization, which is composed of the attorneys general of each of the 50 States. I believe the text of the NAAG resolution will be useful in helping Members inform themselves on this matter, and, accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that it appear at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I invite cosponsorship to this resolution by other Members who share my concern regarding the importance of vigorous and effective enforcement of our antitrust laws against resale price maintenance and other vertical restraints of trade.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS
GENERAL

RESOLUTION 1.—UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
JUSTICE VERTICAL RESTRAINTS GUIDELINES

Whereas, the United States Department of Justice published antitrust enforcement guidelines entitled "Vertical Restraints Guidelines" on January 23, 1985, which have been circulated to the judiciary, business community, and the public at large; and

Whereas, such Guidelines were issued with the avowed purpose of clarifying the enforcement policy of the Department of Justice's Antitrust Division with regard to non-price vertical restraints of trade and in so doing have purported to interpret and state what the current federal law is in the area of vertical restraints; and

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Whereas, the Antitrust Division has not filed any lawsuits challenging vertical restraints of trade in the past 55 months; and
Whereas, the Antitrust Division engaged in an "amicus intervention program" in the period 1981-1983, intervening in private antitrust suits where defendants were charged with vertical price-fixing, urging the courts to abandon the settled law that such price-fixing agreements were per se unlawful, and continued such amicus filings until Congress barred further activity in the Department of Justice appropriation for fiscal year 1984; and

Whereas, despite the stated purpose of clarifying policy in the area of non-price vertical restraints and despite the Supreme Court's recent refusal to overturn the rule that vertical price-fixing is per se unlawful in the case of *Monsanto v. Spray-Rite Service Corp.*, 104 S. Ct. 1464 (1984), the Guidelines clearly apply to certain vertical price-fixing agreements and treat these as subject to the "rule of reason" rather than settled per se rule; and

Whereas, the Guidelines misstate the law applicable to vertical restraints by totally excluding anticompetitive effects in intrabrand markets from the rule of reason analysis; and

Whereas, the Guidelines treat certain horizontal restraints of trade that are per se unlawful as though they were vertical restraints subject to rule of reason analysis; and

Whereas, the Guidelines adopt the position that certain vertical restraints are always lawful, when the lawfulness of such restraints can only be determined after a full rule of reason inquiry and such restraints have in certain cases been found unreasonable and illegal, thereby jeopardizing businesses that might rely upon the Guidelines in adopting these restraints; and

Whereas, the Guidelines misstate the rule of per se illegality applicable to certain restraints of trade and adopt an unprecedented modified rule of reason test in relation to certain restraints that are per se unlawful; and

Whereas, the Guidelines misstate the law applicable to tying arrangements despite the fact that the applicable law was recently clarified by the Supreme Court in the case of *Jefferson Parish Hospital District No. 2 v. Hyde*, 104 S. Ct. 1551 (1984); and

Whereas, the Guidelines misstate the law concerning the liability of corporations for acts of responsible corporate employees;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That it is the sense of National Association of Attorneys General that:

(1) The Vertical Restraints Guidelines issued by the Department of Justice on January 23, 1985, do not accurately reflect the judicial interpretation of the federal antitrust laws with regard to non-price vertical restraints of trade, vertical price-fixing agreements, the relevance of intrabrand competition, the application of per se rules, tying arrangements, the distinction between horizontal and vertical restraints, and the liability of corporations for the acts of responsible corporate employees; and

(2) The Guidelines should not be accorded any force of law or treated by the courts of the United States or of any state as persuasive; and

(3) The Guidelines are a danger to the business community in that reliance thereupon might encourage businesses to adopt restraints of trade that might be actionable and ultimately held unlawful, exposing the defendants to treble damages and litigation costs; and

September 26, 1985

Be it further resolved, That the National Association of Attorneys General directs its Executive Director and General Counsel to furnish copies of this resolution to the Administration, Congress, leaders of the business community, and other interested individuals.

A SALUTE TO MISS EDITH L.
BROWNING

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in Greencastle, a city of 8,500 people, in the heart of my Indiana district, lives a most remarkable lady who has touched the lives of thousands. For the past 40 years Miss Edith L. Browning has been passing out sticks of chewing gum to the children of this Putnam County city.

Known throughout the State for her kindness, I would like to salute Miss Browning's generosity by reprinting an article which appeared in the Monday, September 9, 1985, edition of the Indianapolis Star.

GREENCASTLE CHEWERS STUCK ON GUM LADY
FOR 40 YEARS

The Chewing Gum Lady is a special delight; She works at our bank, just barely in sight. When I go in, holding my mother's hand, She calls to me, "Hi there, young man." I run to her counter, hoping for gum. She reaches over to give me some. I wish we went to the bank every day. I like to see my friend and say, "Thanks for the gum you give to me." My friend likes children, you can see.

(By James A. Gillaspay)

GREENCASTLE, IND.—The poem, by a DePauw University professor and his wife, is part of a Sunday school storybook that was published in 1968.

"They were trying to emphasize big people being nice to little people," says Edith I. Browning. "That seems to be my forte."

Indeed, for more than 40 years Miss Browning has been the nice lady who always has a free stick of gum for children like the professor's son. Most people know her by name, yet children of all ages refer to her with affection as the Chewing Gum Lady.

It is a moniker she has heartily approved of and encouraged. Her Christmas cards—with a stick of gum inside—routinely bear the signature of "The Chewing Gum Lady." Ditto for her welcome mat, an instant clue to what awaits visitors on the other side of her door.

"This all started during World War II when they couldn't get gum," recalls Miss Browning, whose tiny countenance used to pop up daily from behind the counter of Central National Bank to greet little ones with a smile, a bit of conversation and a stick of gum.

"After the war was over I thought they could get all the gum they wanted and they wouldn't want to get it from me anymore. But they just kind of got in the habit of it. So it never stopped."

Almost 80 years old now, Miss Browning has been retired from the bank since 1968,

when she ended 39 years of service as secretary to the president. But she is still greeting smiling neighborhood children who visit her at home, stop her on the street or see her at Sunday school classes.

And she never forgets to "gum them," says the small lady with the big heart.

"In the last 35 years, I've never given anything but Juicy Fruit," she exclaims proudly, noting the extra effort she's taken to please her chewing gum beneficiaries. "Children like Juicy Fruit better."

Attention to such detail has not gone unnoticed by the makers of Juicy Fruit, either.

In October, Miss Browning will be featured in the fall issue of *All Around Wrigley*, a quarterly magazine for employees of the Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co., the Chicago-based chewing gum manufacturer.

"We just thought it was a nice story to share with our employees, to show that someone outside the company had that much confidence in one of our products to distribute it for that many years," says editor Linda A. Keane, who recently visited the Chewing Gum Lady and her hometown.

"We do have other people who do this, and they're usually from small towns," says Mrs. Keane. "But I'm sure she has done it the greatest number of years."

That comes as no surprise to Miss Browning, who says she recently "gummed" a local tyke whose mother looked familiar. It turned out that she had given gum to the mother in her childhood years.

That was not uncommon. "There's plenty of second-generations around," notes the Chewing Gum Lady. However, a brief chat revealed that Miss Browning had also given gum to the mother's mom as a child.

"I had gummed a third generation," says Miss Browning, who estimates that she handed out 100 sticks of gum a week during her employment at the bank and 35 to 40 sticks a week since then.

"Little did I think that when I got to be 80 years old that gum would still be that important," says Miss Browning. The 1927 DePauw University graduate and longtime civic leader credits local youths with keeping her young and active.

"There's two things I don't do," she says laughing. "I don't go to the senior citizens center and I don't watch soap operas."

Surprisingly, there is a third thing she doesn't do. She doesn't chew gum—she never has.

The upcoming Wrigley article explains the essence of Miss Browning and acknowledges that her years of generosity were "not entirely due to the delicious flavor of Juicy Fruit gum."

"Edith Browning has a genuine affection for children, an interest in people that would be hard for anyone to resist," says Mrs. Keane in her article.

Miss Browning put it another way in her chat with the editor for the *All Around Wrigley* article: "Some people collect stamps and coins. I collect people."

NATO'S IMPORTANCE TO THE UNITED STATES

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD an article from the September 30 edition of the *New Republic*

by Walter Laqueur on NATO. While I don't agree with everything that Mr. Laqueur has to say about NATO—particularly his assessment of the importance of Greece to the alliance—I think Greece plays an important role—or his belief that NATO is more important to the Europeans than to the United States—I believe it is equally important to both—I think he does deal fairly with an issue of crucial importance to America's security.

Too often we overlook just how important NATO is to the United States. We have a tendency to become too preoccupied with crises in other regions of the world to remember the cornerstone of our Nation's defense—NATO. I believe, therefore, that we must be reminded from time to time just how important and dependable NATO has been and still is for the United States.

[From the *New Republic*, Sept. 30, 1985]

NATO'S IDENTITY CRISIS

NATO, as usual, faces problems. Prime Minister Andreas Papandreu of Greece recently announced that he will make good on his commitment to remove American bases from Greece. In coming months Spain will vote on whether to join NATO. There has been some worried speculation that within the next two or three years parties opposed to current NATO strategies will assume power in West Germany and Britain. Above all, a growing number of U.S. legislators seem to be losing patience with the state of the alliance.

This predicament is nothing new. Alliances are characteristically strife-torn and unstable. (Someone once said that Napoleon was not, after all, a great general because he always confronted notoriously weak and unreliable alliances rather than strong and united enemies.) NATO, moreover, has been in a state of disarray from the beginning. In 1949, when NATO was first conceived, there were mighty outcries from both the right and the left, in the United States as well as in Europe. Henry Wallace called it an instrument of aggression in violation of the U.N. Charter. Senator Robert Taft, who was advocating an isolationism of the right, was equally opposed. The subsequent history of the alliance will be written one day in terms of a permanent crisis, from Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' "agonizing reappraisal" in 1954 to the cancellation of Skybolt in 1962 (a blow to Britain, which had insisted it was an essential part of its nuclear defense strategy), from the gradual withdrawal of France beginning in 1962 to Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's Brussels speech a few years ago, in which he told Europeans that they could not automatically count on America in a time of crisis unless they worked to restore some balance to NATO.

In a closely reasoned article some seven years ago, Earl Ravenal wrote that NATO had in fact died, and no one had even noticed. He rightly pointed out that the alliance had been created in another time and designed for another state of affairs. How could such a structure survive in a "radically different geopolitical era"? Ravenal's clothes were later stolen, figuratively speaking, by Irving Kristol and others, much to Ravenal's dismay. Other schools of thought proposed as an alternative that American foreign policy be reoriented toward the Pacific basin.

Ravenal's obituary notwithstanding, NATO has shown an astonishing resilience.

One does not have to look far for the reasons. The world situation in 1985 does not, of course, resemble that of 1950, but the threat that made these nations join forces has not disappeared. I am not certain what a "geopolitical era" is, but I was taught that anything connected with "geo" seldom if ever changes. As for the Pacific basin proposal, New Zealand, the Philippines, South Korea, and even Singapore and Taiwan, are not promising candidates for establishing global defense alliances.

And so after all these years of doubts and setbacks, some political scientists investigating the state of the American alliance system have concluded that we never had it so good. In the lead article of *International Security's* spring issue, Stephen Walt proclaims that the world's democracies are "wealthy, technologically advanced and militarily capable. . . . The American alliance system is both impressive in its capabilities and unusually cohesive. . . ." This assertion becomes somewhat suspect if one looks more closely at the facts and figures on which it is based. Not all will share Walt's enthusiasm about the military capabilities (or agree about the willingness to shed blood for the alliance) of Mexico and Brazil, of Greece and Saudi Arabia, of Pakistan and New Zealand—to single out but a few of Mr. Walt's stalwart allies.

Nevertheless, there is a grain of truth in what he is saying. The true state of the alliance is somewhere between the theory of premature demise and the wilder flights of optimism. The last few years have been relatively calm. The dire predictions about the consequences of stationing the Pershing II have been proved wrong; even the Soviets have more or less dropped the subject. But how long will the calm last? It is always misleading to generalize about Europe, because there is not one Europe. And this, of course is very much part of the problem.

Once upon a time there was consensus on defense; now if there is a consensus, it is mainly negative. Reduced to the lowest common denominator, the dilemma can be defined as follows: the European members of NATO, rightly or wrongly, are skeptical about Star Wars because they believe it would weaken deterrence. But they do not like deterrence either. They want a higher nuclear threshold—a wholly laudable desire—but they claim that for political, social, and economic reasons they are unable to strengthen their conventional defense in accordance with past NATO resolutions. They complain about American predominance, but they are unable to bring about the Europeanization of Europe's defense. They express fear of strategies that would result in a military "decoupling" (that is, contrary to the original NATO agreement, an attack on one country wouldn't necessarily mean an attack on the others), but they do not hesitate to pursue political decoupling in their dealings with the Soviet bloc and the Third World. They support détente, but are willing to accept the Kremlin rules, under which détente is limited to Europe.

The American record with its partners has been far from unblemished. But would the situation be radically different even if American policymakers had acted with the wisdom of sages and the patience of angels? Seen in retrospect, America's main sin has not been neglect and lack of consultation, but an excess of zeal. The handling of Star Wars is the most recent example: whatever the merits of the initiative, was it really necessary to beg European governments to col-

laborate, to bring pressure on them, even to create the impression of an ultimatum? There is now a sweeping conviction that U.S. investment in Western Europe—financial as well as political and strategic—is so extensive that America cannot afford to reduce its commitment. What's more, there is a widespread belief that the conflict is essentially between the two superpowers and thus only of limited concern to Western Europe.

The threat posed by the Soviets is not of a blitzkrieg, but of the gradual establishment of Russian hegemony in Europe. This danger has become difficult to understand in Europe, precisely because of too much American solicitude. In fact, Europe needs the alliance as much (or more) than America because of its unfortunate proximity to the one superpower that also happens to have the greater appetite. To understand this, neither great political wisdom is needed nor ideological sympathy with the White House. But American overprotectiveness has helped to suppress this simple truth, and instead a "false consciousness" has developed. Hence the erosion of the consensus.

Could it be restored? Certainly not by an American policy more European than that of most European governments. A new consensus might emerge on the basis of a hard look at the realities of the world situation. But this will come about only as the result of European self-education, in which America cannot and should not play a prominent role. Why should it implore millions of Spaniards to vote for NATO in the forthcoming elections? Why should it endlessly upbraid the Danes and others for failing to meet their defense commitments? All this is clearly the task of the major European governments. American initiatives in this direction are neither dignified nor effective.

It is not entirely clear whether the loss of Greece would be a disaster or a blessing for NATO. The difficulties go deeper than the fact that the Greek military effort is wholly directed against another NATO member. Greece's links with Europe are tenuous; there is more affinity between Papandreu and Colonel Qaddafi than between him and most European leaders, and there seems to be a genuine longing in the country for non-alignment. Its record in the European Economic Community has persuaded most members that it was a mistake to let Greece join. The EEC decision cannot now be reversed. But the NATO situation is different. In view of Greece's economic plight, it is quite likely that Papandreu, desperately seeking loans and other aid, will be ready for some "concessions," which might include subletting naval bases to the alliance. But the price should be reasonable, and it should be clear to Papandreu that the other Western nations do not want him to act against his conscience.

Spain is also torn in two directions—forward to Europe and freedom, and backward to northern Africa. Thirty years of Francoism cannot be quickly lived down. Spain's political self-education is by necessity a long, drawn-out process; as with Greece, its self-interest may in the end propel it toward cooperation with Europe. One encouraging sign is that even the socialist ministers who in the past opposed this move are now willing to help the prime minister fight for it. Still, many Spaniards have yet to resolve the question of their country's place in the world. Until then, outside pressure will not be appreciated.

Then there remains the problem of the leaders and movements in the major Euro-

pean countries who in recent years have increasingly stressed their national interests—and the special interests of Europe—in contradiction to those of America. French neo-Gaullists, German and British socialists, Dutch churchmen, British and Danish liberals (and not a few conservatives), and others have expressed unhappiness with American leadership—whatever the name and the style of the president, and regardless of his party affiliation.

During the last year there have been some new initiatives toward the Europeanization of the defense of Europe within the framework of the West European Union and the Independent European Program Group. WEU was founded in the early 1950s, and was revived in 1984 after being dormant for many years. Among its handful of members are France, Great Britain, West Germany, and Italy; but it does not include Denmark and Norway, Greece and Turkey. Various common projects have been discussed such as European fighter aircraft and European tanks. There is, of course, no certainty that WEU will succeed where NATO has so far failed: progress has been very slow. According to the recent annual Strategy survey, published London's International Institute for Strategic Studies: "It must be said, however, that the impulses toward cooperation are a good deal clearer than the precise nature of such cooperation. Most West European governments are adopting a cautious . . . attitude. . . . It is likely to be a year or two before it is clear whether or not this particular train is going anywhere."

Some European leaders have expressed fears that these initiatives may offend Washington, but this should be the least of their worries. They may be well advised to ignore the kind of letter that the State Department has been sending, warning them against uncoordinated defense activities. Americans will prefer almost any sign of life, almost any initiative emanating from Europe, even if they may not agree with all the details.

But what if forces should come to power in one or more European countries whose views about Western defense are even more divergent from America's? A victory of the German Social Democrats and a weakening of the position of the British Conservatives cannot be ruled out. Yet both in Britain and in West Germany during the last year there has been a marked movement from the extreme anti-American left toward the center—partly, no doubt, in recognition that an extreme political platform is an invitation for defeat. The Greens, whose influence was always overrated by the American media, are on the decline; and the unfriendly statements of Neil Kinnock or the German young turks such as Oskar Lafontaine should not be taken too seriously: the dismantling of the alliance is not part of their program. The Socialist leaders have spent many days in Soviet bloc capitals in the hope of bringing back some positive messages. They have returned with empty hands. Even European Communists overwhelmingly favor the preservation of the status quo as far as Western defense is concerned. For obvious reasons they do not feel free to say so openly.

The great majority of European neutralists simply lack the courage of their convictions. If America were to challenge them tomorrow, there would be no rush to take the plunge. A neutral Europe, they would say, yes, of course. . . . But the time is not ripe yet. Much more preparatory work is needed to create the preconditions. . . . It might be a spectacle worth watching.

No alliance lasts forever, but as for the coming years, it can be said with considerable assurance that if the western alliance disintegrates, it will not be on the initiative of the Europeans but because of a loss of patience among a growing number of Americans.

European attitudes toward defense have been contradictory for a long time: they have been critical of American insensitivity and overreliance on nuclear weapons. But at the same time there has been little willingness to do something about this. They want a Europe not subjected to outside command, but they do not want too many sacrifices toward this end. Perhaps the threat does not exist or is not as formidable as the "cold warriors" maintain. A comforting thought this, and it would solve most problems. But the facts so far do not bear it out, and even the neutralists in their innermost hearts know it.

Thus, in the final analysis, the future of the alliance does not mainly depend upon the resolution of Papandreu's financial difficulties, the outcome of a Spanish plebiscite, or a vote in the Danish parliament. It depends upon the course the United States chooses to take. Patience has never been an outstanding American virtue, which is something Europeans should keep in mind as they struggle to resolve their ambivalence about their own defense needs.

RECORD COCAINE FLOW CONTINUES UNABATED

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues and the public to an article that appeared in the *New York Times* of August 8, 1985, entitled "U.S. Says Smugglers 'Overwhelm' Borders With Record Cocaine Flow."

The news story states:

According to Congressional staff experts, national cocaine consumption, which in 1984 was about 85 metric tons will exceed 100 (metric) tons this year. The Drug Enforcement Administration estimated consumption of cocaine at 34 to 45 metric tons in 1982, and 50 and 61 metric tons in 1983.

According to the Drug Enforcement Administration, 4,400 kilograms of cocaine was seized nationally in 1982, 7,300 kilograms in 1983, and 11,742 kilograms in 1984. In the first six months of this year in south Florida alone over 13,000 kilograms of cocaine was seized, more than the entire country in 1984.

Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from visiting the drug-producing nations of Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay. Our delegation met with heads of state of six nations and with the ranking Cabinet minister responsible for narcotics control in each country.

I am sad to report that we found a shocking increase in the growth of coca, the raw material from which cocaine is made, and the ability of traffickers to operate unimpeded in vast areas of South America. The situation is out of control, narcotics traffickers are winning the war

even in the face of increased efforts by most governments in the region to combat the escalating production and trafficking. Within the past year, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the House Judiciary Committee, the U.N. International Narcotics Control Board, the State Department, and the President's Commission on Organized Crime have all noted the dramatic increase in the traffic and abuse of narcotic and psychotropic drugs in the United States and throughout the world.

The annual report of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control for 1984 calls upon producer nations to develop plans for the elimination of all illicit drug production within a reasonable period of time, and for the United States, other industrialized nations, and the United Nations to provide the technical and financial assistance needed to bring the problem under control.

I sponsored an amendment to H.R. 1555, "International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985," that makes military and economic assistance to Bolivia contingent upon Bolivia developing a narcotics control plan and meeting certain eradication targets, and that makes nonhumanitarian aid to Peru contingent upon that country developing a narcotics control plan. This bill was enacted into law on August 8, 1985, Public Law 99-83.

An estimated 25 million Americans are users of cocaine and 5,000 people experiment with the drug every day. The price of cocaine has fallen, which is an indicator of an ample supply of the drug, and it is readily available on our streets. The total cost to America of narcotics abuse is over \$200 billion a year. We, in the Congress, must do everything in our power to bring this staggering figure down.

The conclusion of the article from the New York Times is that "despite improved vigilance by Federal and local agencies, more cocaine than ever is entering the United States, and law enforcement officials expect that improved smuggling strategies and unrelenting demand will keep the record-breaking flow coming."

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the news story entitled "U.S. Says Smugglers 'Overwhelm' Borders With Record Cocaine Flow" be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The news story follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 8, 1985]
UNITED STATES SAYS SMUGGLERS "OVERWHELM" BORDERS WITH RECORD COCAINE FLOW

(By George Volsky)

MIAMI, Aug. 7.—Despite improved vigilance by Federal and local agencies, more cocaine than ever is entering the United States, Law-enforcement officials say. And they expect that improved smuggling strategies and unrelenting demand will keep the record-breaking flow coming.

The officials said Miami was the center of cocaine traffic in this country, adding that about three-quarters of the cocaine intercepted nationwide last year was seized in the Florida-Caribbean district of the Drug Enforcement Administration. With a long coast and thousands of unused airstrips,

south Florida has for years been the main point of entry of cocaine into the United States, which, according to recent statistics, has seen a dramatic increase in cocaine use at all social and economic levels.

The officials, interviewed over several months, cited a shift from the use of large ships and airplanes for transporting cocaine to a wave of smaller boats and planes. They say this makes interception harder and, as one official said, "overwhelms our interdiction resources."

Trying to counter this new transportation technique, Congress has appropriated funds for a fleet of 104 high-speed boats to be stationed in south Florida and manned by United States Coast Guard and Customs personnel.

COCAINE IN ARTIFICIAL YAMS

Concealment of cocaine has also become more professional. For example, it was by chance that agents of the United States Customs Service discovered 300 pounds of cocaine packed inside artificial yams in a freighter that had just docked at the Port of Miami in June. Agents said the artfully painted fiberglass yams were almost impossible to distinguish from the real ones they were mixed with.

"They're always ahead of us," William Rosenblatt, the top Customs Service agent in the area, said of cocaine smugglers. "They scheme 18 hours a day how to smuggle coke into the U.S. We often work more than 10 hours daily, but what we basically do is to react."

In Washington, a new report by the General Accounting Office says the National Narcotics Border Interdiction System, a new program to coordinate the seizing of drugs at the borders, was spending nearly all its energy on marijuana and making almost no effort on cocaine.

The officials interviewed suggested that the effort against narcotics smuggling had been weak basically because agents lacked detailed knowledge of the inner workings of the international drug business.

A LACK OF COOPERATION

Major drug organizations are very difficult to penetrate, they say. The smugglers who have been arrested are usually people in the low and middle levels of drug smuggling rings, and they refuse to cooperate with investigators because they fear reprisals by the organization.

Officials here have complained that over the last few years their resources have grown only moderately while the number of people working in drug syndicates has more than doubled.

A result is that Latin American cocaine is increasingly available to supply what by all indications is a steadily expanding demand for the drug in the United States.

According to Congressional staff experts, national cocaine consumption, which in 1984 was about 85 metric tons, will exceed 100 tons this year. The Drug Enforcement Administration estimated consumption of cocaine at 34 to 45 metric tons in 1981, 45 to 54 metric tons in 1982 and 50 to 61 metric tons in 1983.

Basing his statement on customs service projections, Senator Lawton Chiles, Democrat of Florida, said last month that 20 percent more cocaine would enter the Southeastern United States this year than in 1984. "From time to time there are suggestions that we are beginning to win the war on drugs," Senator Chiles said. "But in Florida and in the Southwest we are still in the trenches."

TWENTY-TWO KILOGRAMS INTERCEPTED

These estimates contrast with the situation in 1967, when a commission on law enforcement appointed by President Johnson did not find cocaine consumption a matter of concern. That year agencies intercepted 22 kilograms in all at a time when experts estimated that seizures accounted for less than 10 percent of what was smuggled.

According to official reports, cultivation of coca leaves and their processing into coca paste, from which pure cocaine is refined, is taking place in Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Mexico, Nicaragua and Venezuela in addition to the traditional sources of the drug, Bolivia, Colombia and Peru.

To be sure, more cocaine than ever is being discovered at the point of entry, or relatively shortly after arrival in the United States. But larger cocaine seizures only suggest that proportionately more is getting through, according to law-enforcement officials.

"An analysis by the House Subcommittee on Operations has concluded that we are intercepting only 0.5 percent of the drug coming by air and about 5 percent of the sea shipments," said John P. Cusack, chief of staff of the House Select Committee on Narcotics.

"This is really frightening," he said, "because it shows that we have made no progress in detecting what is being shot at us."

According to the Drug Enforcement Administration, 4,400 kilograms of cocaine was seized nationally in 1982, 7,300 kilograms in 1983 and 11,742 kilograms in 1984. In the first six months of this year, in south Florida alone over 13,000 kilograms of cocaine was seized, more than in the entire country in 1984.

"Colombian traffickers—and so far Colombia has been mostly what the cocaine problem is all about—have perfected the drug transportation, distribution and financing of operations," said S. B. Billbrough, assistant special agent in charge of the D.E.A. district office in Miami.

"They have realized that small planes and boats are very difficult to detect on the radar screens," Mr. Billbrough said, "Moreover, they use their boats and planes more efficiently. They have established refueling, transshipment and repair facilities in the Bahamas, Belize, Jamaica, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Puerto Rico, Turks and Caicos and other smaller Caribbean islands."

Traffickers have also become more proficient in packaging, rapid loading and unloading of shipments and in communications. Mr. Cusack believes many Americans are working for the drug syndicates.

Mr. Billbrough said that even though the United States had been pressing foreign countries to step up their antidrug campaigns, "the extent of their cooperation is not known."

"The problem in working with them," he said, "is that drug business has become an important part of their economies."

JAMAICAN AIRSTRIPS BULLDOZED

The Colombian Government recently arrested 1,400 people in its efforts to root out illegal processing and smuggling of cocaine and seized tons of the drug. But officials say there have been no signs that this has lessened the amount shipped to the United States.

Recently Jamaica ordered bulldozing of some airstrips to deny their use to marijuana-laden planes. But according to law-en-

forcement reports from Jamaica, traffickers are now using general aviation facilities.

When some officials call an "Americanization of the drug business" has also been detected in South Florida. In the Miami area alone, 22 small cocaine laboratories were discovered in 18 months by the Miami-Dade Organized Crime Bureau.

Arthur R. Nehrbass, commander of the bureau, a former agent in charge of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Miami office, said the trend indicated that more cocaine refining facilities would be established in the United States.

LINK TO ORGANIZED CRIME

Like other experts interviewed, Mr. Nehrbass spoke about what he called "a new breed of cocaine traffickers." Until about five years ago, he said, three or four Colombian syndicates dominated the processing and transportation of cocaine to the United States. Syndicate agents sold the drug to other Hispanic people, among them a strong Cuban contingent here, who were in charge of the wholesale and, in part, of the retail end of the business.

In recent years "Colombians have moved into the distribution of cocaine, too," he said, adding, "About 17 Colombian families are known to be engaged now in the cocaine business in the United States."

According to Mr. Billbrough, Colombians have established a "heavy interaction" with organized crime families in New York City and with Hispanic criminal elements in other cities, especially Los Angeles.

There have been other substantial changes in the last few years, law-enforcement officials said.

"The flamboyance has disappeared," said William Dingfelder, spokesman for Vice President Bush's South Florida Task Force on Drugs. "Smugglers are more sophisticated and knowledgeable in the use of computer software and hardware.

"For them, the drug operations is a regular business. They can establish a corporate structure, with heads of production, transportation, marketing and investment departments, with their own collection service, public relations and, of course, a strong professional enforcement section."

According to Mr. Rosenblatt, after a period of violence in the early 1980's, "the pecking order has been established in the drug syndicates."

"The time 'cocaine cowboys' could kill enemies all over Miami in broad daylight, is over," he said. "The killing is now more professional and discrete. These people realize that gang-style executions are bad for business."

Law-enforcement officers have noticed that a number of Americans have entered the drug business. "Often small-town 'red-neck' elements put together a modest investment syndicate, travel to Bogotá and buy a small quantity of cocaine which then is transported in their areas," Mr. Billbrough said. "This leads to larger investments, bigger smuggling operations, more contacts with Colombians and more Americans involved. This pattern has been repeated time and time again."

DESTINATION OF PROFITS SOUGHT

In the face of all this, law-enforcement agencies are trying to improve their intelligence capabilities. "We are getting better, even though we are often caught flatfooted," said Mr. Billbrough. "We are expanding our analytical resources through the National Narcotics Intelligence Consumer Committee, which coordinates foreign and

domestic information from 12 agencies engaged in antidrug campaigns."

For years Federal investigators have been trying to learn the destination of profits realized by the drug syndicates, presuming that a large part has been invested in the United States.

It has been difficult because in the course of transfers of millions of dollars made by American financial institutions to banks around the globe and back into this country, the sender's identity is invariably covered up.

"Traffickers are back to where they were in the late 1970's," said Mr. Nehrbass. "Now we see cash going out of the country. They use speedboats to move the dollars in the Bahamas, Grand Cayman and Panama, which is relatively easy because they seldom intercept boats, planes or passengers leaving the country."

Mr. Nehrbass said he thought that the United States was "making progress now," but, like his colleagues, believes that the cocaine problem can be overcome only with an extensive educational campaign among young people to counteract the notion that cocaine makes people happy, lucid and powerful without harming them.

Analyzing the overall drug-enforcement effort, Mr. Cusack said: "We are still losing ground. We know that coke is now available in almost every town in the United States and in many schoolyards. We simply have to invest more money and resources into this bucket."

TRIBUTE TO T. HAROLD FORBES

HON. JOSEPH J. DiOGUARDI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. DiOGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, I take this respite from proceedings of the House to note the centennial anniversary of the birth of T. Harold Forbes on September 27. Mr. Forbes was the late founder and first publisher of the New Rochelle "Standard-Star," a daily newspaper in my home community that to this day continues to prosper.

Harold Forbes was the son of a newspaperman, George Morris Forbes, who came to New Rochelle in 1870. Later, Harold and his wife, Carrie, raised five sons, each of whom has made a career in various aspects of the newspaper business.

To best appreciate the late Harold Forbes and his impact on my home community of New Rochelle, the county of Westchester and, in the later years of his life, on Long Island I submit a "Standard-Star" editorial published on March 6, 1953:

T. HAROLD FORBES, PUBLISHER

When T. Harold Forbes was a young man he went on the stage and with Carrie Bohrmann, who later became his wife, he formed a song and dance team. His early connections indicated he was on the way to unusual success upon the theatrical boards.

However, Mr. Forbes was stricken ill and his ailment at that time forced him from the bright lights scene to an upstate country town where he went to regain his health, which, incidentally, he did in remarkable fashion. In that upstate community, Livingston Manor by name, he became interested in newspaper publishing and

there was born a career that had much to do eventually with the development of newspaper enterprises in this vicinity.

Of course, it is true that Mr. Forbes was not exactly a stranger to the newspaper publishing field before he went to Livingston Manor. He was born in a family that has made newspaper history in New Rochelle and elsewhere. His father was a New York City newspaperman and later was active in the weekly newspaper field here. One brother, the late Robert Lucas Forbes, founded The Daily Star and also owned the New Rochelle Paragraph, a weekly. Another brother, George P. Forbes, at that time and for many years thereafter was publisher of the Larchmont Times. Mr. George Forbes was also publisher of The Daily Times, Mamaroneck, when that paper was founded in the twenties.

So, with that family background, it was natural that T. Harold Forbes would turn to newspaper publishing when he was unable to continue in the theatrical world. He spent about eight years at Livingston Manor overcoming his illness and gaining the experience of turning out a small weekly newspaper before coming back to his home town.

But, once having gotten printer's ink in his blood, as the saying goes, he remained in the publishing field the rest of his life. He acquired The Daily Star in New Rochelle and worked out a merger of interests with the publishers of The Daily Argus, Mount Vernon, in 1923 by which The Evening Standard was purchased and The Standard-Star was born. In 1929, he and his affiliates sold his newspapers . . . and Mr. Forbes devoted himself to a new daily newspaper in White Plains. Later, he went to Flushing in another venture with a daily and then returned to the weekly field when he acquired a plant at Riverhead, L.I., where he was president of the News-Review Publishing Corporation at the time of his death.

The period Mr. Forbes spent here as publisher of The Standard-Star was the lush era of the twenties. As the executive head of the community newspaper he had a keen interest in civic betterment. One of the public improvement projects for which he campaigned ardently was the widening of Rose Street, as it was then known. This became a reality but not until after he had left the local scene. Rose Street was a short, narrow street, between Main and Huguenot, parallel to and similar to Lawton and Mechanic. It became a part of the North Avenue extension, built in 1931 from Pershing Square to Pelham Road. The improvement had a major effect on the appearance and development of a business area, which, due to the depression of the early 1930s, was slow in coming but eventually came to pass as economic conditions improved.

Mr. Forbes was closely allied with other newspapers in the county but, until he sold out, he maintained his offices (then) in the newspaper's present plant at 251 North Avenue which he built and during that time devoted most of his attention to the progress of The Standard-Star. He was active in a score of civic, social and community organizations to which he gave effective service in many ways.

The events reported in a newspaper mirror the community life of the day. In a sense, then, a newspaper publisher is a historian, and Mr. Forbes, in his position as a founder and publisher of this newspaper, made local history by creating and producing the medium through which it was possible to chronicle the events of his time. His interest in his hometown never flagged, for it was

here he had made friendships during the years when his personal popularity as a community citizen was at its zenith.

TEST BAN FEVER—RUNNING HIGH

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, our colleague HENRY HYDE has once again demonstrated his ability to cut through the malarkey and get to the heart of the matter. This time the subject is the impassioned call for a revival of the comprehensive nuclear test ban talks. Who could be against such nice sounding talks? As HENRY HYDE demonstrates, any American with common sense and an understanding of the complex realities of nuclear testing should be against them. HENRY HYDE gives us chapter and verse of the imposing case against House Joint Resolution 3, which calls for immediate negotiations on such a treaty.

At this point I insert in the RECORD, "Test Ban Fever" by Representative HENRY J. HYDE of Illinois, as published in the Washington Post, September 25, 1985:

TEST BAN FEVER: WITH AN EMPHASIS ON IMAGE, NOT SECURITY

(By Henry J. Hyde)

Recently, one of my colleagues from the Senate, Democrat Carl Levin of Michigan, made a plea for the revival of Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban talks with the Soviet Union [op-ed, Sept. 19]. While he offered several reasons for a resumption of these talks, his bedrock argument was that if we failed to do so, we would almost certainly receive a "diplomatic black eye from our closest friends," thus "embarrassing us" on the eve of the Reagan-Gorbachev summit.

The linkage between political considerations and national security policy is perhaps inevitable, but I fail to see the wisdom of advocating—at this critical presummit juncture—what has been a Soviet propaganda proposal for years.

President Reagan has stated repeatedly that he will not resume negotiations on a Comprehensive Test Ban (CTB) Treaty at the present time for one very important reason: our nation's security. Levin says we should continue, but for public relations reasons, which he somehow finds compelling. In any weighing of national security concerns against public relations considerations, the scales had better tilt toward security.

This entire issue, the banning of all nuclear testing, has grave consequences for our nation's security, not merely for our image abroad. Moreover, although Levin believes that our allies may reject our unwillingness to immediately negotiate a CTB, it is worth remembering that these same allies depend upon a credible U.S. nuclear deterrent. Nuclear testing plays an essential role in maintaining this deterrent in view of the massive and ongoing Soviet nuclear force modernization, as well as a lack of substantive Soviet nuclear arms reduction proposals at Geneva.

Overall, it is cause for worry that some prominent political figures have seized upon this issue, politicized it and treat it as a soft

"confidence building measure," which it certainly is not. This attempt to decouple nuclear testing from national security is demonstrated by the fact that House Democrats have placed a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty resolution on the legislative fast track. Talk about "friends and allies" trying to embarrass the president on the eve of the summit! It seems that our armchair arms controllers have decided to take that upon themselves, at a time when bipartisan support for the president and our Geneva negotiators is imperative.

The Democrats' proposal H.J. Resolution 3, will probably be before the House in early October. It is composed of two parts. Part one calls upon the president to submit the unratified Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty (PNET) and Threshold Test Ban Treaty (TTBT) to the Senate for ratification. The second part calls upon the president to resume immediately negotiations with the Soviet Union on a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Many experts, including our chief negotiator of PNET and TTBT, Ambassador Walter Stoessel Jr., seriously question whether either of these treaties can be adequately verified. In fact, in recent public testimony before Congress, Dr. Donald Kerr, the director of the Los Alamos National Laboratory, pointed out that on at least one occasion a Soviet test, which we knew about, was not seismically detected.

H.J. Resolution 3, by demanding that the United States resume *immediately* negotiations with the Soviet Union on a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, overlooks some recent history—namely, that it was Jimmy Carter, not Ronald Reagan, who cut off CTB negotiations with the Soviets for several reasons, among them the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The Democratic leadership seems to prefer political opportunism over common sense in this instance. Clearly a nuclear test ban is a logical *follow-on* to an arms reduction agreement, not a *prelude* to one. As an editorial in The Post Aug. 1 appropriately stated, "why give away through a test ban what the Soviet Union should be expected to pay in arms reductions. This is why a ban cannot be treated as a separate option distinguishable from the proposals on the table in Geneva."

Test ban proponents would have you believe that the best reason for a ban on all testing is that, as time passes, weapons makers simply won't trust their old systems and at the same time won't be able to test new ones. So, following this line of thinking . . . viola! No more nuclear weapons, no more arms race. Unfortunately, the opposite will be the case.

Additionally, we must keep in mind that under a comprehensive test ban the nature of Soviet society and government would permit the Soviet Union to keep its most skilled technical people in their weapons program, whereas many U.S.A. experts would leave for more professionally active fields.

Nuclear testing is very significant for a number of reasons, but one of the most important is that it allows us to move away from large nuclear weapons, with indiscriminate destructive power to smaller weapons designed to accomplish their military tasks more inefficiently and with less collateral damage. A ban on testing will make this type of megatonnage reduction impossible, but it won't stop production. All nuclear weapons experts agree that the basic ability to build large, "dirty" nuclear weapons—able to accomplish their goals by

brute destructive force—may always be available, without further testing.

So ironically, a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty—which has not been preceded by an arms reduction agreement—could well feed the arms race by increasing, or at least maintaining, U.S. megatonnage, precisely at a time when we are trying to minimize this aspect of our strategic forces through defense research and development as well as arms control efforts in Geneva.

Furthermore, in the absence of an arms reduction agreement limiting warheads, yet in an environment in which both sides are tied down by a testing ban, the United States could find itself forced to build larger, more destructive and unsafe warheads in order to insure a continued strategic balance. At the same time, the Soviets, who already rely on bigger and more destructive warheads, will be forced to continue to do so, since they may be unable to test smaller, less destructive warheads. In essence, it could spark an arms race in megatonnage.

As congressional test ban advocates frame it, this issue turns the world on its head. For the Soviets it is merely a propaganda exercise of unilateral challenges and "moratoriums." For the United States, it is a matter of vital security. But one thing it is not—it is definitely not, as the Democratic leadership would have us believe, an innocuous confidence-building measure designed to save us "embarrassment" and show our "goodwill."

CHI CHI RODRIGUEZ

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, this weekend in Clearwater, FL, some very special people are playing golf for a very special reason. The "Fifth Annual Chi Chi Rodriguez Charity Golf Classic" will feature more than 132 golfers and will raise more than \$60,000 for the Chi Chi Rodriguez Foundation.

Here is what the Clearwater Sun has to say:

The Chi Chi Rodriguez Youth Foundation is an inspiring success story that keeps getting better.

Former golf pro Bill Hayes got the idea from working with troubled youngsters in the Pinellas County school system. He was convinced many of the kids could be turned around by a program that challenged them physically as well as mentally—something fascinating enough to hold their interest.

Hayes figured golf would do the job.

So he got touring pro Chi Chi Rodriguez to sponsor a foundation to help troubled Pinellas County kids.

Mr. Speaker, not only did Chi Chi Rodriguez, the world famous golf pro, lend his name to this foundation, but he has been personally involved in all aspects of it and has enlisted the support of the local community as well as national business leaders like Bill Braddock, Marshall Berkowitz, Laurence Rockefeller, and Jim Kemper. In

fact, this weekend Chi Chi and many friends of his from around the country will come to Clearwater to golf on behalf of the kids.

Through the discipline learned through golf, the young people of our area have been helped with problems ranging from underachievement, drug and alcohol abuse, and other serious criminal activities. In fact, a report from the Pinellas County School Board summarized the foundation's program by saying that in regards to the young people involved, "academic growth and law compliance were the most dramatic changes."

The Chi Chi Rodriguez Foundation is a shining example of what can be done to help the young people of America. I am honored to report their noble goal and know that their project can be a model to many communities throughout our Nation. For every challenge our country faces, there is, indeed, some solution, and the Chi Chi Rodriguez Foundation is a very good solution to a very important challenge.

A CHAMPION AND HIS HOME

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, Brockton, MA, prides itself on being the "City of Champions," the hometown of world middleweight boxing champion Marvellous Marvin Hagler and of the legendary heavyweight champion, Rocky Marciano.

The pride of the city and the character of its champions was explored recently in a perceptive article by John Ed Bradley of the Washington Post.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 15, 1985]

A CHAMPION AND HIS HOME

(By John Ed Bradley)

BROCKTON, MASS.—Every now and then, Marvellous Marvin Hagler, the middleweight champ, asks his manager about Rocky Marciano. Driving down the back streets of town with no place in particular to go, Hagler says, "Tell me about Rocky Pat."

And Pat Petronelli, who knows Marciano's story from start to finish, says you would have liked the Rock, Marvin. You two were alike, a lot alike.

He says: "It is Brockton you love, and it was Brockton he loved.

But Hagler wants to know, "What else, Pat?" And Petronelli says what Hagler's heard before and always will hear, that Rocky was a tough and honest man, though not very fancy, not even as a fighter. He had the shortest reach of any heavyweight champ ever, only 68 inches on the stretch. And he never lost a professional fight. What he lacked in skill, Petronelli says, he made up for with heart. You could say Rocky was all heart and not embarrass yourself. You could say that and just about hit it right on the money.

"You'd a liked the Rock," Petronelli says he tells Hagler all the time. "And he'd a liked you."

Another thing about Marciano: He never for a minute forget where he came from. And where he came from never forgot him

either. Even though he'd moved his wife and kids down to Fort Lauderdale, Fla., several years before he died in a plane crash near Newton, Iowa, in 1969, Brockton was Rocky's town. It was his heart's home, the place where he could walk around in a ragged old sweat top and khaki pants and feel as though he were rich and blessed with all the good things a man could want.

Running with the boys at the old Ward Two Club off Dover Street, down in that part of town everybody called "Little Italy," or hitching a ride to West Bridgewater and the dances at The Canoe Club, Rocky Marciano enjoyed a relationship with Brockton that his brother Peter once described as being "just like a love affair. It was like the town and the man belonged to each other."

Fighters other than Marciano and Hagler, who moved here as a teen-ager, have made Brockton their home, though most everybody you talk to would be hard-pressed to come up with names. But none was like the Rock. And none ever will be.

The only heavyweight boxing champion to retire undefeated, Marciano won 49 fights—43 by knockout—before retiring April 27, 1956, about seven months after knocking out Archie Moore in his sixth title defense. Reporters liked to ask Rocky how he got by without ever losing, and he liked to mention the two times he almost lost, the times he'd been knocked to the canvas. First there was Jersey Joe Walcott in 1952, when Rocky won the title he would hold for about four years, and then there was Moore, the former light heavyweight champ who popped him with a big left hook and sent him reeling in the first round.

Rocky liked to say he felt more embarrassment than hurt those times he came so close to defeat. There were all those people from Brockton to think about. "They couldn't afford to see me lose," he said. "They couldn't afford those \$25 seats. I always knew I would get up."

Although he died more than 16 years ago, Rocky Marciano is not forgotten in Brockton, a city of about 100,000 once known as the shoe capital of the world. Now that Larry Holmes, the current heavyweight champion, threatens to tie Marciano's record by beating Michael Spinks Saturday in Las Vegas, the good memory of Marciano once again has gripped the hearts of more than a few townspeople who take great pleasure in talking about their lost friend and hero in the present tense. Still loyal to their native son, and proud, some locals all but growl and kick the earth when asked what they think about Holmes, his career and his campaign to break Marciano's record.

"Larry Holmes is a greedy man, just a greedy man," Pat Petronelli said at his home in Brockton a few weeks ago. "He's not breaking Rocky's record with dignity or class, which surprises me because Larry used to be a good champion. Now he's just picking (his opponents) at random. As a fight man, I can never accept that, not him breaking the record."

"Larry knows he can't fight much anymore. He's 36, his legs are gone, his reflexes are shot. He doesn't care about his people or fans. He picked guys like Scott Frank to fight, not even an eight-round fighter. And Marvis Frazier, he used to spar with the kid and slap him all over the ring. It was a disgrace, a phony record. But it was another easy win for Larry . . . It makes me sick knowing he'll take the Rock's record because he doesn't deserve it. I just can't accept the way he's doing it."

Peter Marciano said that if Rocky were around, he'd probably make very little of it and "applaud what Larry had done. But deep down inside, Rocky thought he was the greatest fighter who ever lived."

Marciano was 23 when he fought his first professional bout against Lee Epperson in Holyoke, Mass. He took that one on a third-round knockout, and he took his first 16 bouts by knockout, nine of them in the first round. Everybody said you'd never seen hard work until you saw the Rock do a job in the gym. More than once, his trainer, Charlie Goldman, had to insist he slow it down some, lest Rocky "leave it all in the gym," as fight people are known to say.

Even on vacation, Marciano liked to stay at hotels with swimming pools so he could take a dip whenever he felt like it and shadow box against the weight of the water. There was a place 12 miles outside of Brockton, a nail factory in Bridgewater where Alan Stone and Alan's father, H. James, and his uncle, Leo, worked. Early in his career, Rocky had asked the Stones if they would help keep him out of trouble and advise him on a thing or two, such as how to go about handling all the silverware at that fancy dinner party Cardinal Spellman was planning to throw in New York. Rocky could have picked up the telephone and called the factory. But he chose to run instead, figuring that extra bit of road work would help build his stamina and might be the difference in one of the fights to come.

"Sometimes after those visits," Alan Stone said, "I'd drive him home in the car, and Rocky would make one stop at every street corner to let him sign autographs for kids. He was kind that way, and a little innocent. But when he hit a guy, that man was never the same again."

In the old days, it never was a big deal to find two kids going at it on the playground, at least not in Brockton. That was sport, recreation, and every neighborhood had its king. Who can say exactly how the shoe factories helped shape the sons of the men who worked the leather? Rocky's old man put his time in at a factory just up Dover Street. His name was Perrino Marchegiano, he weighed about 155 pounds and he owned a pair of hands that could have belonged on someone twice his size. Everybody knew Rocky's father because he was famous for having survived a number of battles during World War I. He had been a Marine and his happiest moment in life came when his commanding officer said, "Perrino, you can be proud to call yourself an American."

Because he was an immigrant, that meant more to Rocky's old man than producing a son who would be champ. The truth is, Perrino Marchegiano never really understood boxing, although he always made a point of attending Rocky's training camps in the Adirondacks and working as his personal chef. That was his way of helping his son's cause, different as it was from the contribution of Mrs. Marchegiano. On fight nights, Rocky's mother went to church and prayed for the safety of her Rocco and of her Rocco's opponent. They were just people looking to do what was right, and they expected the same of their children.

But the town was tough, as are most mill towns, there always was some trouble. One day Rocky got into a fight with a kid named Julie Durham, who could hit you like the end of the world. Everybody said you just don't mess around with Julie. And then here comes Rocky looking for a little trouble down by the Bay State Bakery on Foster Street.

They were rolling around in the dust and pea gravel when Rocky missed a punch and caught Julie with an elbow that split his face open. After a while, no matter how tough Julie was, Rocky was just too strong. They should have stuck that win in the record books, should have made it 50-0 for Marciano.

Whenever Marciano fought, people from all over town would congregate in front of the Brockton Enterprise on 60 Main St. and look through the giant picture window at the bulletins strung across stringers for a news update. There existed a social climate at the newspaper on these nights that surpassed the best town balls and church picnics. Everybody came and everybody won. Carl D. Pitaro, now the mayor of Brockton, said he remembers staring through the window at the bulletins and hearing the rousing cheers of the crowd.

"Rocky's time was our time, his wins were our wins," Pitaro said. "It is not hard to understand why most of the old-timers in town feel that what he accomplished will never be equalled, not by Larry Holmes or by anyone else for that matter. For a long time, Rocky Marciano was Brockton, he was everything the place stood for. Shoes put us on the map, but he was our champion. He belonged to us."

At the end of his career, Peter Marciano said, his brother had trouble dealing with the smell of the gym, the fight game had become that difficult. He loved boxing so much that he gave it up when the work became too hard and the fun was no longer there.

"I think Rocky just decided nobody could beat him," Peter said. "He wanted to get away from it and go out and live."

When he died, on the eve of his 46th birthday, Rocky's wife Barbara decided to bury him in Fort Lauderdale, which is a long way from Brockton. One of the Rock's old friends said it was "just criminal," and he wondered what Rocky would have wanted: Florida or home. The gesture may have been well intended, but there was little consolation in having the wake at the Hickey Funeral Home in Brockton. Hickey's was an Irish place whose property line ran right up to the Peca Funeral Home, an Italian parlor. Peter Marciano said the directors of the two funeral homes were bitter enemies until Rocky's body came back to town. There was a line that ferried across both the Irish and Italian properties, and cars parked on both lots. There was, after all, only one Rocky Marciano.

"The month before he was killed," Peter Marciano said, "I went to see Rocky down in Florida. We jogged the beaches together, and I got to know him better in one week than I had my whole life. He'd say, 'What's going on in Brockton?' And that was strange to me. Rocky wasn't a small-talking kind of guy. But he wanted to know how Eugene and Nicky Sylvester were doing, and how was the Columbo family."

"I said this before, Brockton, Mass., always was and always will be Rocky Marciano's hometown. Any other city or town or country he may have lived in was just a stopping place. He loved this place. And he loved it until the day he died."

THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE AND AMERICA'S OUTCRY

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman NANCY JOHNSON's discussion about two prior congressional resolutions on the atrocities against the Armenian population of Ottoman Turkey is important new information for Members of Congress. Still pending at the Rules Committee is House Joint Resolution 192, a commemorative resolution that would honor the victims of the Armenian genocide of 1915 to 1923. Assuming this resolution reaches the floor this fall, we should cast our votes based on the precedent set in these Halls in 1896 and 1920.

The resolution adopted by both Chambers in 1896, entitled "Armenian Outrages," is especially significant in that it demonstrates congressional concern about Armenian suffering decades before World War I. This resolution mirrors what the Republican Party included in its national platform of 1896:

The massacres in Armenia have aroused the deep sympathy and just indignation of the American people, and we believe that the United States should exercise all the influence it can properly exert to bring these atrocities to an end.

In the later period of genocide, the Democratic Party platforms of 1920, 1924, and 1928 also included statements of sympathy with the Armenians in Turkey and expressed a desire for the Armenians to be given an opportunity for self-rule.

For a period spanning 32 years, the major American political parties placed at the forefront of their agendas the treatment of the Armenian people in their homeland. This cross-party consensus led Congress to adopt resolutions on two occasions condemning the brutal mass murders. Yet, Turkish officials today are asking Members of this body to ignore the actions of our own predecessors and instead believe their own version of history.

Turkey is a valued ally to the United States. However, that does not change the fact that the Armenian people were the victims of genocidal atrocities of the late 1890's. By suggesting that United States-Turkish friendship is dependent upon the Congress' adoption of their revised version of history, these officials are basing our relations on needlessly shaky grounds. A friendship between allies must carry with it an understanding that the two nations will not call upon one another to adopt a course of action which violates a sacred principle of all democratic states—the inviolability of history. While we in Congress have made a point of disassociating present-day Turkey, and Germany from the events of their predecessors, Turkey, like Germany, should understand that the remembrance of the horrors of history is important to Americans as a means of insuring that these tragedies do not recur.

In my view, the best course for Turkey to take is to recognize as best they can the historical facts of Turkish involvement, and work to end the present-day animosities that have resulted. My admirations for the people of Turkey would be greatly enhanced by such an action.

We must pass House Joint Resolution 192 when it comes up for a vote on the floor again this fall. We must do no less than our party platforms advocated beginning 89 years ago.

CHURCH SETS BICENTENNIAL EVENTS

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, in 1785, parishioners of the newly opened First Presbyterian Church of Sunbury, PA, gathered on the second floor of the sanctuary to worship as guards stationed at the entrance on the ground floor of the church building watched for threatening Indians. Throughout the ensuing years, this institution, like many others, has had to adapt to changing times and adversities.

Mr. Speaker, 200 years later, this church, this institution, in a community situated along the Susquehanna River, is intact not because the building has remained firmly planted on the soil, but because the people who have worshiped there and continue to worship there today have committed themselves to their faith and their church.

The First Presbyterian Church began its year-long bicentennial festival last March and will climax beginning October 6 through 13. I would like to share with my colleagues a brief history of this church as was reported in the Sunbury Daily Item on September 14, 1985.

CHURCH SETS BICENTENNIAL EVENTS

According to church officials, Presbyterian preachers visiting the Sunbury area more than 200 years ago indicated that there was a congregation here before the first known date of the founding of the church.

In 1770 the Synod of Philadelphia and New York appointed several men who were veterans of the armed forces to do missionary work in frontier settlements among the Indians and at Fort Augusta.

These missionaries also had power to organize churches. Following their visits, four Presbyterian churches were constructed about 1774, Old Buffalo, Chillisquaque, Warrior Run and Northumberland.

It is not known for sure whether the Presbyterians of Sunbury assembled under the leadership of elders. But these "sheeps without a Shepherd" voluntarily joined under the leadership of unordained men who acted as elders of the congregation without any formal organization.

Some men called the people together in social meetings for prayer and praise from which grew the larger gatherings.

Chillisquaque and Warrior Run had no "settled" minister until the Rev. John Bryson came in 1789, while Sunbury Buffalo and Northumberland called their first minister in 1787.

It is assumed that 1785 may have been the year the church was founded since the group had been meeting for about two years before the Rev. Hugh Morrison was installed as pastor in 1787.

The early records of the Sunbury church does not exist. They were taken to a Presbytery meeting in Lewisburg in April 1867 by Elder John Eckman. The bridge across the river had been swept away by the flood of 1865 and it was not rebuilt or opened for traffic until 1868. The trip had to be made by boat. By a sudden movement of the boat, the book was torn from the elder's hand and fell into the water and was swept down the stream. All that is known of the early history of the church has been gathered from other sources.

I would like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to reflect my personal congratulations to the members of the First Presbyterian and its pastor, the Reverend William Ludwig Hartmann, as the church enters, what very few can claim today—its third century of existence.

**JACK BROWN TO RECEIVE
GOLDEN DEEDS AWARD**

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is befitting that the Exchange Club of San Bernardino will honor Jack Brown, president of Stater Brothers Markets, on October 11, 1985, at a dinner at the National Orange Show, bestowing the highly coveted Exchange Club Golden Deeds Award.

In honor of this occasion, I would like to share with my colleagues the following editorial from the San Bernardino Sun of Thursday, September 19, 1985:

It is appropriate to say "happy birthday" to Stater Bros. markets, the Inland Empire's largest hometown company.

The chain of Groceries began nearly 50 years ago when twin brothers, Leo and Cleo Stater, bought the W.A. Davis market in Yucaipa.

It was a family affair. They later brought their brother, Lavoy, into the business. As their late fourth brother, Virgil, said a few years ago, at one time or another, the entire Stater family worked for the chain. Even their mother, Mary, was an active participant. At one point, she managed three of the stores in Fontana, Rialto and Cedar Glen.

Jack Brown, now Stater's president and chief executive officer, says the dates are "fuzzy," but the company is celebrating its 50th anniversary now and will continue to do so until Aug. 17, 1986, anniversary of the day company officials believe Leo and Cleo acquired the Yucaipa market and started repainting the outside.

Petrolane, a petroleum services company, bought the enterprise from the Stater family in 1968. Brown and other top executives of the chain bought it from Petrolane in 1983.

Today, Stater has 94 stores in five counties, employs more than 5,000 people, and does a gross business of \$800 million a year.

That makes it the biggest company headquartered in the Inland Empire—in Colton,

specifically—and the sixth biggest grocery chain in the West. With 3,500 of its 5,000 employees working in San Bernardino County, it is the area's largest private employer.

More important, Brown chuckles a polite "no way" when asked if the company might move elsewhere as has happened with some of our other successful home-grown organizations.

Stater Bros. started here, remains here, and is important here. It contributes not only as a supplier, taxpayer and employer, but individually and corporately through its executives, managers and employees who are supporters of academic, civic and cultural activities. They've been good citizens.

We wish the firm a happy golden anniversary, and we hope it will enjoy many more.

**DAVID THOMAS, THE LORD PITT
OF HAMPSTEAD HONORED IN
UNITED STATES**

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, when I was a young man in Trinidad, I met another young man, a doctor from Grenada. We both were interested in politics. But we found ourselves on opposite sides of the political fence. Nevertheless, over the years we became friends. After a time, I emigrated to the United States and began a career in politics. My friend went to England and did the same thing. I take a lot of pride in my long association with the good doctor. I take pride in the fact that he is only the third black man to have been elevated by the Queen to the House of Lords. I take pride in the fact that he is the first black man to assume the presidency of the British Medical Association.

For the past week, David Thomas, the Lord Pitt of Hampstead has been touring the United States and receiving accolades wherever he goes. He has made a point of visiting all the historically black medical schools in the United States during his tour. And at Shaw University in Raleigh, NC, an institution that has served black people educationally for over a century, Lord Pitt received an honorary doctor of laws degree. In recognition of the magnificent contributions he has made to black people politically and in medicine over the past half century, I ask that the proclamation that accompanied the bestowing of the degree of doctor of laws on Lord Pitt be entered in the permanent RECORD of the proceedings of the Congress of the United States:

**DAVID THOMAS, THE LORD PITT OF
HAMPSTEAD, DOCTOR OF LAWS**

Mr. President: The Honorable David Thomas, the Lord Pitt of Hampstead, has carved out for himself an enviable and inimitable and world renowned record in the areas of medicine and politics.

He obtained his medical training at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland, and served commendably and creditably as a General Medical Practitioner in the Caribbean for nine years before returning to the

United Kingdom where, for the past thirty-eight years, he has continued to bring healing and hope to the citizenry of London, England. In recognition of his sterling and exemplary services as a distinguished health professional, he was elected by his medical colleagues this year (1985) President of the prestigious, internationally known and recognized British Medical Association.

While his medical contributions have been great, his contributions in the area of voluntary humanitarianism have been as great, if not greater. As a student leader at Edinburgh he showed a keen political awareness and an alert social consciousness. He carried those qualities with him and they have aided him as he has served some twenty-five organizations and movements in promoting political, civic and social causes in the Caribbean and England, including: President, West Indian National Party; Member, Greater London Council; Deputy Chairman and Chairman of Greater London Council; and Deputy Chairman and Chairman of the Community Relations Commission. This strong sense of Social responsibility and this profound commitment to the healing and helping arts have culminated in the quintessential recognition when in 1975, he was created Life Peer (Baron) and assumed the laudable appellation of the Lord Pitt of Hampstead.

Mr. President, any man who has accomplished so much in a chosen career and in voluntary service deserves the highest commendations. With that in mind, I proudly present David Thomas, the Lord Pitt of Hampstead, for the honorary degree Doctor Laws.

HELP FOR THE HUNGRY

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, the battle against hunger in our society is one that must be fought on many fronts.

A new program in Quincy, MA, is setting an example for community involvement and participation that deserves to be a model for the rest of the country. I encourage my colleagues to encourage a similar response in their own districts to the very successful pilot program that was described recently in the pages of the Quincy, MA, Sun.

The article follows:

[From the Quincy Sun, Sept. 12, 1985]

**FARMERS' MARKET CONTRIBUTES OVER 1,000
POUNDS PRODUCE TO NEEDY**

The Farmer's Market in Quincy has contributed over 1,000 pounds of fresh produce to the needy since a pilot program to help the state's hungry was launched last month.

According to Annel Johnson of the Norfolk County Extension Service—Nutrition Agency, a large portion of the 1,127 pounds of produce (including some 40 dozen ears of sweet corn) was picked up by the Southwest Community Center for distribution by Quincy Community Action's Emergency Food Program.

On Aug. 10 the pilot food program was launched in Quincy Center by State Agriculture Commissioner August Schumacher Jr. It was the first time a farmers' market

donated a variety of fresh fruits and vegetables at the end of the selling day.

According to Schumacher, if the program is successful, it will be expanded to include all 45 farmers' markets in the state, and if necessary, recruit foundations to help pay the costs.

Contributing to the cost of the pilot program at the Quincy Farmers' Market are The Colonial Federal Savings Bank, Quincy Savings Bank, and the City of Quincy.

Quincy Farmers' Market is coordinated and supervised by the Nutrition Education program of Norfolk County Extension Service, and a group of volunteers from the community.

LESSONS OF GREENPEACE

HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the admission this week by the French Government of direct responsibility for the attack on the Greenpeace ship, the *Rainbow Warrior*, has raised profound moral questions as well as underscored important lessons for all democratic systems of governance.

For 14 years, Greenpeace has striven to prevent nuclear testing and save endangered sea animals. It is a profound irony that an organization dedicated to peace and nonviolence should fall victim to such a senseless act of state-sponsored terrorism.

From an American perspective, it is instructive to search out the important lessons of this tragedy. There appear to be several of note.

First, a great power can make a great mistake, this one bordering on the silly. For France to seek recourse in sabotage against an idealistic few could not demonstrate more graphically the increasing tendency of peoples—and governments—to vent their disagreements and accomplish their objectives through violence against innocents.

Second, even if seemingly justified from a national interest perspective, acts that violate international law and international norms of behavior are generally counterproductive. Support for Greenpeace as well as senseless rifts between democratic countries like New Zealand and France can only grow after such egregious, premeditated violence.

Third, seldom can a democratic society engage in covert violence without eventually being forced to accept responsibility. Intelligence services must understand that despite great safeguards, leaks often occur and, as in this instance, a government in power has been forced to recant, to its embarrassment and jeopardy.

Fourth, few governments have armies that can stand up to the awesome military capabilities of the nuclear powers. But in the area of terrorism, they can compete on equal, and in some cases stronger, footing because acts of a terrorist nature are usually less acceptable in democratic as opposed to authoritarian societies. Accordingly,

democratic governments have a vested interest in avoiding terrorism and conforming foreign policy as pristinely as possible to international law. Adherence to the rule of law should be the touchstone that distinguishes democracy from politically repressive systems of the left and the right. Authoritarian societies should never be given the excuse of rationalizing terrorism as a tit-for-tat response to the illegal acts of democracies.

Europeans sometimes assume that the venerable histories of their societies provide them a greater grasp of the subtleties of international affairs and diplomacy. The Greenpeace episode belies such assumptions.

But in the case, we would do well to assess the mistakes of the French and ask whether there are lessons for our own foreign policy. Does it, for instance, advance international law to deny the jurisdiction of the World Court over our policies in Central America? Do we retard or invite greater terrorism by aiding and abetting counterrevolutionary forces in Nicaragua? Can we insulate our interventionist policy in Lebanon from reactions against Americans and governmental facilities, here and abroad?

In plotting the sinking of the *Rainbow Warrior*, the French appear to have overreacted to the Greenpeace movement. In initially denying public accountability they appear to have underestimated the demand for truth in a democracy.

An American might ask whether Paris has become anesthetized to the subtleties of right and wrong in national security policy. A Frenchman might respond that the anesthesia had been administered in powerful doses on this side of the Atlantic.

THE YEAR OF THANKSGIVING

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] and I are introducing a resolution to designate 1987 as the "Year of Thanksgiving."

Previously, we had introduced House Joint Resolution 398, a resolution to designate 1986 as the "Year of Thanksgiving." The National Committee of the Year of Thanksgiving has advised us of their decision to focus upon 1987 as the "Year of Thanksgiving." The year 1987 will be especially appropriate since it marks both the bicentennial of the Constitution of the United States and the convening of the 100th Congress. In addition, the selection of the year 1987 will provide extra time for the preparation of ceremonies and activities to observe the "Year of Thanksgiving."

Therefore, we are introducing a new resolution to reflect this change. The resolution we are introducing is identical to House Joint Resolution 398, except that the "Year of Thanksgiving" has been changed from 1986 to 1987.

We urge our colleagues to join with us as cosponsors of the "Year of Thanksgiving" resolution. The text of the resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 398

To designate 1987 as the "Year of Thanksgiving".

Whereas, since the days of the early settlers, it has been a tradition of the American people to celebrate a season of thanksgiving;

Whereas many of our great national leaders, including President Washington and President Lincoln, recognized the importance of setting aside a time of thanksgiving by Presidential proclamation, as in proclamations which established the fourth Thursday in November as Thanksgiving Day;

Whereas, in 1941, Thanksgiving Day was established as a permanent national holiday; and

Whereas, in 1987, the people of the United States will celebrate the Bicentennial of the Constitution of the United States and the convening of the 100th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That 1987 is designated as the "Year of Thanksgiving", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the Governors of the several States, the chief officials of local governments, and the people of the United States to observe such year with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

LEV ELBERT'S 37th BIRTHDAY

HON. MIKE LOWRY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. LOWRY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to Lev Elbert of Ki'ev on the occasion of his 37th birthday on September 30. Lev, his wife Inna, and their son Carmi are among the many Soviet Jews who inspire us all with the courage, dignity, and determination that characterize their struggle to win the rights to worship freely and to emigrate.

The past few years have been difficult ones for the Elberts. In 1983, Lev was sentenced to imprisonment in a labor camp for refusing to report for reserve military duty. His refusal stemmed from his concern that the authorities would claim that he was exposed to military secrets during the additional military service and use this excuse to permanently deny him permission to emigrate. Inna's health has suffered from a hunger strike that she began to protest phony drug charges against Lev, which were eventually dropped. Their son Carmi was injured in anti-Semitic attacks at his school. In May of this year, Lev's most recent application for permission to emigrate was turned down. Lev's brother has received anti-Semitic hate mail. But the family has shown immense inner strengths throughout their ordeal.

I know that our continuing expressions of support and concern are a great help. I

would like to express my deep appreciation to the National Conference on Soviet Jewry and the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews for their continuing devotion to this most important cause. In addition, I very much appreciate the efforts of the Members from Georgia to send books to the Elberts. As the occasion of Lev's birthday reminds us, we must continue our efforts as long as they are needed.

**CLEVELAND'S POLONIA
HERITAGE AWARDS**

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 6, 1985 the Polonia Foundation of Ohio will be holding its "Pulaski Commemorative and Recognition Banquet" at the Knights of Columbus Hall in Garfield Heights. This year's event will mark the 206th commemorative observance of the untimely death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

General Pulaski is an important figure in American as well as Polish history. He is known as the "Father of American Cavalry" and distinguished himself in our Revolutionary War. At the Battle of Brandywine, he saved the life of Gen. George Washington, the "Father of our Country." General Pulaski was wounded in combat at the battle of Savannah, GA and died from wounds on October 11, 1779. In 1929, Congress passed an act designating each October 11 as "Pulaski Day."

The memory of General Pulaski is traditionally observed in our country by honoring the men and women of Polish descent who have distinguished themselves with unselfish service to their communities. This year, Stanley Preebe, chairman of the Honoree Selection Committee, announced that the prestigious "Polonia Heritage Awards" will be bestowed to Mrs. Irene Morrow, secretary of the Cleveland Civil Service Commission; Jerome Krakowski, clerk of the Cleveland Municipal Court; and Edmund Goodwin, former national, State, county and Cleveland leader in the Polish Legion of American Veterans.

Violet Paul, chairman of the Scholarship Committee, will present the academic, engineering and medical assistant grants. Mayor Raymond Grabow will serve as toastmaster and Casimir Bielen as banquet general chairman.

I ask that short biographical sketches of this year's honorees be printed in the RECORD.

ABOUT IRENE MORROW

Irene Morrow was born in Cleveland, an only child of Lottie and the late George Tomcik, and although her father's roots were Slovak, Irene was raised in the Polish traditions of her mother. As a child, she attended Immaculate Heart of Mary School, where she learned to read and write in the Polish language, however, it was her mother who taught her about her Slavic heritage and those traditions which she so strongly embraces, even to this day. She attended

Marymount High School, Cleveland College and the Cleveland Institute of Art. Her interest in music lead her to study piano, violin and voice, and although her career has lead her down other paths, she still enjoys the arts, in both music and drawing. Irene married in 1951 and the products of this union are Jeffrey, Patrick, Martin, Roberta, Lorraine and Christine. Irene has carefully guided her children through college and into successful careers.

Among her most cherished hobbies is her love of politics. She has been involved in numerous campaigns from the Presidency of the United States down to local campaigns for Councilmen and School Boards. A review of her political record would indicate that she has been an asset to her favorite candidates. She has been a member of the Cuyahoga County Republican Organization's Executive Committee for many years. During her twenty-two (22) years of public service, Irene worked for the Cuyahoga County Auditor as the Supervisor of County Payrolls, then became a Personnel Administrator at the City of Cleveland for ten (10) years. For the past four years, she has served as the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission of Cleveland administering the testing programs in over 850 classifications.

For most of her life, Irene has been a member of the Association of Polish Women, holding two (2) different offices. She also has been a life long member of the Slovak Catholic Union, and a member of the Polish American Congress for the past ten (10) years. During the last twenty (20) years, Irene has been on the Executive Committee of the American Nationalities Movement, an organization comprised of thirty-three (33) different nationalities, serving as the Treasurer for the last two (2) years. She has been active with the National Republican Heritage Groups Council and has represented her nationality at their conventions.

ABOUT JEROME KRAKOWSKI

Cleveland Municipal Court Clerk, Jerome F. Krakowski, has been a lifelong resident of Cleveland. Mr. Krakowski graduated from Benedictine High School in 1955, then went on to major in economics at Kent State University. Prior to his coming to the Cleveland Municipal Court, Mr. Krakowski was a partner with his father in the family-owned plumbing business. Later, he served as the Editor of a neighborhood newspaper, the "Perry News", which to this day still serves the community in which he resides. In 1972, Mr. Krakowski was named Personnel Bailiff to the Chief Judge of the Cleveland Municipal Court, Edward F. Katalinas. When the Office of Clerk of Courts became vacant in 1977, Mr. Krakowski was unanimously appointed to fill the unexpired term by the Judges of the Cleveland Municipal Court. In his first bid for public office, Mr. Krakowski was elected to fill this unexpired term of office. Then, two years later, he was re-elected to a six year term as Clerk of Courts.

During his distinguished service as Clerk, Mr. Krakowski has been instrumental in the modernization and implementation of several new programs in the Clerk of Courts office. His list of accomplishments include the introduction of electronic microfilming and computerized case indexing. He was instrumental in working with the Ohio General Assembly in developing the legislation that "decriminalized" the parking ticket. Cleveland City Council, recognizing Mr. Krakowski as a nationally acclaimed au-

thority in this field, named him as the Administrator of the new Parking Violation Bureau, providing for the effective collection of parking violation fines, revenues of which are in the millions of dollars.

Throughout his tenure as Clerk, Mr. Krakowski has not only operated his office on a balanced budget, he has, through his investment of public funds, earned interest in excess of one million dollars for the citizens of Cleveland. Mr. Krakowski's involvement in community and civic organizations are many. Among them he is a member of the National Association for Court Administration, the Ohio Association of Municipality Court Clerks, the Northeast Ohio Clerks Association, the Greater Cleveland knights of Columbus, the Citizens League of Greater Cleveland, the Alliance of Poles and the Union of Poles. Mr. Kakowski and his family are members of St. Vitus Catholic Church and is still associated with St. Casimir Catholic church. He is also the recipient of numerous other civic and community awards.

ABOUT EDMUND GOODWIN

PAST

Commander of Brooklyn Post 61—5 terms; District Commander—P.L.A.V. District No. 1; Dept. Commander—State of Ohio; National Americanism officer—P.L.A.V.; National Public Relations officer—P.L.A.V.; President—Parma Heights Chamber of Commerce—Two terms as president (1962 & 1969); Member of the Board of Zoning Appeals—City of Parma Heights; President—Parma Heights Democratic Club; Director of National Dept.—P.L.A.V.—Convention Corp.; Director—Brooklyn Polish American Home, Inc.; Also served as Canteen Chairman while Director, and as Co-chairman of the building committee during the building of our second floor; Past President of Polonia Foundation of Ohio—1982-83; Vice President of Joint Veterans Commission—10 terms and President in 1982-83; Recipient of the "Man of the Year Award"—Parma Heights—Chamber of Commerce 1963-64; Recipient of the "Veteran of the Year Award" of the Joint Veterans Commission 1969.

PRESENT

Treasurer of Memorial Day Association—30 years and now; Trustee of Memorial Day Association—40 years; Member of Cleveland Parade Council—one of 8 marshals on the staff; Organizer and member of P.L.A.V. Brooklyn Post No. 61; Life member of Disabled American Veterans; Life member of Amvets; Member of American Legion and presently serving in the capacity of Vice-Commander of Excelsior Post 628—largest in the district; Service Officer of P.L.A.V. Brooklyn Post No. 61; Inspector General—P.L.A.V. Dept. of Ohio; Public Relations Officer—National Dept. P.L.A.V.; Director of the Board of the Polonia Foundation; Director on the Board of Trustees—Parma Heights Chamber of Commerce; Trustee on the board of the Brooklyn Polish American Home Scholarship Fund; Director on the Convention Corporation Dept. of Ohio, P.L.A.V.; Member of the Executive Board of the Polish Americans, Inc.—Political non-partisan organization of the Poles in Cleveland; Member of Cleveland Society—An organization of Polish businessmen and professional people; Member of the Board of Trustees Joint Veterans Council; President of Department of Ohio (PLAV) Convention Corp.

FAMILY

Married Victoria on August 21, 1937 and has two married daughters.

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM M. THOMAS SALUTES POLLY VAUGHAN AND BEBE BURKE

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, and my fellow representatives, I would like to take a few moments of your time to bring to your attention the endeavors of two very special women from my district, Mrs. Polly Vaughan and Mrs. Bebe Burke.

Polly and Bebe have shown unselfish dedication to improving the community of which they are a most vital part. Through their personal devotion to teenagers of Bakersfield, Polly and Bebe are providing a long-term solution to a problem that is facing many of our young people throughout the country.

Twenty-three years ago Polly and Bebe began their campaign to help combat teenage drug abuse. Their program, "Teen Involvement" now reaches hundreds of high school and junior high school students, educating them about the dangers of drug abuse. Their program is unique in that it trains high school students to be positive role models for younger students. Their efforts began at West High School in Bakersfield where they trained students to give a series of presentations to a nearby junior high school. They worked with teachers and students of West High to get the program to the successful level it has now achieved.

Before Polly and Bebe began this training, many hours were spent talking with school officials from not only Kern High School District but also San Diego and Anaheim to find out what programs were available to their students. Due to the unavailability of school funds, fund raising was a big part of their job. Their efforts reached out to the state mental health program, the county superintendent of schools, and many friends in the private sector. "Teen Involvement" is now in full-swing at five different high schools. Many junior high students who were once on the receiving end of the drug-abuse presentations have enlisted in the program to serve as role-models. The program has just been institutionalized and for the first time will run without the direct hand of Polly and Bebe.

Polly and Bebe have proven that through hard work and dedication an individual can make a difference. If other schools throughout the country followed the examples set by their program, "Teen Involvement", perhaps the problem of drug abuse among teenagers could be greatly alleviated. I feel these women deserve the highest praise from this body.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CLEARWATER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, tonight the Greater Clearwater Chamber of Commerce holds its 62d annual banquet. It will be the time when the gavel is passed from Ron Smith, north suncoast division manager of Florida Power, to Alan Bomstein, president of Creative Contractors. It is also the time when a special milestone is commemorated: achieving more than 2,000 members making the Greater Clearwater Chamber of Commerce the single largest chamber of commerce in Pinellas County.

Reaching that membership goal enabled the Clearwater chamber to be recognized nationwide as having the highest total new membership value for chambers of commerce in the United States in cities with populations of 75,000 to 200,000. According to Mr. Smith, "This is an outstanding accomplishment for our chamber since Clearwater is in the lower population range for the award. This reflects the strong support our chamber receives from clearwater's business community."

Achieving the membership goal is only one of the many accomplishments this year of the Greater Clearwater Chamber of Commerce. Overall they had undertaken 73 different projects coordinated through the five different divisions of the chamber, economic development, public affairs, business improvement, organizational improvement, and tourism. In turn, each division was composed of eight or nine committees and subcommittees representing the efforts of hundreds of dedicated volunteers, the backbone of the Clearwater chamber.

Mr. Speaker, as a former president of a chamber of commerce I understand the important role it plays in the effective functioning of a single business or an entire community. The Greater Clearwater Chamber of Commerce experience success in both areas, because they listen to people from all walks of life as they try to meet the needs of the entire community.

I feel honored to represent the people who comprise the Greater Clearwater Chamber of Commerce. As they pursue excellence for themselves and their community, they raise the standard for many across the United States to attempt to do the same.

Upon the celebration of the 62d banquet of the Greater Clearwater Chamber of Commerce, I would like to extend my most sincere congratulations.

THE RETIREMENT OF MR. ROBERT U. BELMONT

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, next month, Mr. Robert U. Belmont will retire as chief of police for the city of Gustine after more than 20 years of service in the field of law enforcement.

Bob was born in Fresno, and attended high school in Dos Palos. He later graduated from the University of Virginia and the National FBI Academy. He served in the Marines from 1946 to 1948, and was later called back for 2 more years of service during the Korean war.

He began his career in law enforcement in the 1950's when he joined the Dos Palos Police Department, and eventually was promoted to chief of police. In 1957, Bob left the department to accept a position with the California State Automobile Association. In 1964, he returned to his law enforcement career, becoming a deputy with the Merced County Sheriff's Department. In 1966, he was appointed to the position he now holds, chief of police in Gustine. During Bob's tenure, due to his efficient law enforcement organization, the crime rate in Gustine has been remarkably low. In fact, Gustine presently has the second-lowest crime rate for small cities in California.

Bob has been very active in local community service organizations. He has been a member of the Salvation Army for over 30 years, and has served as a member of the Gustine School Board. He has been a member of the Rotary Club for 20 years, and has served as president of both the Dos Palos and Gustine chapters. He is also a member of the Gustine Lions Club.

Throughout his career, Chief Robert Belmont has worked hard to serve the people of our community. His successful control of crime in Gustine and his selfless community service will serve as an enduring record of his work. On behalf of the people of Gustine, I would like to commend him for all that he has done to make our community a better place to live, and I wish him continued health and happiness in his retirement.

1985 CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, as a participant in the 1985 Congressional Call to Conscience Vigil for Soviet Jews I would like to call my colleagues attention to the nightmare that Tatiana Zunshine has been living.

Mrs. Zunshine's husband, Zachar, has been imprisoned since March 6, 1984, for

the simple reason that he desires to emigrate from the Soviet Union. The Zunshines first applied to emigrate in 1981, but were subsequently denied that right. Recently, however, life has become more difficult for Tatiana. She is struggling with Soviet authorities in an attempt to visit her husband in prison.

After learning of her plans to go to Irkutsk for a chance to meet with her husband, who was soon to be transferred from the internal prison, the KGB denied her permission to leave Riga. For 2 weeks she was followed constantly by a team of KGB. When she finally went to Irkutsk prison, she found that her husband was already gone. She then traveled to Bazoni where Zachar was now being held and requested a meeting with her husband. The officials of the camp denied her request and said that Zachar had been placed in solitary confinement since his arrival, by an order signed by the commandant of Khanyahki.

In a meeting with Mr. Stepaneko, chief of the Bazoni Camp, Tatiana learned her husband had been in a solitary confinement punishment cell from July 19 to August 3, allegedly due to his refusal to submit to a medical examination. He was also placed in this cell from August 6 to August 23 for exchanging words with another inmate during exercise. The reason for the first punishment, according to Tatiana, is highly questionable since her husband has sought medical attention repeatedly during his incarceration.

In an unprecedented action by the Soviets, Tatiana was denied access to Government offices in Moscow where she attempted to register her complaints. Mr. Pobezhimov, chief of the board for the Regulation and Fulfillment of Laws of Prisons and Labor Camps refused to see her. Furthermore, Tatiana was the only person not permitted at the monthly reception held by the Gulag office of the U.S.S.R. According to my sources, Tatiana's interpretation of the events is that an official decision has been made by the authorities to neutralize and suppress her activities on behalf of her husband. She has informed the authorities that she will not be silent about continued breaches of Soviet Law and continued denial of her rights as a Soviet citizen.

I am sure that my colleagues can sympathize with Tatiana's struggle to see her husband and the persecution that the Zunshines have been forced to suffer. It is an outrage that this innocent family, who simply desire to practice their religion in Israel, have become victims of the tyranny of Soviet authorities. Unfortunately, the Zunshine family is only one of thousands who are denied permission to emigrate and are subject to great harassment.

We must not forget the Zunshines and the injustice suffered by other Soviet refugees. Their situation emphasizes the need for congressional activity, such as the Congressional Human Rights Caucus and International Parliamentary Group for Human Rights in the Soviet Union, to focus attention on abuses practiced by the Soviet Government. We must continue to do all that we can to help the Zunshines realize

their dream of living in Israel. There is no more vital task than to help innocent victims, whose only crime is their desire for human liberty.

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 3228 CONCERNING U.S. MONETARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, when the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act, H.R. 3228, comes before the House in the next couple of weeks, it is my intention to offer a number of amendments to various sections of the bill which are aimed at reducing U.S. contributions to the United Nations.

On next Tuesday, during a 1-hour special order, I will share with my colleagues of the House sufficient information on the policies and operations of the United Nations and its related agencies with which to answer a couple of very important questions: First, What kind of voice does the United States have in the votes and day-to-day operations of the United Nations? And, second, Is the United Nations good for the United States and the rest of the free world?

I will show that the United States really does not have any control over the actions of the United Nations or its related agencies. We don't determine where these funds go, to whom, or how much. The United Nations has evolved into a valuable tool used by the Soviet Union and her satellites in executing their expansionist policies.

I invite my colleagues to listen to this speech on Tuesday, whether they are here on the floor or in their offices watching channel 3. And, I would hope that, after listening to the facts, my colleagues would be inclined to support my amendments.

It is high time we, as an institution, do something about this incredible situation.

HONORING FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to call the attention of my colleagues to the outstanding contributions to the field of education, and the Nation as a whole, by a university in the Second Congressional District of Florida.

Florida A&M University, seated on the tallest of seven hills on 419 acres of rolling wooded land in Tallahassee, FL, has become a major force in the field of education and research. The third oldest State institution in Florida's university system, FAMU was founded in 1887 as a State normal school with 15 students and 12

teachers. Today, it is recognized as one of the leading institutions of higher education in America. Led by a long line of distinguished presidents, beginning with Thomas De Salle Tucker to the present head, Dr. Frederick Humphries, and including Dr. William H. Gray, Jr., father of our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the university has maintained for nearly 100 years its primary goals of promoting academic excellence and improving the quality of life for the individuals it serves and their society.

Today, the university serves more than 6,000 undergraduate and graduate students. A 4-year public land grant institution, it offers courses in 10 colleges, a division of graduate studies, and continuing education.

FAMU is a leader in many aspects, including housing the oldest school of nursing in the State. It is the only black college or university to offer the B.S., M.S., Ph.D. and Ph.D. in the area of pharmacy. The chronopharmacology research being conducted in conjunction with NASA will have a significant impact on space flight travel. The school of pharmacy graduates have a 95 percent first-time pass rate on the State board examination. As evidence of its program excellence, FAMU has been the largest producer of black pharmacists in the country during the past 10 years.

The world renowned school of business and industry is one of the few business programs of its kind, emphasizing behavior as an integral part of the curriculum. The school teachers corporate behavior, not just theory but practical as well. Corporate America has been involved in every part of the curriculum. The college sponsored forum series brings in chief executive officers from national and international corporations, including Chase Manhattan, Johnson & Johnson, General Electric, General Motors Corp., and Bank of Tokyo. The number of yearly applicants vastly exceed the number admitted to the program.

The college of engineering science has nearly 400 majors in data processing and technology, and is considered one of the major suppliers of computer programmers in the region.

FAMU's band, the incomparable "Marching 100," has appeared on national television more than 34 times on all three major networks. Their unmatched performances have been viewed by more than 3 billion people, with appearances on 60 Minutes, 20/20, Entertainment Tonight, and PM Magazine. The band has performed at several Super Bowls and is the only collegiate band to have performed with the U.S. Army Band in a joint concert at Constitution Hall. Led by Dr. William P. Foster, past president of the Collegiate Band Directors National Music Association, the "Marching 100" will, in October, become the fourth recipient of the Sutler Intercollegiate Marching Band Trophy.

FAMU's School of Journalism, Media, and Graphic Arts, offers the only baccalaureate degree in printing in Florida, where the industry is one of the top 10 in the State. The division of journalism was the

first such program at a historically black university to be accredited by the Council for Education in Journalism and Mass Communications. It is still the only one.

FAMU's Black Archives Research Center and Museum, directed by James Eaton, will this year celebrate a decade of service to the State and Nation. Housed in the Carnegie Library, the archives is the largest repository of Afro-American history and artifacts in the Southeast. The museum, which has more than 100,000 guests annually, has been cited in journals throughout the Nation, including U.S. News & World Report. The archives diligently continues to enlarge its holdings and makes a concerted effort to bring different aspects of the center to the attention of the American people.

It is for these and many other reasons, that time will not permit me to list, that I today salute Florida A&M University and the more than 100 national historically black colleges which share such a rich heritage and which grants more than 30,000 degrees each year in every field of study. From such humble beginnings, these schools have risen to the forefront in the field of education and research.

**RETIRES CHAPTER OF LOCAL
696 CELEBRATES 50TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF UAW**

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on October 6, the retirees chapter of local 696 of the UAW will hold its annual dinner at the Dayton Convention Center. This year is a special occasion because it marks the 50th anniversary of the founding of the UAW.

At 1,100 members strong, the local 696 chapter is one of the most active UAW retirees group in Ohio. It provides important services not only to its members but to the entire greater Dayton community. Chapter volunteers distribute food to the needy, visit shut-ins, provide toys for children, and work with United Way programs. In addition, members are active with area senior citizen groups.

I wish to take this time to commend the retirees of local 696 for their contributions to the community. In addition, it is fitting on the 50th anniversary of the UAW to mark their contributions to the UAW and to the union movement.

The UAW was 4 years old when local 696 was founded in 1939. Since that time, local members have fought for and won many of the rights which are enjoyed by working men and women today.

The retirees of local 696 helped build the union into a powerful force to represent American labor. They remain concerned and active in promoting the interests of the union.

To the members of the retirees chapter of Local 696 of the UAW, thanks for your service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

**CRITICAL NEED TO REDUCE
FEDERAL DEFICIT**

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I received an excellent letter from my friend and constituent, Mr. Rumsey Taylor, Sr., owner of Princeton Lumber Co. in Princeton, KY, which I would like to share with my colleagues.

Rumsey Taylor, one of Kentucky's most respected business, civic, and religious leaders, is approaching his 83d birthday, and he is extremely concerned about the adverse effects upon America of Federal deficit financing and Congress' inability to make substantive reductions in Federal Government spending.

Mr. Taylor, a close friend and confidant of several past and present Kentucky Governors and Members of Congress, is supportive of a constitutional amendment "that will demand a balanced budget." I urge my colleagues to read his timely comments to me. His September 9 letter follows:

SEPTEMBER 9, 1985.

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD,
Congressman, First District, Kentucky, 2182
Rayburn Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CARROLL: This beloved Nation of ours faces a turning point. We are either going to make a new start toward financial stability or we are going bankrupt. I am convinced that the chief cause of our economic crisis is deficit financing. Entirely too much of our tax income must go for servicing these deficit obligations.

I am approaching my 83rd birthday. I have been a student of government and business since college days—the early twenties. I have never seen or known of any business—agricultural, industrial, retail or cooperative—that operated on repeated deficit budgets that did not fail. A government is no different.

Because of the influence of special interests, the lack of "guts" on the part of Congress to tackle the problem of a run-away social programs, and the refusal of Congress to eliminate duplicate and/or unneeded projects, I am convinced that only one avenue offers any hope for the return of financial stability.

That hope is a constitutional amendment that will demand a balanced budget. And I believe that if such a bill is passed by Congress, it will be speedily ratified by the States. Many of them already operate under a balanced budget in State affairs.

As a life-long friend of both you and your father, may I urge you to make every effort to make possible for this Nation a balanced budget—and make it mandatory.

It will not be easy. Some will be hurt as we pay for our sins of the past. But I can see no other solution to our problem. I am positive that I express the feelings of millions of our fellow Americans.

May God bless you in your efforts,
RUMSEY TAYLOR, SR.,
Princeton Lumber Co., Princeton, KY.

**TIME FOR A REAL WAR ON
DRUGS**

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I want to bring my colleagues' attention to a column entitled "Time for a Real War on Drugs", by Dr. Mitchell S. Rosenthal, head of the New York City-based drug treatment program called Phoenix House. Dr. Rosenthal's remarks appeared in the September 2, 1985, issue of Newsweek on the "My Turn" page.

Dr. Rosenthal correctly points out that those who advocate legalization of illicit narcotics do not recognize the difference between losing the war on drugs, and not winning it. He cites others who believe, as I do, that legalizing illicit drugs will result in a major increase in their use far beyond the startling numbers of Americans who already are users of these deadly substances.

Dr. Rosenthal also is correct in his assessment that the war against drugs in going badly these days, partly because of a failure of will and also an inappropriate strategy. He notes the Government spends little, comparatively, on drug abuse and my own select committee has found that the amount has decreased steadily under the Reagan administration. We also are losing the interdiction battle, and my committee learned from a recent study mission to South America that this year's skirmishes are likely to be even more tragic as we face a bumper crop of illicit narcotics flowing from our southern neighbors.

Interdiction, prevention and treatment are all parts of a needed multifaceted approach to curbing this killer that is poisoning our young people and our society. We also, as Dr. Rosenthal notes, must change our attitudes about drug abuse. More former drug abusers must step forward to relate their mistakes, and more nonusers must stand up and be proud of their shunning of harmful narcotics. And I hope he is right that if we can change our attitudes about drunken driving and cigarettes, we can continue to work to change our attitudes about the false glamor of illicit drugs.

I ask that Dr. Rosenthal's article "time for a Real War on Drugs" be submitted into the RECORD at this time.

[From the Newsweek, Sept. 2, 1985]

TIME FOR A REAL WAR ON DRUGS

(By Mitchell S. Rosenthal)

America is not winning the war against drugs, at least that is the popular perception. As a result a good many folks—many of them lawyers, some of them scientists and a clutch of writers, including columnist William F. Buckley Jr.—are suggesting it is time to quit. They argue that legalization of marijuana and cocaine would eliminate drug crime and reduce the profits from vice as well.

The "quit now" crowd plainly does not recognize the difference between "not win-

ning" a war and "losing" one. The notion that we could make drugs legal while simultaneously mounting a massive public-education campaign to discourage their use, would give cocaine and marijuana the same status as cigarettes. The most likely result, according to the former director of the National Institute of Drug Abuse, would be a tenfold increase in cocaine use, about as many Americans using cocaine as now smoke cigarettes, of which a sizable number are between the ages of 10 and 18.

INTERDICTION

There is another reason not to give up the fight, and it is because we can win. After more than 20 years of treating and curing drug abuse, I see enough evidence to convince me that the war is winnable—not now, but in time. The war goes badly now for much the same reasons that any war goes badly. In part it is inappropriate strategy—fighting the wrong enemy, in the wrong place, with the wrong weapons. And in part it is failure of will.

Most of the billion dollars a year the federal government spends enforcing drug laws (only \$81 million of that is used to fight drug abuse) goes to halt the flow of drugs into our country. Interdiction is the major weapon, and 12 tons of cocaine and 1,500 tons of marijuana worth billions of dollars on the street were seized last year. Yet the more we seize at our end of the pipeline, the more drug traffickers feed into the other end. In frustration, we turn our ire on producing nations and struggle to reduce supply.

The demand side, however, is easier to reach. It is barely concealed at all these days, and it consists of the more than 20 million Americans who now regularly use illicit drugs. Yet our reluctance to attack demand reflects a failure of will—not on the part of law-enforcement agencies or drug abuse professionals, but on the part of the American public. What it comes down to is what Americans feel personally about drugs, about what is wrongheadedly called "recreational" use of marijuana and cocaine by children and friends. We are unwilling to see them at risk of arrest because of it. We are content with a "trickle down" approach—one that focuses on putting major dealers behind bars.

FREEDOM

Unless we reach consensus on the strict enforcement of drug laws, we will not win the war. Too many young adults are convinced they enjoy some special "right" to use illicit drugs. Too many Americans are torn between the urge to condemn behavior of which they disapprove and the need to tolerate what they have somehow come to believe is a matter of individual freedom or simply none of their business.

What is needed is broad societal disapproval of illicit drug use. This does not mean that drug users should go to jail; the purpose of drug laws is not punishment—certainly not when applied to users. The laws are a means of controlling a contagious disease by imposing the requirement of education and treatment on its carriers. And active disapproval and the use of informal social sanctions might even make more aggressive law enforcement irrelevant.

The hostess who is certain of her own unwillingness to tolerate pot smoking in her home doesn't need to call the cops to keep her guests from lighting up—no more than she need call them to stop her guests from stealing the silver or spitting in the soup. There are far more effective ways of bring-

ing the behavior of colleagues into line—once we accept the need to draw such a line.

In many ways our society resembles the American family in the 1960s. Many parents allowed their youngsters to stumble through the drug experience and only later came to realize the costs in terms of chronic impairment and lost educational and career opportunities. Parental attitudes have changed markedly and many are taking the hard line, which is really the loving line, one that shows responsible concern.

The Navy, too, is attacking the demand side. Although it brings heavy weapons into play—drug tests and disciplinary actions—it stresses the interdependence of seamen with the motto: "Not on my watch, not on my ship, not in my Navy."

COSTS

This is the kind of attitudinal change I expect to see over the next decade. And it is already under way. Adolescents have become far more critical of drug use by their friends—the result of better drug education in the schools and more awareness of the dangers on the street. Employers are also responding to the evidence that drug use on the job has economic costs.

We have, in recent years, shown a remarkable capacity to alter our attitudes in response to new evidence. We have, for example, dramatically changed the ways we think about cigarettes and about drunken driving. So now is hardly the time to withdraw from the war against drugs. While we are not winning, we are holding the line. And every day brings us closer to the kind of consensus that will let us really begin to fight.

ROCKFORD HIGH SCHOOL MARCHING BAND

HON. PAUL B. HENRY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, it is with special pride that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to recognize the Rockford, MI, High School Marching Band and celebrate with these individuals their invitation and acceptance of participation in this year's Tournament of Roses Parade in Pasadena, CA.

The Rockford High School Marching Band has the honor of being only the third marching band from the State of Michigan to be invited in the 97-year history of the parade. Rockford High School Marching Band is the first band from western Michigan to enjoy this great honor.

Of the 22 talented bands in the Rose Bowl Parade, only 8 high school bands from States other than California are selected to participate each year. Over 200 bands presented formal applications to the Tournament of Roses Selection Committee this year alone. The Rockford Band will be the only band from Michigan to attend in 1986 and will carry special greetings of "Say Yes to Michigan" to California.

I have had many opportunities to hear the band and participate in parades with them. I am very impressed with the Rockford Band—the music quality is outstanding and the members of the band display

the highest level of discipline and style during performances. The leadership and direction provided by Mr. David Bass and Mr. James Mollema is exceptional and always imaginative.

I would ask that my colleagues join me in bestowing best wishes of congratulations to the 252 students which make up this fine band. Watching our high school students work hard and achieve the goals they have set for themselves makes me even more proud to represent the Rockford area.

The Rockford High School Marching Band will significantly contribute to the Rose Bowl Parade both musically and with their presence. These individuals are indeed an excellent representative from the State of Michigan and I look forward to enjoying their performance on national television.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

CRITICS OF FARM AID SHOULD BE ASHAMED

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, a group of entertainers came together under the leadership of Willie Nelson to perform and do their part in illustrating the plight of the American farmer. Although they fell short of their fundraising goal, I believe they were successful in creating a national awareness of the farm crisis.

As a Member of Congress who represents a nonagricultural district, I have heard from more constituents on the plight of the farmer in the past few days than I can remember at anytime. Clearly, these musicians raised public awareness and they are to be congratulated for their unselfish work. It is unfortunate that there are some who have found it necessary to criticize this effort.

Among those are John White, president of the Illinois Farm Bureau, who, according to an article in Wednesday's Washington Post, characterized Farm Aid as

a carefully orchestrated political event . . . loaded with a political message the Farm Bureau totally rejects. The concert stage became a soapbox for a small group of entertainers pleading support for a poorly understood piece of legislation.

Another spokesman for the Illinois Farm Bureau, Jim Altemus, echoed those statements by saying,

After all the rhetoric that the politics should stay out of the concert, we are disappointed and surprised that the politicians did keep politics out) and the entertainers didn't.

And finally, Larry Werries, head of the Illinois Agriculture Department said, "I'll promise not to sing if they promise not to continue developing agriculture policy."

Mr. Speaker, unlike these spokesmen, I feel entertainers have a right to express themselves on matters involving our Government and country. When someone asked

Pablo Picasso why a painter gets involved in politics, he said, "You mean when I pick up my palette, I'm supposed to give away my brain?" Apparently, Mr. White and company believe that when an entertainer picks up a guitar, that disqualifies him from discussing issues important to our society.

Following the Vietnam War, there was a period when musicians seemed to care more about their own personal success than the direction of this country. It is refreshing to see this trend has reversed itself. The late Harry Chapin sang on behalf of the world's hungry long before the issue became popular. The work of Bob Geldoff in organizing African relief efforts through Band Aid and Live Aid has been a tremendous success in providing needed assistance. The USA for Africa group has also demonstrated its valuable commitment in dealing with the problems of world hunger.

I am proud that one of my constituents, Bruce Springsteen, has undertaken a major humanitarian role by donating thousands and thousands of dollars to food banks in many cities across the Nation. He does not contribute the money for publicity, he does it because he cares. He also urges his audience to take a look around their hometown and show some compassion toward their neighbors.

The critics of Farm Aid should be ashamed. We could use more people like Willie Nelson, Bob Geldoff and Bruce Springsteen. Our democracy works best when we have the full participation of our citizens. Entertainers are citizens, and they deserve and have the right to air their views, no matter how political.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, as the House continues to consider the farm bill, I think we can point to one other benefit arriving from the Farm Aid weekend. I think that by looking at the work of those involved and reading the comments of those critical of such efforts, we are able to more clearly determine which organizations truly care about the plight of the small family farmer.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 3

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am again today extending my remarks to add the cosponsorship of two other Members of the House who would like to associate their names with the other cosponsors of House Joint Resolution 3—a measure to prevent nuclear explosive testing. I am taking this action because House rules preclude the addition of cosponsors to any measure after a committee has filed a report on pending legislation. Nevertheless, I am most pleased to add the cosponsorship of the Honorable GLEN ANDERSON of California and the Honorable HANK BROWN of Colorado. Their support in this effort is deeply appreciated and brings the total

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

number of cosponsors of this modest but important arms control initiative to 206.

GLORIA CANCELS MARCH, BUT NOT APARTHEID

HON. PHILIP R. SHARP

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, young people often have wisdom to offer their elders, if we have wisdom enough to listen.

An 8-year-old friend of mine, Michael Riggs, a student at Horace Mann Elementary School, was looking forward to joining me and many of my colleagues in tomorrow's Congressional Black Caucus march against apartheid.

He was disappointed to learn that it was being canceled because of Hurricane Gloria's expected arrival in the Washington region, and he asked, "Why? The hurricane won't cancel apartheid, will it?"

Let his words remind us: Although we cannot march this time, we must not reduce our commitment to justice for all people everywhere.

ST. MICHAEL CHURCH 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, the St. Michael Church of New Castle, PA, is celebrating its 75th anniversary on September 29, 1985.

On this grand occasion for the congregation and the religious community of New Castle, let us look at the history of this worthy church.

In May 1910, plans for the building of the church were initiated under the guidance and supervision of A.S. Green, Joseph Klamar, Joseph Duda, Paul Palkovich, Michael Scerlak, and Paul Zidow.

In July of that same year, the plans were completed and approved by 42 families present at the parish meeting. It also decided at this same meeting to present the approved plans to the Right Reverend Bishop, and A.S. Green and Joseph Klamar called upon his excellency for this purpose.

On September 19, 1910, the contractor began laying the foundation of the new church, and the corner stone was blessed on October 10, that same year, at 4 p.m.

Rev. Joseph Eger blessed the corner stone, and Father Joseph Vrhunec delivered a spiritual message in Slovak before the great gathering of priests and laity.

The founder of St. Michael Church was Rev. Joseph Vrhunec. The current pastor is Father Charles Georgevich.

The parish of St. Michael consists of people as hard working as its founders. The congregation of St. Michael claim strong family ties, a proud heritage and an emphasis on traditional values.

I am most pleased and proud to represent the fine people of St. Michael Church and to honor them in this way today before the U.S. House of Representatives. They have established a tradition that their grandchildren—75 years from now—will joyfully carry on.

TRIBUTES TO CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, over the past year, I have been working with my friends in the Hungarian community to celebrate the life and accomplishments of Cardinal Mindszenty. As part of this effort, I would like the following remarks entered into the RECORD.

St. Stephen of Hungary Church in New York City paid tribute to Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty on April 16, 1967 on the occasion of his 75th birthday which the Cardinal spent in the 12th year of his involuntary confinement at the American Embassy in Budapest. The Lay Committee of the church sent a letter to all ordinaries of the Catholic hierarchy in the United States, inviting them to participate "in spirit" in that tribute. The Cardinal was unaware of the remembrance at the time but acknowledged it gratefully when learning about it after taking up residence in Vienna in 1971.

Included here are: the letter of invitation by the Lay Committee; a selection of individual tributes by the American prelates; and, a letter acknowledging the late Terence Cardinal Cooke's—then Auxiliary Bishop of New York—special tribute as principal celebrant. Because of the surrounding circumstances, the material has unique historic significance in demonstrating that Cardinal Mindszenty was widely remembered and honored in the United States when the rest of the world had virtually forgotten him.

The excerpted material follows:

CHURCH OF ST. STEPHEN OF HUNGARY,
New York, NY, April 11, 1967.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: The Lay Committee of the Church of St. Stephen of Hungary plans a Solemn Tribute to Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, Primate-Archbishop of Hungary, who has just passed his 75th birthday. The Tribute on April 16, 1967 will consist of a Radio Sermon on WHBI-FM at noon, a Pontifical Mass at 3:30 P.M. and a Solemn Convocation at 5 P.M. We on the Committee respectfully request Your Excellency to join us in spirit on this occasion.

Cardinal Mindszenty earned the admiration of the entire Free World when he took up his fight against atheistic Communism. Facing heavy odds, he chose to resist the abolition of religious education and the political infiltration of the Church. As a good shepherd, he further chose to remain with his flock through all adversity. Harassment, persecution, a mock trial, life imprisonment and, since the 1956 Freedom Fight, involuntary confinement to the American Embassy in Budapest, have only confirmed him as

the living symbol of religious freedom and the source of inspiration to the oppressed.

In his home land where he is a virtual prisoner, the Cardinal's heroism cannot be publicly recognized. That task is left to us who live in the Free World. Our Committee would be very grateful if Your Excellency let us know whether Your Diocese could join us in any small way in our commemoration and in our fervent prayers that God may allow the Cardinal to continue serving his people and his Church. The spiritual union of your faithful with us would be the greatest source of strength for the Cardinal and his suffering nation.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT L. HARKAY,
Chairman, Lay Committee.

I will be with you in spirit in the celebration you will have on April the 16th and within a couple of weeks I will remind the readers of our Archdiocesan paper, the Pilot, through my special columns, to remember his Eminence's seventy-fifth anniversary through their prayers and sacrifices. He is one of the greatest Prelates of the twentieth century. May God be with him.

(S) RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING,
Archbishop of Boston.

We wish to assure you of our sympathy and cooperation in the commemoration of His Eminence, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty. The Cardinal was always a source of most respectful consideration in our memories as we recall the magnificent example he has given to the world of upholding principle, right and justice.

(S) J. FRANCIS McINTYRE,
Archbishop of Los Angeles.

I wish to assure you that not only the Hungarian people of San Francisco, but the clergy and the faithful also unite their prayers with yours that God may bless the great sacrifice which Cardinal Mindszenty is making for the spiritual welfare and freedom of the sons of St. Stephen.

(S) JOSEPH T. MCGUCKEN,
Archbishop of San Francisco.

I am asking the editor of our paper, the Catholic Standard, to run a special article on Cardinal Mindszenty.

(S) PATRICK A. O'BOYLE,
Archbishop of Washington.

I was happy to join with you in spirit, as I offered Mass yesterday, prayerfully remembering the heroic Cardinal Mindszenty and the good Hungarian people who have suffered with him for the sake of freedom. I was happy to join my prayers with yours for these modern heroes against oppression in our time.

(S) WILLIAM G. CONNARE,
Bishop of Greenburg.

I want to assure you of my own prayers and warm remembrance for him and all the people of Hungary. . . . With every good wish and the assurance of my gratitude for your reminder of this tribute which you are justly paying to this great churchman and patriot.

(S) ERNEST J. BRENNAN,
Bishop of Manchester.

I hope that your tribute to Cardinal Mindszenty will be most successful. He is one of the great men of the church.

(S) LAWRENCE B. CASEY,
Bishop of Patterson.

Let me re-assure you that here we join all of you in prayer for this great Churchman, the Beloved Cardinal of Hungary, and we ask the good God to bring untold graces and blessings to the entire Hungarian Nation

through all that the Cardinal bears and suffers for the Church of Silence.

(S) WM. T. McCARTY, C.S.S.R.,
Bishop of Rapid City.

You will be pleased to know that on April 16, 1967 in the Prayer of the Faithful we had a remembrance of that heroic soul, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, Primate-Archbishop of Hungary. Certainly, he is one of whom we are all very proud, he has been so faithful to his convictions even withstanding tremendous pressure.

(S) JOHN J. RUSSELL,
Bishop of Richmond.

I am sure that most Catholics in the United States keep the heroic Cardinal in their prayers because he was a champion of human rights and human liberty. I promise a very fervent memento to the Cardinal tomorrow at my Mass here in the Cathedral.

(S) MARK K. CARROLL,
Bishop of Wichita.

APRIL 16, 1967.

Most Rev. TERENCE J. COOKE, D.D., V.G.,
Auxiliary Bishop of New York,
New York, NY.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: In the name of the Lay Committee, I wish to express our deepest gratitude to Your Excellency for coming in our midst and celebrating Mass for us today in prayerful remembrance of Cardinal Mindszenty's 75th birthday. Your presence added so much to our intended tribute to this great churchman and great Hungarian.

Beyond Your active participation in our festivities, Your Excellency also gave us a touching sermon which will long be remembered and treasured by our parishioners. We truly appreciated the kind greetings and encouragement from His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman. We also cherished Your every word concerning Cardinal Mindszenty's service to the Church and, particularly, Your characterization of him as the good shepherd. Our Committee would very much like to obtain and to preserve for posterity a copy of Your entire sermon, if available.

Your Excellency may be interested in the enclosed copy of a letter which the Lay Committee sent to all Bishops Ordinary in the United States. Each letter was individually typed and personally signed. We are indeed gratified at the rate at which a number of Bishops and Vicars General have already replied, indicating their approval of our plans and assuring us of their participation in our tribute. The only Diocese to which we did not send the letter was New York since our good Pastor, Father Edward J. Holleran, had offered to arrange for Your invitation and we did not want to interfere with these arrangements.

Please accept once again our most heartfelt thanks for Your Excellency's playing the leading part in our tribute to Cardinal Mindszenty.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT L. HARKAY,
Chairman, Lay Committee.

Welcoming remarks of His Excellency William Baum, Archbishop of Washington, delivered at the arrival of Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty to Washington:

Your Eminence, on behalf of His Eminence Cardinal O'Boyle, the priests and the people of the Archdiocese of Washington I welcome you. It is a great grace that you come to us. We love and venerate Your Eminence and welcome you as a cardinal and as a bishop of the Church. We are overjoyed that you will be with us to celebrate Holy Mass and give the sacrament of confirma-

tion. We are grateful. Your coming among us is a blessing. May I ask Your Eminence would you give us your blessing as your first gesture to the people of Washington.

Welcoming remarks of Congressman William J. Scherle, delivered at the arrival of Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty to Washington: Cardinal Mindszenty, as an American Hungarian I want to welcome you to our nation's Capital in behalf of the Congress of the United States and the American people. I wish to welcome you to our country. I want you to know that we in America uphold your philosophy and hold you in high esteem. I thank you for visiting us here in Washington.

Welcoming remarks of Istvan B. Gereben, Co-Chairman of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation, delivered at the arrival of Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty to Washington:

Your Eminence, the arrival of the Prelate of Hungary to Washington compels us to celebrate, to express our admiration towards our spiritual leader, who is the symbol not only of the Hungarian character, of our humble but sacrificing christianity and of the independence of our downtrodden native land, but of our own commitment to freedom as well. The respect and faithfulness of the Hungarians of Washington, Baltimore and Richmond cannot be expressed better than with the words of the students of our school, of our children, coming from their pure, innocent hearts. Their greeting is our creed also.

Remarks of Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty, delivered at his arrival to Washington:

Ladies and gentlemen, my beloved Hungarians, I am grateful for the presence of the leaders of the Church and the Nation at my arrival. I thank them for coming in such a great number to greet me. Thank you for the warm welcome. I am thankful to God that I have the opportunity today and the next day to meet with the whole of the Hungarian community of Washington. There is much to be discussed, there is much to be done. I am looking forward to the program which has been prepared for me here with much pleasure. I am joyful to be with my Hungarians. I bless all of you who came to welcome me.

RULE ON H.R. 1562

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform my colleagues that the Committee on Ways and Means today favorably reported to the House of Representatives H.R. 1562, the Textile and Apparel Trade Enforcement Act of 1985.

I wish to serve notice, pursuant to the rules of the Democratic caucus, that I have been instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to seek less than an open rule for the consideration of the provisions of this bill by the House of Representatives.

NOT A TYPICAL TEACHER

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a very special teacher in Newton County, GA. As we continue to look for ways of improving the education of our Nation's children, we should pay special attention to those teachers with a special desire to invent creative and innovative ways to educate our children.

I think every Member, parent, and teacher should read the letter from Mr. Randall Lynn and learn from his example.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GINGRICH: I am not a typical teacher. I see my role as far more important than merely the imparting of academic knowledge (though, of course, there is nothing "mere" about that!). Beyond that, I see myself as being able to help students enlarge the horizons of their lives and see in a far greater way than they might otherwise the limitless possibilities for thought and action afforded them by virtue of their citizenship in this country at this time in their lives and in this period of its history.

I have been deeply concerned by the fact that so many of them see their own lives and their own potential as limited. Other teachers may write it off as typical teenage apathy and leave it at that, but I can't. I want to light a fire under them that will not go out. I want to help them see that these hours in which we live are more open perhaps to the creative energies and daring of the individual than any other time in our history and that the times fairly cry out for their caring and their involvement. I want them to see that it matters not what county you come from, urban or rural, or what economic condition you were born into, or what color your skin is. I want them to see the opportunities that are literally all around them to achieve their own personal dreams and to assist in the fulfillment of our American dreams.

The problem I have run up against in my high school—a problem, sad to say, that has left some of my fellow faculty members floundering for a solution, though not, happily, our school administration—is that many of our students just don't see things that way. They live in a semirural county. Nothing really "big" ever touches their lives, they will tell you. Most of the boys will tell you that, upon graduation, they hope to get a job at the Hercules plant in town and stay there until retirement. Why try for anything greater when that is the easiest road to follow?

Now you and I both know that there is nothing innately evil in that approach to life, that such a life can be lived with great productivity and nobility. But, frankly, you and I both know that the opportunities out there today are far greater than that!

A wasted life is the greatest tragedy of all, potential unrealized because a young person wrongly measured the limits of his or her horizons. As a teacher, that is what I have made it my mission to fight. I simply do not believe in limited horizons. I am out to show my students that the only limits that will ever truly stop them are the limits they set for themselves, that limitless opportunities are in the road before them as long as they will admit no limitations.

Do you understand what I am trying to say, and what I am trying to do? I hope you do . . .

Anyway, here is what I have decided to attempt, with the help and complete support of the school administration:

Newton County High School is the only public high school in Newton County. This indicates several important things: that our student body is quite large, that we are adequate, if not generously, funded by the county, that our facilities for public events (auditorium, gym, etc.) are the finest in the area, and that there is a great deal of parental interest in the quality of programs that we, as a school, provide.

The extracurricular activity for which I am responsible is the Close Up Club of Newton County, a local unit of the national Close Up Foundation, with which you are familiar. Every year, the central activity of the club is the preparation of students for the trip to Washington in the Spring.

It occurred to me to try to make the club more than that.

In Newton County, though we are relatively close, people see themselves as somewhat isolated from the Atlanta area. To date if prominent political personalities have come through our area they made the standard stop at the Kiwanis, Lion's, Rotary, etc. lunches and dinners, getting their meal, and speaking before the "big people" that so often seem to be the only ones that count to many politicians.

My idea was to do something to help put the Close Up Club of Newton County on the "must" list for visiting speakers. My goal is to build it into the primary forum for the expression of political thought in this area.

It doesn't seem to be an impossible goal. We have student and community interest. We have administrative support. We have a local newspaper ready to cover whatever activities I can put together. And we have that auditorium I've already mentioned that seats hundreds in the atmosphere of a professional theater, one so nice that the Atlanta newspapers covered its opening and the fact that it has attracted international touring acts.

It seemed to me that my idea had some potential. I would like prominent speakers to come here annually. During election campaigns, our auditorium would be perfect for a regional debate or two. But, first and foremost, I would like the Close Up Club to be the primary political forum in our area because it would turn on my students' minds, and help awaken them to the potential for achievement that exists in their own lives. After all, the great achievers were once high school students, too, concerned about what lay ahead for them. If my students could see that, maybe it would shake some of them free from their lethargy and make it all worthwhile.

As I said, I am trying to light some fires that will never go out . . .

RANDALL LYNN,
Social Studies Department,
Newton County High School,
Covington, GA.

THE BETHESDA UNITED METHODODIST CHURCH'S 200TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the 200th anniversary celebration of the Bethesda United Methodist Church in Preston, MD.

As we in Maryland commemorate the Bethesda United Methodist Church's untiring and unwavering commitment to faith during these past 200 years, I believe it is altogether fitting that we give thanks to the many church members who, over the generations, have brought comfort and light to the people of Preston. On momentous occasions such as this, we not only share remembrances of a rich and vibrant past, but we also prepare to perpetuate our ideals far into the future.

So as Bethesda United Methodist Church presents its 200th anniversary pageant next month, I praise its spirit of community and compassion, and hope that this proud place of worship continue to grow and prosper in the years to come.

PROPOSALS TO TAX EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 20, a number of House Members on a broadly bipartisan basis joined in co-sponsoring House Resolution 268 to express the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to proposals currently before the Congress to tax certain employer-paid benefits and other life-support benefits. The Members of the House who joined with me in sponsoring that resolution went on record as supporting a continuation of the present tax treatment of employee pension and benefit plans.

The pension and employee benefit plans of American workers have taken on a uniquely private character. Other nations of the industrialized world provide protection for their citizens in areas such as health care, education, retirement security and life, disability and unemployment insurance through direct government programs financed out of general revenues. The United States has chosen to meet these needs indirectly through tax policy. Employers receive tax deductions for their contributions to employee benefit plans and their employees are not taxed on those contributions.

It has been this Nation's policy to protect and nurture employee benefit programs, to encourage the extension of their coverage universally to workers and their families.

Just 11 years ago on Labor Day 1974, President Ford in the Rose Garden signed the Employee Retirement Income Security Act. In passing that law, the Congress declared that the continued well-being and security of millions of employees and their dependents are directly affected by employee pension and welfare benefit plans; that employee benefit plans are affected with the national public interest; and that they have become an important factor affecting the stability of employment and the successful development of industrial relations.

Thus, the Congress explicitly recognized the growth, scope, size, and number of benefit plans, their social and economic impact and their importance to the continued well-being and security of millions of employees and their dependents.

It is now proposed by some to change this longstanding and basic policy, to impose taxes on these pension and benefit plans.

None of us cosponsoring House Resolution 268 are unsympathetic to the need for additional revenues. But the relatively small amount of new taxes that would come from taxing these benefits would hardly be worth the devastation that would be worked by their imposition.

It is quite clear that such taxes would substantially dampen employer enthusiasm for the employee compensation and benefit packages that exist today.

The imposition of taxes will result in the erosion of health care to the particular detriment of the elderly, the handicapped, and families. A recent Roper survey disclosed that most employers will move to reduce health benefits. If the tax benefits for health care are scaled back, the young, single, and most physically fit will opt out or more willingly acquiesce in a scaling back of benefits. Health plan costs will rise and eventually they will prove uneconomic. The imposition of taxes may sound the death knell of health benefit plans, and as has been suggested would be "the beginning of a dangerous precedent to tax all employee benefits in the long term."

Imposition of taxes on workers' compensation and unemployment benefits would result in the further impoverishment of injured workers and a compounding of the miseries of unemployment.

Proposals to tax pension and retirement plans, if enacted, are certain to have a devastating effect on the long-term ability of workers and their employers to provide retirement security. Legislative changes in the past have invariably disrupted the retirement planning of some. Employers and pension plan managers have complained about the costs of such changes. In the past, such changes have resulted from a concern for the level and security of employee benefits, for minimum participation standards and other rules forbidding discrimination in contributions and benefits. Congress in the past has encouraged pension plans through laws that made them more fair and more effective. In view of the legislative history, it is particularly difficult to understand the continuing interest in taxing employer contributions to work-

ers' program plans. Such an action is not only disruptive in the extreme, it makes such plans economically less attractive to the employer and to employees.

To those who suggest that fringe benefits would provide a good source of revenue, I say that focusing on the revenue implications alone is not enough. We must be sensitive to the importance of pensions, health insurance, day care, and education programs, workers compensation, unemployment, and other such benefits which form an imperative life-support system for our working people.

So far 181 Members have joined in cosponsoring House Resolution 268. Additional Members have expressed an interest in joining our effort and supplemental lists of cosponsors will be filed. I invite anyone interested in doing so to communicate with us.

SKOWHEGAN, ME, EDUCATOR
HONORED FOR FIGHT
AGAINST DRUG ABUSE

HON. JOHN R. MCKERNAN, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. MCKERNAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Tom Farrell, a Skowhegan, ME, resident, who has been a leader in the fight to reduce alcohol and drug abuse among teenagers.

Mr. Farrell, principal of Skowhegan High School, became concerned about teenage drug and alcohol abuse through his experiences as a teacher, a coach and as a high school administrator. His active involvement with this problem began when he was an assistant principal and found that many of his discipline cases were drug and alcohol related. Since that time, he has established programs at Mount Blue, Dirigo, and Skowhegan High Schools that allow students to get help from support groups and "dryout" programs. Mr. Farrell has been instrumental in helping dozens of teenagers resolve their dependency problems. Along with his local efforts, he has recently spoken throughout the country on his experiences and on the need for teachers and coaches to serve as role models for teenagers.

In recognition of his efforts and accomplishments, he received the National Federation of Parents for Drug Free Youth Award in 1983. This year, he has received the Air Force Commander's Award for his continuing contributions.

I join my colleagues in saluting his tireless efforts and selfless contribution.

THE INTRODUCTION OF A BILL
TO NAME THE CLOSED BASIN
PROJECT CONVEYANCE CHAN-
NEL, SAN LUIS VALLEY
PROJECT, AS THE FRANKLIN
EDDY CANAL

HON. MICHAEL L. (MIKE) STRANG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to introduce legislation to name the major water collection feature of the "Closed Basin Project in Colorado the Franklin Eddy Canal."

The late Franklin Eddy was the driving force behind efforts to develop the project's concept and to secure authorization and funding for the Bureau of Reclamation project. For 30 years, Franklin Eddy was deeply involved in the important water resource protection issues in the San Luis Valley. He died in May of 1980. Mr. Eddy was active in the original formation of the Rio Grande water conservation district, the primary sponsor of the project. He served on its board of directors and later as its manager.

Mr. Eddy worked tirelessly to help secure local, State and Federal support for the closed basin project. The project's purpose is to help resolve the complicated and at times contentious local, national and international water rights issues in the San Luis Valley and along the Rio Grande River. When the project was first authorized in 1972, the Congress set in motion a program that, when completed in 1989, will help stabilize water rights and water use concerns in the San Luis Valley, while also helping Colorado meet the terms of interstate water delivery compacts and a water treaty with Mexico. The project will put to beneficial use groundwater now lost through evaporation, and will at the same time enhance wildlife and recreation opportunities in at three county areas.

The people of the San Luis Valley in Colorado are deeply indebted to the vision and dedication of Franklin Eddy. It is my honor to introduce this legislation in public commemoration of Mr. Eddy's dedication to his friends, his neighbors and this project, by naming the closed basin conveyance channel the "Franklin Eddy Canal."

H.R. 3339, THE CABLE TELEVISION
COPYRIGHT DEREGULATION
ACT OF 1985

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 3339, legislation which will eliminate Government intervention in the carriage by cable television of copyrighted broadcast programming. The bill abolishes the compulsory license for copyrighted program-

ming, granted to cable television in 1976 by the Congress, and places greater reliance upon free negotiation by the cable industry in the marketplace for the rights to programming carried by distant television stations. I am convinced that the interests of the public are best served by reducing the role of the Federal Government in the increasingly complex relationship between cable television and the broadcast industries.

In 1976, cable television systems were in their infancy, and, in an effort to nurture the new medium, the Congress insulated the cable systems from unlimited copyright liability in the Copyright Act of 1976. Under the 1976 act, cable is not liable for the prevailing market value of copyrighted programming, but receives a compulsory license to retransmit copyrighted broadcast programming. The Copyright Royalty Tribunal [CRT], a new agency, has the responsibility for implementing the Federal compulsory license scheme; my bill would terminate its role in the distribution of royalties to program producers and adjustment of royalty rates. In place of the present federally regulated royalty system, the cable and broadcast industries will have the freedom to develop their own clearinghouse for copyrighted programming with market rates determined by private negotiation.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal system granting cable a compulsory license was based on three existing, complementary Federal Communications Commission [FCC] rules which benefited broadcasters. The Congress gave cable a compulsory license to balance the interests of the two industries. Since 1976, the three regulations benefiting broadcasters have been eliminated. The FCC has eliminated the distant signal rule which limited cable companies from importing a large number of distant signals, and also, ended broadcasters' syndicated exclusivity of programs where retransmission, is prohibited by, exclusive contract between the program supplier—copyright owner—and local broadcaster. On July 19, 1985, a Federal court struck down the last of these rules, eliminating the requirement that cable not discriminate among local stations, but "must carry" all local signals. In referring to the decision in Quincy Cable TV versus FCC, FCC Chairman Mark S. Fowler issued the following public statement:

Although this Quincy decision takes the first step toward a true marketplace for the distribution of programming by cable systems, we believe that the mass media marketplace will not be set entirely right until cable's copyright immunity is replaced with a scheme of full copyright liability, allowing unimpeded negotiations between the parties.

These changes within the industry add complexity to the compulsory license scheme and the role of the Federal government. The time has come for the Federal Government to end its regulatory scheme and to rely on the free market. During the last Congress, I advocated a free market environment in my cable copyright bill, which included the repeal of the "must carry" regulations. My present bill would

also prohibit regulation by any government body of cable carriage of local signals of broadcast stations.

Mr. Speaker, the bill accomplishes the following: First, retains the cable television compulsory license, contained in section 111 and chapter 8 of the Copyright Act of 1976, until the orderly expiration of the 6-month royalty fee cycle; second, allows the cable industry to negotiate in the marketplace for the rights to the programming carried by distant broadcast stations; third, excludes satellite resale carriers from the "passive common carrier exemption in section 111(a); fourth, exempts from all copyright liability the cable carriage of local signals, if the cable system chooses to carry all local stations within 50 miles; fifth, creates copyright liability for cable retransmission of local signals, where cable systems discriminate and carry only some of the local signals; sixth, exempts from all copyright liability cable systems with 12 or fewer channels to carry local signals it wishes to carry; seventh, exempts from all copyright liability small cable systems with 2,500 or fewer subscribers for retransmission of local and distant programming signals; eighth, exempts rural cable systems from all copyright liability for importing any network station not available locally; and ninth, eliminates all of the current paperwork cable systems must file with the Copyright Office and eliminates the role of the Copyright Royalty Tribunal in the distribution of royalties from the compulsory license and the adjustment of compulsory license royalty rates.

Mr. Speaker, the cable and broadcast industries have sought numerous changes in the compulsory license regulatory scheme on many occasions since 1976. The free market is the best solution to these concerns and will promote a system which will encourage and foster creative programming in the public interest, which is the stated purpose of copyright law. Program producers and broadcasters will be freed from the current lawful appropriation by the cable industry of their property rights. The free market will provide a more flexible and permanent solution which enables the parties to resolve their copyright issues privately in the free market.

The text of H.R. 3339 follows:

H.R. 3339

A bill to amend the copyright law respecting the limitations on exclusive rights to secondary transmissions; to amend the Communications Act of 1934 respecting retransmission of programs originated by broadcast stations; and for other purposes

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

SEC. 1. LIMITATIONS ON EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS IN CERTAIN SECONDARY TRANSMISSIONS AND DELETION OF COMPULSORY LICENSES.

(a) AMENDMENT TO SECTION 111 OF TITLE 17.—Section 111 of title 17 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 111. Limitations of exclusive rights: secondary transmissions

"(a) CERTAIN SECONDARY TRANSMISSIONS EXEMPTED.—Notwithstanding the provisions

of section 106, the secondary transmission of a primary transmission embodying a performance or display of a work is not an infringement of copyright if—

"(1) the secondary transmission is not made by a cable system, and consists entirely of the relaying by the management of a hotel, apartment house, or similar establishment, of signals transmitted by a broadcast station licensed by the Federal Communications Commission to the private lodgings of guests or residents of such establishment, and no direct charge is made to see or hear the secondary transmission, and—

"(A) the secondary transmission is made within the local service area of such station; or

"(B) the signals are received by such establishment by means of the direct reception of a free space radio wave emitted by such station; or

"(2) the secondary transmission is made solely for the purpose and under the conditions specified by clause (2) of section 110; or

"(3) the secondary transmission is made by any carrier, other than a satellite resale carrier, who has no direct or indirect control over the content or selection of the primary transmission or over the particular recipients of the secondary transmission, and whose activities with respect to the secondary transmission consist solely of providing wires, cable, or other communications channels for the use of others: *Provided*, That the provisions of this clause extend only to the activities of said carrier with respect to secondary transmissions and do not exempt from liability the activities of others with respect to their own primary or secondary transmissions; or

"(4) the secondary transmission is not made by a cable system but is made by the governmental body, or other nonprofit organization, without any purpose of direct or indirect commercial advantage, and without charge to the recipients of the secondary transmission other than assessments necessary to defray the actual and reasonable costs of maintaining and operating the secondary transmission service.

"(b) SECONDARY TRANSMISSION OF PRIMARY TRANSMISSION TO CONTROLLED GROUP.—Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (c), the secondary transmission to the public of a primary transmission embodying a performance or display of a work is, in the absence of a negotiated license, actionable as an act of infringement under section 501, and is fully subject to the remedies provided by sections 502 through 506 and 509, if the primary transmission is not made for reception by the public at large but is controlled and limited to reception by particular members of the public.

"(c) CERTAIN SECONDARY TRANSMISSIONS BY CABLE SYSTEMS EXEMPTED.—

"(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 106 and subject to the provisions of clause (2) of this subsection, the secondary transmission made by a cable system to the public of a primary transmission made by a broadcast station licensed by the Federal Communications Commission or by an appropriate governmental authority of Canada or Mexico and embodying a performance or display of a work is not an infringement of copyright if—

"(A) the cable system serves fewer than 2,500 subscribers; or

"(B) the cable system is located in whole or in part within the local service area of the primary transmitter and the cable

system does not have the capacity to carry more than 12 channels; or

"(C) the cable system is located in whole or in part within the local service area of the primary transmitter and—

"(i) the cable system is not a cable system to which subclause (A) or (B) of this clause applies, and

"(ii) the cable system carries, as part of the basic tier of cable service regularly provided to all subscribers at the minimum charge, in full and in their entirety the signals of every broadcast television station within whose local service area the cable system is located in whole or in part; or

"(D) the primary transmission is of a network television station and—

"(i) the cable system is not located in whole or in part within the local service area of a station affiliated with the same network, and

"(ii) the primary transmission is from the most proximate network television station affiliated with the same network.

"(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of clause (1) of this subsection, the secondary transmission to the public by a cable system of a primary transmission made by a broadcast station licensed by the Federal Communications Commission or by an appropriate governmental authority of Canada or Mexico and embodying a performance or display of a work otherwise exempt under clause (1) of this subsection is actionable as an act of infringement under section 501, and is fully subject to the remedies provided by sections 502 through 506 and sections 509 and 510, if the content of the particular program in which the performance or display is embodied, or any commercial advertising or station announcements transmitted by the primary transmitter during, or immediately before or after, the transmission of such program, is in any way willfully altered by the cable system through changes, deletions, or additions.

"(3) Clause (2) does not apply to the alteration, deletion, or substitution of commercial advertisements performed by those engaged in television commercial advertising market research if—

"(A) the research company has obtained the prior consent of the advertiser who has purchased the original commercial advertisement, the television station broadcasting that commercial advertisement, and the cable system performing the secondary transmission; and

"(B) such commercial alteration, deletion, or substitution is not performed for the purpose of deriving income from the sale of that commercial time.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section, the following terms and their variant forms mean the following:

"A 'primary transmission' is a transmission made to the public by the transmitting facility whose signals are being received and further transmitted by the secondary transmission service, regardless of where or when the performance or display was first transmitted.

"A 'secondary transmission' is the further transmitting by any device or process of a primary transmission simultaneously with the primary transmission, or nonsimultaneously with the primary transmission if by a 'cable system' not located in whole or in part within the boundary of the forty-eight contiguous States, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico: *Provided, however,* That a nonsimultaneous further transmission by a cable system located in Hawaii of a primary transmission shall be deemed to be a secondary transmission.

"A 'cable system' has the meaning given such term under regulations of the Federal Communications Commission which existed on January 1, 1985, and July 1, 1985. A system is covered by such term if it would be a cable system under such regulation as existed on either such date. For purposes of determining the exemption under subsection (c)(1)(A), two or more cable systems in contiguous communities, under common ownership or control, or operating from one headend, shall be considered as one system.

"The 'local service area of a primary transmitter', in the case of a television broadcast station, is the area within a 50-mile radius of the reference point in the community to which that station is licensed or authorized by the Federal Communications Commission, as such reference point is defined under regulations of such Commission as in effect on July 1, 1985.

"The 'local service area of a primary transmitter', in the case of a radio broadcast station, comprises the primary service area of such station, pursuant to the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission.

"A 'network television station' is a broadcast station owned or operated by, or affiliated with one of the three national commercial television broadcast networks or the Public Broadcasting Service."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall take effect on the first January 1 or July 1 occurring more than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934.

(a) PROHIBITION OF MUST-CARRY OR OTHER REGULATION BY THE FCC OR STATES OF RETRANSMISSIONS.—Section 325 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"(d) Except as otherwise provided in subsections (a), (b), and (c), the Commission shall not have any authority to establish or enforce any restriction, requirement, or other rule or regulation relating to the retransmission by any person of any program or portion of a program originated by a broadcast station. No State or unit of general local government shall have any authority to establish or enforce any such restriction, requirement, or other rule or regulation."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) SUSPENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PETITION COPYRIGHT ROYALTY TRIBUNAL FOR ADJUSTMENTS IN RATES FOR RETRANSMISSIONS UNDER COMPULSORY LICENSES DURING 1985.—(1) Section 804(a)(2) of title 17 of the United States Code is amended by striking out subparagraph (A) and redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B) respectively.

(2) Section 804 of title 17 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the last sentence of subsection (b).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO PROVISIONS RELATING TO REMEDIES FOR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT.—(1) Section 501(c) of title 17 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "subsection (c) of section 111" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 106".

(2) Section 501(d) of title 17 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "section 111(c)(3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 111(c)(2)."

(3) Section 510(a) of title 17 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "section 111(c)(3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 111(c)(2)".

(4) Section 510(a) of title 17 of the United States Code is amended by striking out ", and the remedy provided by subsection (b) of this section" both times it appears therein.

(5) Section 510 of title 17 of the United States Code is amended by striking out subsection (b).

(c) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY OR COPYRIGHT ROYALTY TRIBUNAL TO ADJUST RATES FOR RETRANSMISSIONS UNDER COMPULSORY LICENSES.—(1) Section 801(b) of title 17 of the United States Code is amended—

(A) by striking out subparagraph (2) and redesignating subparagraph (3) as subparagraph (2); and

(B) by striking out "sections 111 and" in such redesignated paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "section".

(2) Section 804(a) of title 17 of the United States Code is amended by striking out ", and with respect to proceedings under section 801(b)(2)(A) and (D)".

(3) Section 804 of title 17 of the United States Code is further amended—

(A) by striking out subsection (b) and redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (b), (c), and (d) respectively; and

(B) by striking out "section 111 or" in subsection (c) (as so redesignated) and inserting in lieu thereof "section".

(4) Section 809 of title 17 of the United States Code is amended by striking out "sections 111 or" and inserting in lieu thereof "section".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—(1) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) The amendments made by subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall take effect on the first January 1 or July 1 occurring more than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

NATIONAL TEMPORARY SERVICES WEEK

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the American temporary services industry. This relatively young industry is quickly growing into a significant business force, containing 500,000 jobs and bringing 5 million people into the U.S. economy each year. In 1984, the temporary help services industry paid out over \$5.5 billion in salaries. It is therefore with honor that I introduce a joint resolution to designate the week of October 20-26, 1985, as "National Temporary Services Week."

The temporary help industry contributes to a strong economy as a private-sector employer. The industry provides business with the ability to react to economic changes and to satisfy short-term labor needs. As employers, temporary help companies create employment for those who might not otherwise be part of the work force.

Over the past 10 years, the temporary services industry has distinguished itself as one of the Nation's fastest growing sectors. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the industry ranked third last year in terms of job growth and people entering the work force.

Mr. Speaker, this industry has built an impressive record. In my own State of Michigan, Kelly Services has become the largest direct-owned temporary services company in the world. I believe that we should now take the time to recognize the contributions the industry has made to our Nation and to encourage its continued success.

**COURAGE AND TENACITY OF
MEXICAN PEOPLE AND GOVERNMENT
LAUDED**

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, today marks a week since the killer quake struck central Mexico. And while this quake may have struck out at the country with full force, it certainly did not strike down a very proud people. In this short period, we have witnessed the extraordinary courage of the Mexican people and its Government. Day after day, the pictures and communications arriving from our southern neighbor chronicle a nation picking itself up and refusing to be caught up in self-pity.

With all due respect to the very generous contributions made by other nations including our own, the Mexicans have very bravely, as a community, pitched in together to help each other in the face of disaster without waiting for others to help them out. This sense of community has prevented a chaotic situation from becoming worse. The streets have remained calm in spite of the thousands who remain homeless.

In the coming weeks and months, Mexico, under the guidance of President de la Madrid, will conclude its immediate tasks of recovery and turn to long-term reconstruction. At that time when her needs become clear, I am certain the United States will continue to extend whatever assistance possible. Most important, Mr. Speaker, 1 week after this tragedy, while our prayers continue, we stand in admiration of the solidarity and tenacity demonstrated by the Mexican people.

TRIBUTE TO H.K. THATCHER

HON. BERYL ANTHONY, JR.

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute in remembrance of a man whose untiring efforts and personal crusade led to the completion of some of

the finest water and navigational facilities on Arkansas waterways.

From his childhood days spent along the banks of the Mississippi River in Mark Twain's town of Hannibal, MO, to the years he lived in the river city of Camden, AR, H.K. Thatcher's life was connected with water. He often commented that he had been associated with "the lack of water, plenty of water, and sometimes too much water" all of his life.

In 1938, he was appointed as the director of the Arkansas Agricultural and Industrial Commission based in Washington. From this vantage point Arkansas began reaping the benefits of Mr. Thatcher's deep concern for the need of water and water transportation.

Mr. Thatcher conceived of and instigated numerous important water programs including the Ouachita River navigation project which has been virtually completed. A 9-foot channel was dug along the bottom of the river which will allow barges to navigate all the way up from the Mississippi River to Camden, AR.

In 1950, Mr. Thatcher became the executive vice president of the Ouachita River Valley Association in Arkansas. Through this office he worked closely with Members of Congress and the Army Corps of Engineers. Mr. Thatcher's accomplishments and personal character won him the deepest respect of colleagues and friends.

Mr. Thatcher's death this September at the full age of 94 comes as a great sadness to all of us who have had the opportunity to come in contact with him and his lasting accomplishments. The Ouachita River project is a treasure to the Nation and an enduring testimony to his foresight. I present this tribute in memory of a man who I will always hold in great admiration. It is an honor for all Arkansans to live in a State which benefits each day from Mr. Thatcher's dedicated service.

**OLDER AMERICANS NUTRITION
ACT SERVES CONTRA COSTA'S
ELDERLY**

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in strong support of H.R. 2453, to increase the funding for reimbursements for meals served under the Older Americans Act nutrition programs.

Without this legislation, the reimbursement rate would be cut between 2 cents and 4 cents below last year's rate just so we could continue to serve the same number of meals we served this year.

These cuts would jeopardize the nutrition and the health of millions of older Americans throughout this country, and would seriously limit participation in the program.

In my own district, Contra Costa County, CA, hundreds of senior citizens take part in daily nutrition programs, both at congre-

gate sites and through home delivery programs. These seniors, and many others who would like to participate in the nutrition programs but cannot due to inadequate Federal support, would vigorously oppose efforts to cut senior nutrition programs—and so do I.

Sound nutrition improves health of seniors, helping them avoid unnecessary medical care and hospitalization. That saves billions of dollars a year for taxpayers who support the Medicare and Medicaid systems.

In my own district, hundreds of seniors have benefited from nutrition services funded in part under the Older Americans Act. In the year ending June 30, 1985, over 268,000 meals were served to thousands of seniors in Contra Costa County through the Nutrition Projects for the Elderly Program.

In addition, nearly 70,000 meals were delivered to home-bound senior citizens whose program is funded by the Meals-on-Wheels Program which I wrote several years ago. This program allows seniors to remain in their own homes instead of forcing them into unfamiliar and expensive institutions, and provides opportunities for social interaction.

I also want to note the fine work of the Contra Costa County Food Coalition which provides food to over 200 programs in my district, including 27 senior centers. In addition, the Brown Bag Program provides weekly groceries to 2,100 seniors, and there is a list of 600 seniors who are waiting to participate in the Brown Bag Program.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who would sharply reduce support for these kinds of essential nutrition programs for seniors. In the recent past, some have even advocated abolishing these programs. But as I travel through my district and talk with those who participate in these programs, the importance of senior nutrition efforts becomes very self-apparent.

Cutting senior nutrition programs would be foolish and unnecessary. Not only would it deprive millions of senior citizens of essential food programs, but it would actually cost taxpayers many times the cost of these programs in increased medical and institutional care. That is why, as in the past, I am pleased to support this legislation.

Passage of this bill assures that these important programs will be able to plan more adequately and assures that millions of older Americans throughout this country will receive the nutrition assistance that they need to sustain healthy lives. I am delighted to support this legislation and the nutrition programs for senior citizens.

H.R. 3248, THE ARTS, HUMANITIES AND MUSEUMS AMENDMENTS OF 1985

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 24 the House debated the Arts, Humanities and Museums Amendments of 1985, which extends the authorization of the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute of Museum Services through fiscal year 1989. I wanted to compliment my colleague, Congressman PAT WILLIAMS, for this legislation which he crafted. It reinforces the Federal mission of fostering a climate of access to excellence in the visual and performing arts as well as fostering scholarship and the preservation of our museum collections across the country. I am proud to cosponsor this legislation which also underscores the need to assure that all Americans benefit from these Federal programs, including those who have traditionally been overlooked because they fall outside the mainstream of our culture or beyond the reach of our cultural centers.

The bill addresses the underrepresented groups in several ways: It encourages support of projects that reach or reflect the culture of a minority, inner city or rural community; it encourages the selection of more individuals from traditionally underrepresented groups for the artists and scholars grant assistance; and it requires that the State planning meetings be open to the public and that the State plan set goals for serving a broad range of groups. These changes will encourage the endowments to respond to the changing demographics of our population by encouraging more rural arts development and access to the arts and humanities for emerging groups and institutions.

I also wanted to comment on another important provision of H.R. 3248 which requires the Secretary of Labor to prescribe regulations so that the National Endowment for the Humanities will pay professional performers and supporting professional personnel employed in their projects at least the prevailing local wage. The 1976 reauthorization amendments included a provision to assure that the National Endowment for the Humanities would conform their hiring practices with those of the National Endowment for the Arts by requiring that workers be paid the prevailing local wage. In the 9 years that have lapsed, the Secretary of Labor has failed to promulgate regulations necessary to carry out the intent of this law. This failure by the National Endowment for the Humanities to adhere to Davis-Bacon provisions is a rare departure from Federal practice which guards against setting up unfair labor projects. I believe the language in H.R. 3248 is vital to retain a consistent Federal policy with respect to hiring practices.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Finally, I would like to note that this year marks the 20th anniversary of the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. According to a recent poll by Lou Harris, an overwhelming 92 percent of those interviewed are convinced that the arts are important to the quality of life and important to the economy of their community. H.R. 3248 reaffirms the Federal role in assuring a continued flourishing of the arts and humanities in our country.

ROBERT LAMBERT AWARDED "BEST INFORMATION SECURITY PROGRAMMER" BY U.S. AIR FORCE

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to offer my congratulations to T. Sgt. Robert Lambert of the U.S. Air Force. Technical Sergeant Lambert has been singled out as the best information security programmer in the Air Force. This award not only distinguishes Technical Sergeant Lambert's 10 years of exemplary service to his country, but is proof positive that clever, capable and dedicated people continue to be our most valuable defense asset.

Technical Sergeant Lambert has played a vital role in assuring the strength, efficiency, and security of our Armed Forces. We are all thankful to him, and owe him, as well as all Americans, our continued dedication to ensuring the strength, reliability, and sensibility of our Nation's defenses. To this end, I will continue to urge my colleagues to support those measures which provide our service people with the benefits they not only need, but deserve.

I know how proud Robert's family and friends are of his accomplishments. I share in that pride, and once again offer my sincere thanks for a job well done.

RECOGNIZING ANNE AND JOHN WANER ON THEIR 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today before my colleagues to recognize a significant event achieved by two residents of the Fifth Congressional District of Illinois, which I am privileged to represent. On September 28, 1985, Anne and John Waner will celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary.

A successful entrepreneur, John Waner's skills in mortgage lending, real estate appraisal, and the construction field prompted him to serve in an advisory capacity to four U.S. Presidents. Mr. Waner has directed such governmental agencies as the Federal Housing Administration and the De-

September 26, 1985

partment of Housing and Urban Development. Anne and John Waner together own and run the Dancing Wheel Skating Rink, a family entertainment center for skating enthusiasts on the southwest side of Chicago. The Waners were both born in Chicago and have resided there all their lives. They were married at St. Camillus Church on the southwest side of Chicago.

Their 50 years together is certainly a worthy accomplishment. It has provided them with four children: Joan, James, Arthur, and Linda; six grandchildren: James Jr., Jonlyn, Geri, Janine, Karen, and Andrew; and one great-granddaughter, Nichole.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to salute this fine couple and I join the residents of the Fifth Congressional District in sending congratulations to Anne and John Waner on this joyous occasion.

H.R. 3371

HON. DEAN A. GALLO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, recently, I introduced a bill, H.R. 3371, designed to reduce the defaults in the Guaranteed Student Loan Program and the National Direct Student Loan Program.

Each year, Congress provides an increasing amount of money to guarantee loans made to students by banks and other authorized lenders. In addition to subsidizing the interest rates on these loans, the Federal Government also pays lenders in cases of student defaults. The two largest student aid programs are the Guaranteed Student Loan Program and the National Direct Student Loan Program which required Federal obligations of \$3.1 billion and \$217 million in fiscal year 1984, respectively.

The most recent figures show that defaults on these student loans have reached an alarming total of \$1.1 billion, a figure that has doubled in the last 4 years. The Secretary of Education has further indicated that total defaults could go as high as \$3 billion in the near future, with the national default rate reaching 10.7 percent last year and projected to go to 11.7 percent this year.

This situation has developed because of the common misconception that no one loses if a student defaults. In fact, you and I, the taxpayers, lose. In addition, the increasing number of students who rely on these loans to finance their education are penalized since more of the Federal contribution to financial aid is required to cover loan defaults.

To remedy this situation, the Federal Government, as well as State governments, has taken action to increase collections on student loans, including garnishing the wages of Government employees who have outstanding loans and withholding tax refund checks.

Further actions, however, are necessary to prevent loans from going into default in

the first place. One way to achieve this goal is to increase the responsibility of the lenders, both schools and financial institutions, in monitoring and collecting the loans.

The bill that I have introduced would contribute to reducing student loan defaults by spreading more evenly the responsibility for monitoring and collecting these loans. I am convinced that one of the most effective ways to make the system more accountable is to recognize those schools and lending institutions with good track records in the loan programs and to remove those with consistently bad records from the list of eligible lenders.

In 1982, for instance, the Department of Education issued final regulations prohibiting any new national direct student loan capital contributions from going to schools with default rates in excess of 25 percent and reducing contributions to those schools with default rates between 10 to 25 percent.

The bill that I have introduced would put these regulations into effect through fiscal year 1987. The Secretary of Education would then be required to report to Congress on the effectiveness of these regulations and propose any necessary or desirable changes that should be made to further reduce defaults.

In addition, H.R. 3371 requires the Secretary of Education to remove from the Guaranteed Student Loan Program those lenders who receive reimbursement from the Federal Government for more than 25 percent of their total GSL matured loan principle.

By limiting the amount of defaulted loans that schools and institutions can turn over to the Federal Government without penalty, the bill makes it clear that lenders are responsible for making good faith loans to students who will repay their debts.

Lenders are ultimately responsible for more than lending money. Lenders should provide a reasonable amount of financial counseling for students applying for federally issued loans and must monitor their process throughout the time that these students are in school and in repayment.

This bill would also encourage those lenders with marginally high default rates to make greater use of private collection efforts in order to maintain their participation in the program.

This legislation provides a mechanism for increasing the responsibility of lenders in monitoring and collecting loans and, thus, will help to ensure that the Guaranteed Student Loan Program and the National Direct Student Loan Program will be maintained at sufficient levels to assist low- and moderate-income students in furthering their education.

CAROL COBB AND CORINNE WRIGHT WIN TEACHER OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. WILLIAM HILL BONER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to recognize two very special people. Special first of all because they are teachers and that makes them more than worth mentioning. But extra special because they have been recognized by their peers as leaders in secondary and elementary education. They are Carol Hamilton Cobb, a kindergarten teacher at Gateway Elementary School in Madison, TN, and the winner of the outstanding elementary social studies teacher of the year by the National Council for Social Studies, and Corinne F. Wright, a U.S. history, government and economics teacher at DuPont Senior High School and the winner of the outstanding secondary social studies teacher of the year award from the National Council of Social Studies. I am doubly proud they both live and teach in the Fifth Congressional District of Tennessee, the district I represent.

I would like to highlight some of their accomplishments and feelings that fellow teachers submitted on the nominating forms:

Carol Hamilton Cobb, a kindergarten teacher believes strongly that the school's role in teaching the qualities and responsibilities of good citizenship begins when a child first enters school. She feels that a kindergarten teacher is in a very special position to give children their first introduction to American government, political processes and political personalities. Instruction in her classroom is planned to foster active, responsible citizenship and patriotism in very young students in the belief that this will provide a sound basis upon which to build pride in our country. Her personal life and professional activities serve as a constructive role model for helping both parents and students understand the concept of active citizenship. Her work in Social Studies education has brought State and national recognition to our school system and it is appropriate that her methods of instruction brought to the attention of the National Council.

Carol develops her own instructional materials and consistently incorporates a high level of creativity in these materials. Her curriculum includes an introduction to many broad social studies from history, government, sociology and geography.

In her words, taken from the Taft Institutes' 1984 collection of exemplary teaching ideas, Carol explains how she works with young children:

I have done major units of study, which introduced my kindergarten children to many aspects of our political system. Among the ideas we have discussed: What is government? Who are the people in government? What do they do each day? What are laws and why do we need them? What are elections? Why do people vote? I have used pictures and television to help children recognize and learn the names of public officials. As a class project, boys and girls helped me

compose letters which were sent to President Reagan, Vice President BUSH, Governor Alexander, Senators BAKER and SASSER, Congressmen GORE and BONER, and Mayor Fulton. These officials sent pictures of themselves which are proudly displayed in our classroom.

During the last election, we held a mock election in our classroom. Since the children could not yet read, they were given a ballot with pictures of the candidates and went into our class voting booth, pulled the curtain and voted for the candidate of their choice. Then the votes were tabulated and the winner announced. Later, the children went to a real voting booth in our school and the election officials allowed them to look inside.

It is important for the children to learn about our government and its current political figures, but it is equally important for them to have a sense of our country's history. Thus, I teach about Presidents such as Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Kennedy. Their birthdays are an excellent time for introducing outstanding contributions they have made to our country.

Carol Hamilton Cobb's accomplishments are not just limited to the classroom. Last year, her students studied about the Statue of Liberty and raised money to support the restoration project. She has developed the kindergarten material for the school system's map and globe skills continuum K-6. And, she has shared her ideas with other Tennessee teachers through seminars and presentations.

Corinne F. Wright, a U.S. history, government, and economics teacher at DuPont Senior High School in Hermitage, TN, consistently provides opportunities for students to experience the things they are learning. She organized a schoolwide mock presidential election, served as school sponsor for the system's first annual model metropolitan government day, conducted a schoolwide drive which raised \$1,000 for the Statue of Liberty restoration project, planned and coordinated a weeklong liberty week celebration, and sponsored the student council.

The mock election was conducted by her government class. They set up election headquarters registered students, conducted the election, and held a celebration party. Using information from media sources, student-made posters caricaturing each major candidate and listing position statements on major issues were posted in the school lobby. Campaign speeches were presented over the intercom. Students were encouraged to work for candidates at political party headquarters and this class took a leadership role in registering the school's 18-year-olds to vote in the actual election.

Her economics class experienced the workings of the free enterprise process as they produced, promoted, and marketed an ethnic cookbook to raise funds for the Statue of Liberty. A classroom "factory" was set up to print, collate, and assemble the 400 cookbooks. Student sellers in Lady Liberty and Uncle Sam costumes attracted enough attention to dispose of all their cookbooks.

The U.S. history class learned about the Great Depression by conducting taped

interviews with older citizens in the community during an oral history project.

These examples suggest methods this teacher has found effective in motivating students, promoting a spirit of inquiry, and encouraging citizen participation in the school and community as well as on a limited national level. She has initiated programs that help each student in the school identify with the total school program.

She is chair of the school's social studies department, served on last year's system-wide textbook adoption committee, presented sessions at social studies workshops and served on the teacher inservice planning committee.

I am proud to make my fellow colleagues in the House aware of the accomplishments of these two, award-winning teachers. They more than deserve this recognition and I look forward to hearing from them time and time again in the future.

HUMAN RIGHTS VIGIL

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, with the Geneva summit growing closer, and the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union deteriorating rapidly, TOM LANTOS and I have decided to take further action on the issue. We have organized a series of extensions to appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every day, beginning after the Jewish High Holy Days have been concluded, and continuing until one has been written about the family of each "Soviet Prisoner of Conscience" known to us. We then plan to bind these statements together, and deliver them to President Reagan for his consideration before the Geneva summit meeting.

The idea originated with my good friend, Lynn Singer, a great woman of courage and an indefatigable soldier in the fight for the rights of Jews in the Soviet Union. Lynn called me up 1 day and said "Do you realize what's going on in the Soviet Union? What they're doing to the wives and families?" So we devised this scheme to focus attention on these indirect victims of Soviet oppression. The original idea was to write each day about the wife of a Prisoner of Conscience, to focus on her plight. Congressman TOM LANTOS was the obvious choice for cosponsor of this action, since his wife, Annette, founded and chairs the Congressional Spouses' Committee of 21. My wife, Joanne, is on the committee, of which each member has adopted a Prisoner of Conscience with whom she tries to maintain lines of communication.

After discussing the matter with TOM, we realized what a task we had set for ourselves. Information on the prisoners themselves is extremely limited, and it is even more so where their wives and families are concerned. Although all members on the committee have corresponded regularly, the results are less than encouraging.

My wife's adopted prisoner is Aleksander Cherniak. Joanne has written to Alek-

sander and his wife, Polina, several times. Each letter was registered and a return receipt requested. Oddly enough, as soon as Joanne had sent her second letter 6 weeks after the first, the first letter was returned as undeliverable: "No One by This Name at This Address." A week later, the return receipt from the second letter arrived; it had been addressed identically and this one had been delivered. The first letter was then sent out again, and that return receipt was received within 3 weeks. None have been acknowledged by the Cherniaks and we can't be sure that Aleksander and Polina have received them.

The other members of the Committee of 21 have had similar experiences. None has received a reply from her adopted prisoner or his family.

It is important to bear in mind that each prisoner of conscience has been convicted on spurious charges. Cherniak, for example, was sentenced to 4 years imprisonment for swindling and forgery. His actual alleged crime? He had changed his hours on his timesheet so that he could return home to Kiev a little early. His real crime? Aleksander is Jewish.

This is a microcosmic example of the greater problem. The fact is that the knock on the door may come at night, and a member of the family may be taken away and not seen again, communication cut off; all for the crime of being Jewish. We get little news, but what we do hear is devastating. We know that the children of prisoners are taunted in school, propaganda is printed and circulated against them, that the family is interrogated, harassed and tormented, even as the prisoner is tortured.

This is too painfully reminiscent of the darkest days of the Holocaust, and we cannot allow this to happen again. These prisoners need our voices to speak for them, or the world will hear only their silence.

Avital Shcharansky is an example of the courage required of the wife of a prisoner of conscience. She is a great spokeswoman for the cause of Soviet Jewry. Avital emigrated to Israel the day after her marriage to Anatoly in 1977, and has since traveled the world seeking assistance for her husband and others like him. I am proud to call Avital my friend. It is appropriate here to insert the editorial she wrote for the New York Times on Tuesday, September 24:

SPEAK UP FOR SOVIET JEWS

(By Avital Shcharansky)

Some 400,000 Jews, among them my husband Anatoly, are being held hostage in the Soviet Union. Will any of these thousands ever taste the bright air of freedom in their ancient homeland, Israel? The American public and its officials might usefully put this excruciating question to the Soviet Foreign Minister, Eduard A. Shevardnadze, during his visit this month to the United States—for its answer lies entirely in the hands of his barbaric Government.

Tyrannies of all sorts have been known on earth, but until our day it has been virtually unheard of for any regime, no matter how despotic, to deny that most elementary of all political alternatives, the right to leave.

Even Nazi Germany in the years before World War II grudgingly allowed free emigration—to say nothing of Russia under the Czars or South Africa under apartheid. In places where whole classes of citizens have been denied the right to vote, or the right to a free press or to freedom of religion, they have been given the right to emigrate. Not, however, in the Soviet Union.

Yet Moscow did in fact put its signature 10 years ago to the Final Act of the Helsinki conference. It thus conceded, among other things, that "everyone has a right to leave any country, including his own, and return to it." It is in accordance with this provision and with internal Soviet regulations that 400,000 Jews have asked to emigrate by requesting invitations from Israel. Yet last year only 896 were permitted to leave (and only 702 through August 1985), while leaders of Soviet Jewry languish in prisons and work camps.

To the charge of barbarism, then, we may add the charge of violation of an international agreement. In flouting this covenant, the Kremlin mocks the values on which civilization itself must rest. Does this not cast the darkest doubts on Moscow's present diplomatic efforts to impart an image of sweet reasonableness and moderation? Should this not put into question the Soviet Union's right to be admitted into the comity of nations?

Anatoly Shcharansky was refused a visa in 1973, but like many others he placed his hopes in the Helsinki covenant. In the mid-1970's, he served as a prominent member of a group that took it upon itself to monitor Soviet compliance. It was on account of these wholly legal activities—and not for the spurious crime of spying with which he was charged—that he was arrested and imprisoned more than eight years ago.

His fate since then is a macabre commentary on the brave words of the Helsinki accords. In 1977, he was sentenced to three years in prison and 10 years of hard labor. After transfer to a work camp, he was placed in solitary confinement for 90 days as punishment for lighting Hanukkah candles and reciting the Hebrew Psalms. While there, he was kept alive on a diet of bread and water, the bread on alternate days only. In November 1984, he was again isolated in the camp's internal prison.

My husband's health has deteriorated dangerously. He suffers from severe pains in his chest and eyes. Months pass when he is not heard from, when no one is allowed to visit him. For him, as for Iosif Begun, Dan Shapiro, Yuli Edelshtein, Alexander Koli-miansky and countless other Soviet Jews, this has been the meaning of the Helsinki accords.

These are days of high hopefulness in the West. Talks between the superpowers are proceeding apace, a summit meeting is in the offing and the democracies, yearning for peace, bend with eager pliancy in the direction of Mikhail S. Gorbachev's smile. The Soviet leader, eager to derail the Strategic Defense Initiative and acquire Western high technology, is desperately seeking accommodation and normalization. Can it be too much, in this season of expectation, to suggest that one unequivocal demand be made of those who have so systematically trampled on the rights and the lives of countless human beings begging for nothing but release? Is it too much to ask that before we seek or trust its signature on future treaties, the Soviet Government be required to honor the Helsinki accords—the most easily implementable of agreements?

Ultimately, the question is for Mr. Shevardnadze's Government to answer. But it is up to the West, particularly the United States, to ask. My husband and the Jews of the Soviet Union wait upon the word.

We are taking this action now because the increased anti-Semitic activities have reached frightening levels. The actions against those left behind when a prisoner of conscience is arrested have lost any semblance of subtlety; they have become overtly hostile and sanctioned by the state. There is an increased effort to give adverse publicity to these individuals under the guise of anti-Soviet slander.

The brave and timely words of Avital Shcharansky best express the feelings of those of us who are concerned for the Jews in the Soviet Union, the prisoners of conscience and their loved ones everywhere. They look to us as their voice and their hope, and we must not fail them.

CONTINUING HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN EL SALVADOR

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1985

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today along with 13 of my colleagues, I am introducing House Joint Resolution 198 condemning the now widely reported and documented indiscriminate bombing of civilian targets and other human rights abuses by the Armed Forces of El Salvador.

Today, the Salvadoran Armed Forces are supplied with 500 and 750 lb. antipersonnel bombs as well as white phosphorus by the United States. Additionally, the Catholic

Archdiocese in San Salvador reports that U.S.-supplied AC-47 gunships—the most powerful weaponry in Central America—are in use, often targeting civilian areas. The administration is continuing to supply the El Salvadoran Armed Forces with billions of dollars of aid while placing very few human rights requirements on that aid.

Since 1980, over 60,000 people have been killed largely by military and paramilitary forces according to Tutela Legal, the human rights monitoring group of San Salvador. Documentation is widespread that the Salvadoran Armed Forces have engaged in systematic human rights abuses including torture, the massacre of civilian populations as well as indiscriminate aerial bombings of civilian areas with white phosphorus and even napalm. Many of these abuses have occurred within the last year.

Last spring, Americas Watch released a report "Draining the Sea . . ." which concluded that the Armed Forces of El Salvador are draining the sea to deny the fish sustenance. The sea is the civilian population in guerrilla-controlled zones; the fish are the guerrillas. This strategy, the report continues, "involves the use of terror tactics—bombings, strafings, shellings, and occasionally, massacres against civilians." To date, there has been virtually no prosecution for these abuses despite the length of time that has elapsed since the documentation.

Just last week, Americas Watch released another report on the human rights abuses in El Salvador. Using figures obtained through the human rights monitoring agencies of San Salvador, press accounts and other documentation, the report concluded that the serious and systemic rights by the armed forces continue unabated and that previous hopes that the Duarte government

could control those human rights abuses by the armed forces proved to be just false hopes.

I welcome interested Members to cosponsor. The text of the resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 198

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress condemning the indiscriminate bombings and attacks on civilians and civilian targets in El Salvador

Whereas the past five years in El Salvador has witnessed the killing of over sixty thousand people, mostly civilians, according to the human rights monitoring group of the Archdiocese of San Salvador;

Whereas reports by human rights organizations, journalists, and independent sources confirm that the Salvadoran armed forces have engaged and continue to engage in indiscriminate aerial and ground attacks against civilian targets;

Whereas the documentation indicates that women and children have been targeted by these attacks;

Whereas the Salvadoran government has brought to justice virtually no individuals for these well documented human rights abuses five years after their documentation;

Whereas this conduct by the Salvadoran military has received condemnation by human rights monitoring groups in the United States and abroad; and

Whereas the United States has taken a very active role in the civil strife, including providing the Salvadoran government with \$1.7 billion in aid, including the provision of antipersonnel bombs and military aircraft as well as continued supervision of military activities: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, to express condemnation for the continuing human rights abuses in El Salvador, including the indiscriminate aerial and ground attacks against Salvadoran civilians and civilian targets by the armed forces of that country.