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Mr. DioGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Congressional Call to Conscience Vigil for Soviet Jewry and to bring attention to an initiative being put forth in the June 1986 issue of Reader's Digest.

Mr. Speaker, democratic nations were thrilled with the Soviet Union's release of renowned human rights activist, Anatoly Shcharansky. In fact, many of us had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Shcharansky during Solidarity Sunday in New York City and on his visit to Washington last week. Unfortunately, as he reminded us, his fortune has been denied to hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews who wish to escape to the West or simply to live their lives without fear of repression by the Soviet Government. He also reminded us that if we were to make progress on human rights within the Soviet Union, we must continue to apply constant pressure upon their Government. While I am in full agreement with this assessment, if our efforts are to be successful, they must come not only from the Congress, but from the American people as well.

This is where Reader's Digest is making its contribution. Their June 1986 issue will feature an article written by Lawrence Elliott entitled, "Buried Alive: The Plight of Soviet Jews." At the end of the article, an appeal is made to their 50 million readers to participate in a letter writing campaign to help end the persecution of Soviet Jews. The letters will be directed to the Soviet Ambassador to the United States. I wholeheartedly support and commend Reader's Digest for their initiative and am proud to have such a committed organization hail from my district. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this article appear in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have shown their dedication to the rights of free men as evidenced by our demonstrations against South Africa's policy of apartheid. It is my hope and belief that we can do the same to help end the ironfisted tyranny being perpetrated against the Jewish people living in the Soviet Union.

BURIED ALIVE: THE PLIGHT OF SOVIET JEWS

(By Lawrence Elliott)

Anatoly Shcharansky's walk across Berlin's Glienicker Bridge to freedom on a stinging cold morning last February exhilarated the non-communist world. Shcharansky had been the animating spirit of the beleaguered human-rights movement in the Soviet Union. Nervy, iron-hearted, he spoke for the thousands of Jews refused permission to emigrate, then braved the Kremlin's wrath and the KGB's inexorable retribution: a crudely fabricated charge of spying, a sentence of 13 years in prisons and a labor camp.

Now, having served nine years—including 403 days in a frigid punishment cell where he was forced to stand for days—he came walking into West Berlin, unconfined, unprovoked, mocking his tormentors to the end. At the East Berlin airport they had ordered him to march straight ahead to a car that would take him to the crossing point. Said Shcharansky, "I agree to nothing proposed by the KGB"—and strode off to freedom, signifying the whole way.

Millions rejoiced; some even hailed his release as proof that freedom was an irresistible idea. If so, it was an idea whose time had not yet come for the rest of the Soviet Jews—and Shcharansky was the first to say so. He vowed not to forget "those whom I left in the camps and prisons, who are still in exile, or struggling for their right to emigrate." Their true numbers are unknown, these people who live in limbo, and for them the only changes have been for the worse.

For Jews in the U.S.S.R. today, life on the always precarious razor's edge has turned critical. Jew-hating is in full fashion, with anti-Semitic graffiti covering all forms of radio and television. A Jew's prospects for an education and a decent job are bleaker than ever. Every expression of Jewish faith and tradition is under attack.

Yet never has it been harder for Jews to leave. Emigration, which exceeded 51,000 in 1979, was below 12,000 last year. Still they keep trying. There is reason to believe that nearly half the Jewish population of two million would ask for visas if they thought they could get them. At least 30,000 have been turned down—some again and again. "Refuseniks" are official pariahs, defamed, routinely dismissed from their jobs, then prosecuted for "parasitism." All they can do is wait, watching helplessly as their creative years slip away in the day-in, day-out struggle to survive.

You name is Nadezhda Fradkova, and in 1978 you live and work as a linguist in Moscow. You apply for a visa to immigrate to Israel. The KGB drags you off to a hospital where you are drugged and force-fed.

They tell you your father will not give his permission. You cannot believe your ears. Your father is appalled. Later, when you and your wife, Mariya, put in for visas to Israel, you hear that he goes to the KGB and refuses to join the Communist Party, your marriage is declared "illegitimate," and your son's identity is erased. You are registered as mentally disturbed. In July, you are kept in total isolation. In September, you are judged fit to stand trial.

Never in the history of Soviet jurisprudence has the defendant in a political trial been acquitted. You are sentenced to two years' imprisonment. In September 1985, in a labor camp in the Arctic north, you are put in a punishment cell for starting another hunger strike. The KGB orders you to complete your sentence, you will apply again for an exit visa. They cannot take away your hope.

Anti-Semitism was banned by law after the Revolution. But under Stalin, Bolsheviks began terrorizing those who clung to a Jewish religious or community life. Unlike every one of the other 100-odd nationalities in the Soviet Union, Jews were expressly denied their own schools, as well as Hebrew newspapers and books. Synagogues were shut down and rabbis persecuted. Even the teaching of Hebrew was made a crime.

The new Israeli nation handed Stalin—and every one of his successors—a pre-text for anti-Semitism. When the Kremlin reviled Israel and its "Zionist warmongers," the threat to Jews in the U.S.S.R. was painfully clear.

But something remarkable happened: instead of being cowed by this abuse of Israel, many Jews found that their feelings of Jewishness intensified, and this served to rekindle Jewish thought and tradition. Israel gave them hope. Putting their fears behind them, Jews began demanding the right to emigrate, the right to have a voice in the institutions of their lives. The KGB responded with intimidation by the secret police, raids and arrests, the impulse to go swelled. In 1970, after only 1000 exit visas were granted, the bravest of the thousands who had been refused defied authorities; they staged sit-ins, wrote open letters to the United Nations, even renounced their citizenship. "Each person has his quota of fear," said one, "We have used up ours."

You are Vladimir Slepak. Your father is an old Bolshevik whose faith in the Revolution remained unshaken even during Stalin's purges and anti-Semitic spasms even though he nearly lost his life. But when you refuse to join the Communist Party, your father is appalled. The KGB responds with intimidation by the secret police, raids and arrests, the impulse to go swelled. In 1970, after only 1000 exit visas were granted, the bravest of the thousands who had been refused defied authorities; they staged sit-ins, wrote open letters to the United Nations, even renounced their citizenship. "Each person has his quota of fear," said one, "We have used up ours."

You lose your job as head of a television-research laboratory. Your visa application is turned down repeatedly. You and Mariya make common cause with other refuseniks in Moscow. You teach yourself Hebrew and attend classes on Jewish culture and history. You are the rock of the Jewish community. Anatoly Shcharansky is in your apartment when the KGB comes to arrest him.

The KGB watches you. Your apartment is searched by the secret police, raids and arrests, the impulse to go swelled. In 1970, after only 1000 exit visas were granted, the bravest of the thousands who had been refused defied authorities; they staged sit-ins, wrote open letters to the United Nations, even renounced their citizenship. "Each person has his quota of fear," said one, "We have used up ours."

You are Vladimir Slepak. Your father is an old Bolshevik whose faith in the Revolution remained unshaken even during Stalin's purges and anti-Semitic spasms even though he nearly lost his life. But when you refuse to join the Communist Party, your father is appalled. The KGB responds with intimidation by the secret police, raids and arrests, the impulse to go swelled. In 1970, after only 1000 exit visas were granted, the bravest of the thousands who had been refused defied authorities; they staged sit-ins, wrote open letters to the United Nations, even renounced their citizenship. "Each person has his quota of fear," said one, "We have used up ours."

You lose your job as head of a television-research laboratory. Your visa application is turned down repeatedly. You and Mariya make common cause with other refuseniks in Moscow. You teach yourself Hebrew and attend classes on Jewish culture and history. You are the rock of the Jewish community. Anatoly Shcharansky is in your apartment when the KGB comes to arrest him.

The KGB watches you. Your apartment is ransacked; you are endlessly questioned, fired from one job after another, twice put in "preventive detention." A KGB officer says you cannot leave the Soviet Union—you know state secrets. "What secret?" you ask. "In our lab we were fourteen years behind the West."

He smiles. "That's the secret."
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The years pass. Your elder son miraculously gets an exit visa. One day in 1978, you and Mariya hang a banner from your window. "Let us out to our son in Israel!"

For this you are arrested and sentenced to five years of internal exile. Mariya is given a suspended sentence.

They send you to a place near the Mongolian border where the winter wind cuts like a knife. Here Mariya joins you and she serves out your sentence in a one-room flat without water. When you return to Moscow, you appear to have been humanely dealt with.

In the mid-1960's, some 4500 Jewish families who had applied to emigrate years before were suddenly given exit visas. This was unprecedented. But even more remarkable was the rising tide of Jewish emigration that followed—nearly 230,000 left over the next ten years.

What happened? Compassion had nothing to do with it. On the contrary, Moscow, aware that the Jewish emigration movement had attracted the sympathy of the civilized world, coldly decided to make it pay. In 1980, the KGB and give up your job as an English teacher in Moscow, perhaps... Larry, who is a dear friend, is one of the finest diplomats who has served our country. He has held numerous foreign service posts in Washington and abroad. In 1969 he began a long association with Henry Kissinger, when he was named executive assistant to the President's National Security Advisor. He subsequently was executive assistant to the Secretary of State, Ambassador to Yugoslavia, form (1977-81) and Assistant Secretary for European Affairs (1981-82), before being named Undersecretary for Political Affairs in 1982. Since 1984 he has been President of Kissinger Associates.

Larry's outstanding address at George Washington University focused on the unfortunate decline in the common vision and in the collective action involving the United States and our allies in Europe and Asia that marked international relations in the post-war world. In recent years, the threat of international terrorism has become an important factor in the relations between us and our friends.

Larry's careful analysis of the impact of terrorism on international relations and his thoughtful suggestions about what we must do to deserve our serious attention. Philip Geyelin's comment 2 years ago when Larry left the Department of State is relevant to this fine address: "Eagleburger is a pro, so you get no show-and-tell; he is tough-minded, so you get no easy answers."

Mr. Speaker, I know of no topic of greater interest or greater concern to our democracy today than Larry Eagleburger's remarks. Folowing, I urge my colleagues in the Congress to give them careful attention:

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

(By Lawrence S. Eagleburger)

As we move into the last decade and one-half of the Twentieth Century it may be instructive—particularly for those of you who will be deciding the nation's fate in the Twenty First Century—to reflect a bit on what we are leaving behind. Except for a few countries, the Twentieth Century has been a difficult time for most of mankind. Barbara Tuchman, in her book "A Distant Mirror," argues convincingly that we have to go back to the Fourteenth Century, in the aftermath of the Black Death, to find a period in human history as tumultuous as contemporary times.

Yet, despite this less than spectacular record of Twentieth Century accomplishment, one trend shows such promise that it is possible to believe that we might pass on to the Twenty First Century a people moving toward greater stability, prosperity, and justice than the one we inherited. The development, after the close of the Second World War, of the concept of collective responsibility on the part of the Western democracies for their common security and economic betterment, and the structure of institutions—ranging the gamut from NATO, the OECD, and GATT, the World Bank, and the IMF—created to carry out those responsibilities, was, and is, an accomplishment unique in human history. The recognition that trans-Atlantic security can be assured only through a common commitment that has brought Europe the longest period of peace in this Century. It is the recogni-
tion that economic progress depends upon commonly accepted international rules of conduct and institutional structures that fa­
cilitate trade and financial cooperation that can be accepted by all. With the notable exception of Mrs. Thatcher, who is certainly no Chamberlain, we cannot be expected to give an inch of our territory.

The enemy is no longer—though it is still an enemy, as it was in the old days of the Cold War—expected to open fire from across the border. It is now expected to open fire from across the sea. This is not a small change. It is not a change that is easy to make, nor is it a change that will take place overnight. It is a change that will take place gradually, and in some cases, very gradually.
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bit about the nature and importance of their future relationship with a nation which may one day be governed by leaders who espouse the removal of nuclear weapons from their territory and trumpet their opposition to the use of U.S. aircraft against a terrorist state.

It has been argued, both here and abroad, that our attack on Libya has strengthened Arab support for Colonel Qaddafi that may, unfortunately, be true. But it is grudging support for a man generally disliked and distrusted, and not likely to become of any substantial long-term significance. What is far more disturbing is that so much of the European left has rallied to him, and yet was singularly silent in the face of the brutal murder of the people of Kos.

For example, the British Labour Party, which has made itself an easy target. By moving to end, he may decide to go ahead, but he will do so in much greater doubt about his future on this planet than would have been the case two weeks ago. He now knows that the news has produced a degree of uncertainty into the equation that was not there before. Hopefully, others—the Assads, Khomenis, and Arafats of this world—will also be a bit more cautious next time, knowing, as they now do, that America crossed the Rubicon once and may do so again.

**WHAT IS TO BE DONE**

The democracies must face up to the unpleasant reality that we are engaged in a new and vicious form of warfare that poses potentially very serious threats to our institutions and to world stability. A wise transit from the First to the Second Century will be difficult enough under the best of circumstances; it will be virtually impossible if the Western democracies are torn by the growing internal tension that will surely develop if current terrorist trends are not reversed. As I see it, there is only one way to assure that they are reversed: those governments that support and employ terror must be brought to a recognition that they have far more to lose than to gain by continuing present policies. It is true that individual terrorists may be willing to die for their cause, but governments usually seek martyrdom. Thus, if they know that they will have to pay the price of political and economic isolation, and, in extremis, a price in lives as well, their enthusiasm for the use of terror may begin to wane. Indeed, I know that there will be no incentive to curb the fanatics, and the use of terror as an instrument of state policy will surely escalate. President Reagan has shown the world that we will act alone if necessary. But I suspect he would be the first to admit that unilateral action is a palliative at best. What is needed is concerted action by all nations of the West—action to isolate through economic and political sanctions those states that support and sponsor terror as an instrument of state policy. That may be a hit about the nature and importance of their future relationship with a nation which may one day be governed by leaders who espouse the removal of nuclear weapons from their territory and trumpet their opposition to the use of U.S. aircraft against a terrorist state.
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ted to me that he listened to (unjammed) VOA broadcasts in English. What he did not say—what he could not say—was that VOA is a principal source of honest, objective news to him and most other Soviet officials. It presumes the same kind of press freedom as enjoyed by jamming to the majority of the Soviet Union’s ordinary citizens who do not understand English.

It is possible that this sort of no-information policy and disinformation difficult to believe should look at the historical record. On November 10, 1917, the Soviets officially opened the press freedom to be a “temporary” measure, but is still in effect with even more rigid controls almost 70 years later.

At the fourth Communist Party Congress in March 1918, a man cried out, complaining that “our newspapers have been closed.” Lenin respond by saying: “Of course. But, unfortunately, not all of them. Soon they will all be closed . . . [and we] will wipe out the shameful purveying of bourgeois opium.” Much more communication control followed.

In 1950, the Soviets jammed the BBC on the grounds it was filled with “lies.” At the time, Soviet Ambassador Andrei Vyshinsky remarked: “We believe the BBC is a nothing but saying that it was necessary because the Russian people were becoming “upset” by the broadcasts.

But with the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan, Soviet jamming came back with renewed power. Today, their static bars the ordinary Soviet citizen from listening to the news of death and destruction in Afghanistan on not only VOA, but Radio Liberty and the BBC. And there is only selectively released news of Afghanistan in the Soviet media. It is the electronic Bear which takes a terrible bite from the truth.

Soviet jamming is the most outrageous evidence of the larger effort by the U.S.S.R. to control communication. Television is a poweful medium in American society. And it is not lost on the Soviet party leaders that television has potentially the same kind of impact as it has in the Soviet Union as it does in the United States. But in the Soviet Union, the Communist Party is the only sponsor and the only network, and the program that the party likes essentially a closed circuit with limited access, by invitation only. What a contrast with the access the Soviets and others have to the diverse media outlets in the United States.

Since Geneva, some communication exchanges have occurred. President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev talked directly to each other’s citizens on television, with resulting radio and print commentary, the first time since 1972. For our part, we continue to offer the Soviet audiences through the U.S. Information Agency’s international print, broadcast, and tele­vision services—people who can discuss and debate issues concerning American policy, our society and institutions and our fundamental beliefs and values. All that is needed is a positive response from the Soviet leadership to create meaningful dialogue.

Nearly 200 million in the fields of culture, education, science, and technology, as outlined in our agreement signed last November 21 in Geneva, are important. These exchange exhibitions and presentations by performing artists, are essential to fulfillment of the agreement.

They help to further a dialogue between nu­merous people in both nations.

Since November, a great deal has been written and commented on what some have termed the “Spirit of Geneva.” implying a cessation of tensions, of more friendly relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Of course, that appeals to millions of Americans who desire arms, reduc­tions, a more cooperative relationship, and a more peaceful world.

But “spirits” are elusive and ephemeral. Ultimately, they drift away and dissipate unless they form and create substance from them.

The Soviet government prevents its cit­izens from having access to divergent opin­ion and uncensored news because it fears the effect of an informed public opinion on its ability to maintain power.

These Soviet bureaucrats know that infor­mation produces knowledge; that knowledge produces ideas; and that ideas often have consequences regimes cannot control. Therefore, they are afraid.

At the summit meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev, it was evident that both countries could advance the cause of world peace by better understand­ing the interests of the larger part of the people of both countries. The Soviets’ turn­ing off the jammers and allowing the people to have the news and views from elsewhere would be like a long way toward removing the doubt and mistrust that now exist. In addi­tion, the Soviets would save an estimated $750 million per year, or more.

Until they face up to their fears, and force themselves to allow their citizens a basic right guaranteed by international law, we can only remain hopeful—not optimistic—about the meaningful exchange and better understand­ing.

FOUNDERATION FOR INTERNA­TIONAL COMMUNITY ASSIS­TANCE

HON. DOUG BEREUTER
OF NEBRASKA

TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 1986

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago I was introduced to Mr. John Hatch, founder the president of the Foundation for International Community Assistance (FINCA). I have listened carefully to the innovative private sector project of FINCA in the Bolivian high­lands. Mr. Hatch described to me the great success of his development project among the Bolivian peasants.

FINCA’s innovative characteristic lies in Mr. Hatch’s model of combining a development project—no traditional technical assistance for increased output of local products—with a marketing capability for those products. This type of innovation, of course, drew opposition from some people at AID. But, FINCA’s suc­cess in making small shares of credit available for large amounts of progress could not be discounted.

FINCA has support from the Inter-American Foundation and some support from AID. This Member has previously brought FINCA to the appropriate congressional committee.

Now, FINCA is drawing on support from groups all over our Nation who have heard of its success. I would like to draw my colleagues’ attention to a letter I received from a Minnesotan Presbyterian church on their in­volvement with Finca. It is an inspiring example of the great American volunteer spirit. I am going to share this letter, and the attached report from Pastor Lundy, with some of the congregations in my State. I would hope other Members would do the same. My office would be glad to provide any of my colleagues with more details.

ST. LUKE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Waconia, MN, May 1, 1986.

Dear Congressmen Bereuter,

Rayburn Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Mr. Speaker, I am writing to you because I understand that you share my interest in FINCA, the Foundation for International Community Assistance. As you may know, FINCA has assisted over 25,000 poor rural families in nearly 500 villages in Central and South America since its inception in 1984 with its innovative, small-scale lending program that is indexed to commodities.

Since learning about FINCA through its founder and President John Hatch, in early 1985, members of St. Luke Presbyterian Church of Minneapolis have been interested in its work. Our congregation of only 250 active members has contributed over $44,000 to FINCA, and thirteen of us recently returned from a visit, at our own expense, to seven Bolivian villages that have benefited from the FINCA loans. The enclosed trip report summarizes our observations.

We were deeply impressed with the impact that the FINCA program has had on the rural villages. Nearly all of the peasant families the program reaches have never had access to any kind of credit before. With FINCA loans as capital, entire villages are motivated to devote existing materials and considerable labor to rapidly increase their productivity and income. Additionally, the nature of community participation in the FINCA program strongly promotes creditworthiness of borrowers.

We at St. Luke feel strongly that FINCA enables the people of rural Latin America to significantly improve their local economy and living standards. We see a real possibility for widespread, long-term economic and social stability for Latin American countries, if the FINCA program continues.

Thousands of peasant villages in Bolivia and other countries can benefit through FINCA assistance. Consequently, FINCA is seeking support from a variety of public and private funding sources in the United States, including USAID, the Inter-American Foundation, and private corporations and foundations. (USAID staff with us in research the possible extension of the FINCA program for getting credit to the very small farmers at a reasonable cost.)

It is encouraging to know that you consider FINCA to be a valuable program for the future. I am sure that you will be able to assist FINCA representatives with putting them in touch with appropriate public and private sources of support. With your help, we believe that the positive example of the FINCA program that we saw in Bolivia can be extended throughout most of Latin America.

Sincerely,

RICHARD A. LUNDY, Pastor.
ST. LUKE PARTICIPATION WITH FINCA

St. Luke is a small, but active, church located in Minneapolis. In January 1985, John Hatch, President and Founder of FINCA and a brother of one of our members, generated considerable enthusiasm among our congregation with his presentation of the FINCA program. This interest resulted in forty contributions totaling over $4,400 in support of FINCA efforts prior to our trip.

Thirteen of the contributing individuals indicated a desire to visit a sampling of projects in Bolivia. Consequently, in mid-March we joined John, Ronoldo Mercado of the USAID Mission in Bolivia, Richard Ameral, a Cornell University anthropologist living in the villages we visited, and two FINCA field supervisors. We spent three days traveling about 750 kilometers plus 2 1/2 hours by water to visit seven villages representing 533 families.

SOME OBSERVATIONS FROM OUR TRIP

Although our visit was short, our congregation is accustomed to world-wide involvement. From our perspective, it is impossible to briefly summarize our many observations, let alone the most important ones. Nevertheless, we would like to devote the following paragraphs to some of the most significant impressions we formed about the effectiveness of the FINCA program in Bolivia.

Observation 1: FINCA catalyzes intra- and inter-community participation and cooperation far beyond the requirements of any specific FINCA project. As a result of a gift from the St. Luke FINCA supporters, Huacuyo is going to share its initial trout fishing production with two adjacent communities to start trout projects.

An initial FINCA loan to Belen was distributed among individual families for purchases of food, tools, seed, etc. In part to FINCA involvement, Belen has also worked on the founding of two community projects: a 1500 tree farm; a potable water system; latrines; a greenhouse and a horticulture project.

Observation 2: The FINCA loan amount frequently is the smallest component of total project “capitalization” when considering campingos (peasant) labor and utilization of existing, available materials.

In addition to about $1,000 in support from FINCA, the trout farm in Huacuyo was constructed largely with available, native materials and 22,000 mahnours of local labor.

Observation 3: The nature of community participation and the available evidence to date suggests that the communities are creditworthy.

In conclusion, the FINCA experiences in Bolivia are so positive that they are expected to provide an additional, $3,000 to FINCA prior to our departure. We specified that the funds were for a specific village project and that partially defraying FINCA salaries within the FINCA/Bolivia office.

In conclusion, the FINCA program offers opportunities to families operating within a Federal system that currently provides little opportunity. The campesinos realize this and are very appreciative—FINCA provides them a chance. The benefits of the system appear to us to be far greater than simply advancing and recovering a loan investment.

We intend to continue supporting FINCA in essentially its present form and appreciate the support offered by our Church.

RICHARD A. LUNDBY, Pastor.
NONPROLIFERATION: THE EUROPEAN COURSE

HON. MARILYN LLOYD
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, recently United States and European panels conducted nuclear nonproliferation studies and the main conclusions from those studies have been published in "Blocking the Spread of Nuclear Weapons: American and European Perspectives" by the Council on Foreign Relations.

The following conclusions, which I have annotated, are from the European report and they indicate in general a steady middle course by the European panel chaired by Johan Jørgen Holst:

IX. CONCLUSIONS

98. In the past fifteen years, a consensus on non-proliferation policy in Western Europe has been developing. This consensus is far from being perfect; many political difficulties remain.

99. Nuclear policies vary widely among West European countries and non-proliferation policy is still the prerogative of the individual nations. However, a joint European approach would considerably strengthen the existing non-proliferation regime. Increasing coordination among West European countries is therefore needed. Developments so far, and particularly the Working Group on Non-Proliferation within European Political Co-operation, justify hope for further progress.

100. Small incremental improvements of the existing regime hold better promises for success than attempts to achieve dramatic changes. One such step could be a joint declaration on non-proliferation by the EC heads of government. This declaration should stress the interest of West European countries in non-proliferation and their opposition to testing by non-nuclear weapon states. Progress on arms control—particularly the Test Ban Treaty coupled with "build-down" and the nuclear weapon systems—would make a unique contribution to the preservation of the legitimacy of the regime. Policies seeking less reliance on nuclear weapons for national and alliance security are also important. Another major task for the future is the integration of new suppliers into the regime.

101. Prudent export policy remains an integral part of non-proliferation policy. It must find a middle ground between strict denial and export promotion. The London Guidelines provide a solid base. The next step should be the development of a pragmatic code of conduct—within the framework of the Guidelines—for dealing with export problems on a case-by-case basis. This code should give proper attention to the sensitivity of the items to be exported as well as to recipients' records.
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99. In the foreseeable future, proliferation concerns will focus on a small number of countries. Most of those threshold countries have made progress in indigenous nuclear technological capabilities. Whether they will use these capabilities for military applications will depend on their assessments of their national interests. Working through the balance of incentives and disincentives as perceived by the threshold countries will in most instances offer the best prospects for success. Preserving the status quo of progress through careful diplomatic efforts if the most promising approach toward these countries.

100. In shaping non-proliferation policy, two important aspects should be borne in mind: the inevitable limits of this policy and the relation of nuclear proliferation to broader issues of international politics. The limits derive from our international system of sovereign nation-states and apply to both the general non-proliferation regime and the possible influence on individual states.

In the absence of world government, any non-proliferation regime is bound to be imperfect. This restricts the opportunity for shaping these decisions from outside. It is essential to temper expectations in both respects. Expectations that are too high may frustrate and over-react to political problems. Non-proliferation policy needs continuity and predictability.

102. Nuclear proliferation is related to, and partly dependent on, broader issues of international relations. Further development of the North-South dialogue will have a strong impact on the general climate for preserving and improving the non-proliferation regime. The evolution of the East-West conflict influences the security of some key threshold states and determines the chances for meaningful arms control, which again has consequences for the non-proliferation regime.

The evolution also affects the standards of international behaviour and the means chosen to influence security relations. Many actions in the arena of foreign policy therefore have intentional or unintentional consequences for proliferation.

101. Nuclear proliferation is related to, and partly dependent on, broader issues of international relations. Further development of the North-South dialogue will have a strong impact on the general climate for preserving and improving the non-proliferation regime. The evolution of the East-West conflict influences the security of some key threshold states and determines the chances for meaningful arms control, which again has consequences for the non-proliferation regime.

The evolution also affects the standards of international behaviour and the means chosen to influence security relations. Many actions in the arena of foreign policy therefore have intentional or unintentional consequences for proliferation.

102. Finally, non-proliferation would benefit from further progress in the difficult process of West European political integration. A very important aspect of this process is the coordination of security policies, including arms control. A joint approach toward non-proliferation would necessarily be a relevant ingredient of such a unified security policy.

Taken together, our considerations suggest that West Europeans can make a significant contribution to non-proliferation policy. They should not miss the opportunity.

I strongly recommend the conclusions of the European panel to all Members of the House.
June 3, 1986

(b), except that the Secretary may modify such powers, authority, or responsibilities if the Secretary determines such action to be necessary because of the special nature of the mortgage involved.

(4) Notwithstanding section 202, the insurance of a mortgage under subsection (b) as modified by this subsection shall be the obligation of the Special Risk Insurance Fund created in section 238.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, this is the 23rd consecutive year that I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report on my personal financial condition. While the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 and the House rules require public financial disclosure, this reporting statement is more precise than what is required by law and by the House rules.

This report contains the calendar year 1985 and also includes the amount of Federal and State of Wisconsin taxes as well as local real estate taxes paid in 1985.

Mr. Speaker, the report follows:

Financial disclosure statement—statement of financial condition, December 31, 1985

Checking account, with the Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives (Includes pay for December)...

$3,038.09

Cash...

35.01

Securities (stocks, bonds, etc.)... WPCF Credit Union (1 share)...

5.85

700 shares Air Wisconsin @ 11%

$8,225.00

Residential real estate:

Arlington house and lot (1985 assessment)...

216,600,00

Less mortgage...

914,67

Equity...

215,685.33

Sun Prairie house and lot...

29,000.00

Improvements (dep’d)...

1,073.00

Back lot...

1,200.00

Sewer and storm utilities (dep’d)...

3,613.00

Total...

34,886.99

Less mortgage...

10,788.00

Equity...

24,098.00

Household goods and miscellaneous personal property...

9,000.00

Miscellaneous assets, deposits, with U.S. Civil Service retirement fund through December 31, 1985, available only in accordance with applicable laws and regulations...

81,852.78

Additional retirement fund deposit...

1,130.00

Cash surrender value of life insurance...

None

Cash surrender value of life insurance:

On the life of Robert W. Kastenmeier...

None

On the life of Dorothy C. Kastenmeier...

544.00
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Deposit, Donaldson Run...

400.00

Automobiles:

1976 Oldsmobile...

300.00

1978 Mercury...

1,300.00

Net worth...

262,631.28

Taxes paid in 1985:

Federal income tax...

15,620.36

Wisconsin income tax...

6,091.00

Federal employment tax...

1,469.89

Arlington County real estate tax...

2,057.70

Sun Prairie real estate taxes, excluding assessments...

$265.68

State sales tax...

500.00

Total...

25,585.43

1985 income congressional salary...

74,891.63

Gross rent, Sun Prairie house...

4,000.00

Honoraria (4)...

3,250.00

Tax refund State...

663.74

Tax refund U.S...

752.57

Total...

82,957.94

1985 separate income of my wife, Dorothy C. Kastenmeier:

Net rents and leases...

1,466.14

Education fund, interest...

2,323.73

Total...

3,789.87

Note: Separate property of spouse not listed.

CONGRESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEC
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. MRAZEC. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written in recent months of a rebirth of conscience in American society.

The proof given for this theory comes in the form of such “megaevents” as Live Aid, Farm Aid and Hands Across America. These demonstrations of concern and compassion certainly signify a new awakening of the qualities in Americans that have always been our greatest strength.

But while these outpourings of resources and conscience should not be downplayed, it went out of style for thousands of American women that have always been our greatest strength. But this has never deterred her from getting involved in improving and enhancing the quality of life of all Long Islanders. Selections of the recipients of this year’s Congressional Achievement Awards were made by a panel of past winners and other business, public foundation, service agency and community organization representatives.

The individuals whose profiles are listed below are this year’s recipients of the Congressional Achievement Awards. I call the attention of my colleagues and of all Americans to their examples of tireless service, volunteerism and good works for their fellow citizens:

Margaret Grossman of New Hyde Park—An active and long-time volunteer, Margaret Grossman has made a distinctive difference in the adjustment to institutional life for countless patients at the Jewish Institute for Geriatric Care. Or Mrs. Gericafine, this woman is older than some of the patients she helps. But this has never deterred her from walking the daily five mile trip from her home to the center (and back). Mrs. Grossman’s personal dedication, warmth and sensitivity to the individual needs of the patients at the center have endeared her to patients and staff alike.

Susan Geraldine Allen of Huntington—Known to hundreds of pre-school children as “Miss Gerri”, Geraldine Allen has been a volunteer Teacher’s Aide in the Suffolk County Family Service League’s Gateway Gardens Pre-school Learning Center for the past eleven years. Mrs. Allen’s love and dedication has helped many children and their income families prepare for success in the public school system. Mrs. Allen is also very active in a number of other community organizations including the Huntington, Church Women United, the NAAACP, and the Bethel AME Church, where she continues to teach Sunday School.

Sandy Chaplin of Huntington—Sandy first became active in the fight against world hunger in 1974 by working with her late husband, Harry, on a benefit concert for Bangladesh in cooperation with UNICEF. She has continued this life-long endeavor to end hunger and human suffering through her personal and financial support of countless agencies and organizations. She is currently Chairperson of Long Island Cares, serves as an active board member of WHY (World Hunger Year), and was recently appointed by Gov. Cuomo to serve on the Martin Luther King Committee as a commission member. The founder of the Harry Chaplin Foundation, Sandy has used this organization to support efforts throughout Long Island to promote peace, education and the arts.

Walter H. Cobb of Roslyn Heights—Deacon of the Friendship Baptist Church in Roslyn for the past 26 years and Chairman of the Roslyn Citizens’ Advisory Committee, Walter Cobb was a major force in the effort to redevelop a once blighted community within Roslyn Heights. Today, this section of town boasts many new apartments, single family homes, new office buildings, and renovated residences. Long active in a wide variety of community issues and organizations, Deacon Cobb’s most recent accomplishment is his realization of the start of construction on the Greater Roslyn Community Center.

Orrin Dayton of Cold Springs Harbor—Starting out as a Big Brother ten years ago, Orrin Dayton became instrumental in the establishment of Big Brothers/Big Sisters of Suffolk County. Under his leadership, the program soon spun off from under the auspices of Catholic Charities to become an independent non-profit organization. Over the past five years has matched more than 600 single-parent children with responsible caring volunteers. His colleagues at Big Brothers/Big Sisters of Suffolk County have best referred to Orrin Dayton as the “Father of the Agency.”
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HON. THOMAS E. PETRI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the Tort Action Procedure Reform Act. As the ranking Republican member of the Labor Standards Subcommittee, I have been concerned with the mounting problem of compensating workers suffering asbestos-related disease. Despite notable efforts by the asbestos industry through the Wellington Group in formulating the Asbestos Claims Facility, and significant legislative proposals before my subcommittee, tort litigation remains the primary engine of compensation. This has overtaxed our Federal court system and contributed to the explosion of tort claims. During the past decade, the number of products liability complaints filed in Federal court increased 370 percent, with a third of those complaints during the past 2 years related to asbestos. Concurrently, the dollar amount of individual awards and settlements has risen steadily. This increasing risk of legal liability has resulted in a partial loss of availability of liability insurance for asbestos-related activities. For example, the premiums for one asbestos-removal company recently increased almost 5,000 percent, from $9,361 to over $450,000 even though the company had never been sued.

The dramatic recent increases in the number and severity of tort claims, and the resultant increase in liability insurance premiums, have not been limited to asbestos-related activities. I wish to touch upon a variety of activities. Since the late 1960s, for example, both the number of medical malpractice claims and the size of resulting awards, have risen at an annual rate of 10 percent or greater, generating average malpractice premiums for doctors and hospitals, about 15 percent per year. In some specialties and in some regions these increases have been much higher, so that obstetricians and neurosurgeons in some areas now face average annual premiums of over $100,000. Similar accounts of sharply increasing risks to legal liability and insurance premiums can be related for such diverse activities as local government and public schools, private day care centers, manufacturing, transportation, construction, and even churches and charitable service organizations. In some of these activities, so many entities cannot even obtain insurance that the cover of Time magazine recently declared, "Sorry, America, Your Insurance has Been Canceled."

The impact of these trends has been costly to all of us. According to one physicians' association, one-third of all medical malpractice claims are done because of fear of litigation, wasting many billions of dollars per year in governmental medicare costs alone. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists reports that liability expenses increased the average price of having a healthy baby by $70 during the past 2 years, and caused one-eighth of its members to stop delivering babies altogether. The Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association calculates that $25 of the $100 retail price of football helmets goes to pay for liability insurance. Overall, $66.5 billion dollars—1.76 percent of our gross national product—goes to pay tort claims and related legal fees, up 61 percent since 1980.

The broad sweep of the tort litigation explosion and the resulting liability insurance crisis led me to seek a comprehensive solution that reached beyond the single issue of asbestos-related claims. In doing so, I have been impressed by the wide variety of meritorious tort reform legislation now before Congress, especially in the area of products liability, most notably that introduced by the Senators from Wisconsin and Missouri [Messrs. KASTEN and DANFORTH] and on behalf of the Reagan administration by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], and in the area of medical malpractice, most notably that introduced by the Gentlemen from Louisiana and Missouri [Messrs. MOORE and GEPHARDT]. Nearly all of this legislation proposes needed substantive changes in what gives rise to tort liability and how and when the costs of legal fees are charged. However, as the head of our Federal court system, Chief Justice Warren Burger, so often reminds us, procedural changes are also needed.

Experience gained from State tort reforms enacted in response to the medical malpractice crisis of the mid-1970s shows that mandatory alternative dispute resolution procedures offer the single most promising answer to the current liability crisis. Indeed, a 1985 statistical study by Prof. Frank A. Sloan, chairman of Vanderbilt University's Economics Department, found that of all the State tort reforms, only the mandatory use of pretrial screening panels had a statistically significant association with lower malpractice insurance premiums.

A 1986 report by the ABA Civil Justice Policy Office surveys interested organizations about the various State medical malpractice tort reforms under scores the value of mandatory pretrial arbitration. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists responded, "States that have enacted some form of binding arbitration system appear to have had a fair degree of success with it." The Consumer Federation of America stated, "Arbitration can add predictability and speed to the tort system." The St. Paul Companies, Inc., the largest private supplier of malpractice insurance, commented, "Arbitration can be an effective method of reducing costs, but only if binding on both parties as to both liability and damages." The American Medical Association added, "Voluntary binding arbitration has proved effective in some States where it has been implemented." The Physicians Insurers Association of America noted, "Arbitration on small damage value claims could be useful," and, finally, the American Association of Retired Persons observed, "Some form of arbitration for some malpractice cases may be desirable. . . . The key is to design a system that meets constitutional challenges, swifty and fairly resolves claims, and allows access to the traditional tort system for particularly egregious cases." I have tried to design just such a system.

Recognizing the value of pretrial screening and arbitration panels for improving the process of handling medical malpractice claims, the Senate from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] has recently introduced legislation to help fund such State court reform. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MRACEK] has more recently introduced similar legislation in this House. Several innovative Federal district courts have also begun successfully experimenting with mandatory pretrial arbitration for disputes outside the medical malpractice arena, as have some State courts. Building on this experience, my proposal would mandate pretrial arbitration for all personal injury tort actions filed in Federal courts unless the constitutional right to a jury trial was immediately invoked. States would be encouraged to establish similar programs.
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in each case, early settlement would be encouraged. These procedures are outlined in a section-by-section analysis of my bill. I ask that the analysis be appended to this statement.

-Petral arbitration works because it helps all parties to a legal dispute. Injured persons obtain swifter, surer justice through speedy resolution of the claims and impose up to $10,000 administrative costs upon those filing them.

Within 18 days after the panel decides a claim, the panel must issue to each party a written decision regarding liability, a statement of the findings of fact and law, and a statement of the amount of damages. Damages are due upon entry of the award with the court and, in any proceeding to enforce an order, the only issue is whether payment has been made according to the terms of the order.

SALT II—State Administration Panels

The United States Attorney General is authorized to make grants to the States to establish and implement panels similar to those established in the Federal courts. These panels are to refer claims to jury trials only to the extent required by the State constitution.

MAJORITY IN HOUSE SUPPORT CONTINUED ADHERENCE TO SALT II

HON. DANTE B. FASCCELL
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. FASCCELL. Mr. Speaker, over 220 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, as well as a majority of the Senate, recently encouraged the President to not undercut the SALT II Treaty.

In issuing his “Interim Restraint Policy” last week and announcing his decision to dismantle two Poseidon submarines when the eighth Trident submarine begins sea trials, the President has wisely continued U.S. adherence to SALT II Treaty limits. Anything less than dismantling the two Poseidon—both are near retirement anyway—would be a clear violation of SALT II.

The President’s “Interim Restraint Policy,” at first glance, appears to signal an end to U.S. adherence to the SALT II Treaty. According to this new policy, instead of basing decisions regarding U.S. strategic forces on the standards contained in the SALT II agreement, the United States will base its strategic decisions “on the nature and magnitude of the threat posed by the Soviet Union.” Moreover, “the United States will not deploy more strategic nuclear delivery vehicles or strategic ballistic missile warheads than the Soviet Union.” If one is not careful, these statements could be interpreted as an administration policy in support of a “freeze.” Knowing, however, that this administration’s longstanding opposition to a freeze concept, the administration’s policy statement will more likely up the ante for an accelerated arms race. Rather than abandoning our adherence to SALT II in favor of nothing else, it would be wiser to maintain our adherence to that important agreement as we pursue future agreements with the Soviet Union. If we abandon the treaty, how is security for either superpower preserved or enhanced in a world in which there are no restraints? How would 8,000 more Soviet nuclear weapons targeted against the United States enhance our security?

If the administration is signaling such an end to U.S. adherence to the SALT II Treaty, this would, in effect, unravel the arms control regime of the last 15 years. Such an outcome would unnecessarily jeopardize the arms talks in Geneva, make prospects of a second summit later this year unlikely, and require the United States to unnecessarily spend billions of dollars.
What is behind the administration's reassessment is the serious issue of Soviet compliance. We should all, of course, closely watch Soviet compliance activities. According to the administration’s own assessment, however, Soviet noncompliance has not had any serious military significance.

But just look at the serious military significance of a Soviet Union free to no longer adhere to SALT. The Soviets could: Deploy any quantity of mobile missiles versus the current limit of one; quickly add 8,000 new nuclear weapons; and replace over 500 single warheads with multiple warheads.

Abandoning the SALT regime would heat up the arms race and give unprecedented opportunities to the Soviets to substantially increase their nuclear threat against the United States. U.S. abandonment of SALT would amount to granting the Soviets a free hunting license to deploy thousands of new and dangerous weapons against the United States.

We would be in the ironical position of abandoning an arms control regime that has militarily limited the Soviets and replacing it with the threat of new Soviet weapons that would be militarily significant and detrimental to U.S. security. The theoretical window of vulnerability would be replaced by the cold wide open winds of Siberia.

To better understand the implications of abandoning SALT, the Subcommittee on Arms Control has received a number of independent analyses which demonstrate that:

Drydocking U.S. submarines would constitute a clear violation of the Treaty.

Abandonment of SALT would allow the Soviets the freedom to substantially increase the number of warheads on existing missiles and allow them to accelerate their deployment of thousands of additional nuclear weapons; and Support for a continuation of the no-undercut policy is widespread among our NATO allies.

The implications of abandoning the SALT arms control regime are real and serious. Every effort should be made by both superpowers to avoid such a development now and in the future. U.S. concerns over Soviet compliance with arms control agreements can and must be presented to the Standing Consultative Commission. That procedure worked in the 1970’s and should be emulated in the 1980’s.

Abandoning the SALT II Treaty is not, in any way, shape, or form, the answer to our problems with the Soviets. We should bear this in mind, now and later this year, as the next direct impact on the treaty occurs: when the number of U.S. bombers equipped with cruise missiles bump up against the number allowed in the treaty.

The letter, signed by 222 House members urging the President to continue U.S. adherence to the SALT II Treaty, follows:

**House of Representatives, Washington, DC, April 19, 1986**

**The President, The White House, Washington, DC.**

Dear Mr. President: We urge you to continue your five-year policy of not undertaking existing SALT offensive arms limitations as long as the Soviet Union similarly remains.

Last year you wisely concluded that continuation of that arms control policy served and enhanced U.S. security interests. Development of thousands of new and dangerous weapons against the United States. U.S. abandonment of SALT would amount to granting the Soviets a free hunting license to deploy thousands of new and dangerous weapons against the United States.

We would be in the ironical position of abandoning an arms control regime that has militarily limited the Soviets and replacing it with the threat of new Soviet weapons that would be militarily significant and detrimental to U.S. security. The theoretical window of vulnerability would be replaced by the cold wide open winds of Siberia.

To better understand the implications of abandoning SALT, the Subcommittee on Arms Control has received a number of independent analyses which demonstrate that:

Drydocking U.S. submarines would constitute a clear violation of the Treaty.

Abandonment of SALT would allow the Soviets the freedom to substantially increase the number of warheads on existing missiles and allow them to accelerate their deployment of thousands of additional nuclear weapons; and Support for a continuation of the no-undercut policy is widespread among our NATO allies.

The implications of abandoning the SALT arms control regime are real and serious. Every effort should be made by both superpowers to avoid such a development now and in the future. U.S. concerns over Soviet compliance with arms control agreements can and must be presented to the Standing Consultative Commission. That procedure worked in the 1970’s and should be emulated in the 1980’s.

Abandoning the SALT II Treaty is not, in any way, shape, or form, the answer to our problems with the Soviets. We should bear this in mind, now and later this year, as the next direct impact on the treaty occurs: when the number of U.S. bombers equipped with cruise missiles bump up against the number allowed in the treaty.

The letter, signed by 222 House members urging the President to continue U.S. adherence to the SALT II Treaty, follows:

**House of Representatives, Washington, DC, April 19, 1986**

**The President, The White House, Washington, DC.**

Dear Mr. President: We urge you to continue your five-year policy of not undertaking existing SALT offensive arms limitations as long as the Soviet Union similarly remains.

Last year you wisely concluded that continuation of that arms control policy served and enhanced U.S. security interests. Development of thousands of new and dangerous weapons against the United States. U.S. abandonment of SALT would amount to granting the Soviets a free hunting license to deploy thousands of new and dangerous weapons against the United States.

We would be in the ironical position of abandoning an arms control regime that has militarily limited the Soviets and replacing it with the threat of new Soviet weapons that would be militarily significant and detrimental to U.S. security. The theoretical window of vulnerability would be replaced by the cold wide open winds of Siberia.

To better understand the implications of abandoning SALT, the Subcommittee on Arms Control has received a number of independent analyses which demonstrate that:

Drydocking U.S. submarines would constitute a clear violation of the Treaty.

Abandonment of SALT would allow the Soviets the freedom to substantially increase the number of warheads on existing missiles and allow them to accelerate their deployment of thousands of additional nuclear weapons; and Support for a continuation of the no-undercut policy is widespread among our NATO allies.

The implications of abandoning the SALT arms control regime are real and serious. Every effort should be made by both superpowers to avoid such a development now and in the future. U.S. concerns over Soviet compliance with arms control agreements can and must be presented to the Standing Consultative Commission. That procedure worked in the 1970’s and should be emulated in the 1980’s.

Abandoning the SALT II Treaty is not, in any way, shape, or form, the answer to our problems with the Soviets. We should bear this in mind, now and later this year, as the next direct impact on the treaty occurs: when the number of U.S. bombers equipped with cruise missiles bump up against the number allowed in the treaty.

The letter, signed by 222 House members urging the President to continue U.S. adherence to the SALT II Treaty, follows:

**House of Representatives, Washington, DC, April 19, 1986**

**The President, The White House, Washington, DC.**

Dear Mr. President: We urge you to continue your five-year policy of not undertaking existing SALT offensive arms limitations as long as the Soviet Union similarly remains.

Last year you wisely concluded that continuation of that arms control policy served and enhanced U.S. security interests. Development of thousands of new and dangerous weapons against the United States. U.S. abandonment of SALT would amount to granting the Soviets a free hunting license to deploy thousands of new and dangerous weapons against the United States.

We would be in the ironical position of abandoning an arms control regime that has militarily limited the Soviets and replacing it with the threat of new Soviet weapons that would be militarily significant and detrimental to U.S. security. The theoretical window of vulnerability would be replaced by the cold wide open winds of Siberia.

To better understand the implications of abandoning SALT, the Subcommittee on Arms Control has received a number of independent analyses which demonstrate that:

Drydocking U.S. submarines would constitute a clear violation of the Treaty.

Abandonment of SALT would allow the Soviets the freedom to substantially increase the number of warheads on existing missiles and allow them to accelerate their deployment of thousands of additional nuclear weapons; and Support for a continuation of the no-undercut policy is widespread among our NATO allies.

The implications of abandoning the SALT arms control regime are real and serious. Every effort should be made by both superpowers to avoid such a development now and in the future. U.S. concerns over Soviet compliance with arms control agreements can and must be presented to the Standing Consultative Commission. That procedure worked in the 1970’s and should be emulated in the 1980’s.

Abandoning the SALT II Treaty is not, in any way, shape, or form, the answer to our problems with the Soviets. We should bear this in mind, now and later this year, as the next direct impact on the treaty occurs: when the number of U.S. bombers equipped with cruise missiles bump up against the number allowed in the treaty.

The letter, signed by 222 House members urging the President to continue U.S. adherence to the SALT II Treaty, follows:

**House of Representatives, Washington, DC, April 19, 1986**

**The President, The White House, Washington, DC.**

Dear Mr. President: We urge you to continue your five-year policy of not undertaking existing SALT offensive arms limitations as long as the Soviet Union similarly remains.

Last year you wisely concluded that continuation of that arms control policy served and enhanced U.S. security interests. Development of thousands of new and dangerous weapons against the United States. U.S. abandonment of SALT would amount to granting the Soviets a free hunting license to deploy thousands of new and dangerous weapons against the United States.

We would be in the ironical position of abandoning an arms control regime that has militarily limited the Soviets and replacing it with the threat of new Soviet weapons that would be militarily significant and detrimental to U.S. security. The theoretical window of vulnerability would be replaced by the cold wide open winds of Siberia.

To better understand the implications of abandoning SALT, the Subcommittee on Arms Control has received a number of independent analyses which demonstrate that:

Drydocking U.S. submarines would constitute a clear violation of the Treaty.

Abandonment of SALT would allow the Soviets the freedom to substantially increase the number of warheads on existing missiles and allow them to accelerate their deployment of thousands of additional nuclear weapons; and Support for a continuation of the no-undercut policy is widespread among our NATO allies.

The implications of abandoning the SALT arms control regime are real and serious. Every effort should be made by both superpowers to avoid such a development now and in the future. U.S. concerns over Soviet compliance with arms control agreements can and must be presented to the Standing Consultative Commission. That procedure worked in the 1970’s and should be emulated in the 1980’s.

Abandoning the SALT II Treaty is not, in any way, shape, or form, the answer to our problems with the Soviets. We should bear this in mind, now and later this year, as the next direct impact on the treaty occurs: when the number of U.S. bombers equipped with cruise missiles bump up against the number allowed in the treaty.

The letter, signed by 222 House members urging the President to continue U.S. adherence to the SALT II Treaty, follows:
Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, these days new ideas to battle terrorism may not seem as radical as they might have a few years ago. Let me, therefore, suggest to this House that we urge the administration to convene an international meeting to renegotiate the Vienna Convention and the tenets of diplomatic immunity.

Much has changed since Metternich's days. Nations such as Libya have no interest in following the niceties of diplomatic agreements. Their embassies are armories and their diplomatic pouches carry more guns than correspondence of state.

I attach for my colleagues' review an article by James Reston in the New York Times. Mr. Reston is correct. Maybe we need to reappropriate the diplomatic rules of the Congress of Vienna.

Reflection on Terror

(William J. Porker, III, New York)

WASHINGTON—Something useful may come out of the recent acts of terror in the world after all. For they are forcing officials to recognize that many of the rules and customs, privileges and immunities of old-time diplomacy are now seriously out of date.

How United States embassies abroad are built and staffed, for example, illustrates the point. Most of them were built for show and not for security. Many of them are overstuffed and headed by overstaffed political appointees who know little about the history, culture, or languages of the nations they are supposed to understand.

Gerry Sikorski of Minnesota, Lawrence Smith of Florida, Olympia Snowe of Maine, John M. Spratt, Jr. of South Carolina, Portney (Petie) Stark of California, and Jerry Nadler of New York, are all of the Congress to secure the embassies, but even if he makes it, he'll still have some other problems.

For in the terror zones of world affairs, even if embassies and ambassadors are made more secure, the foreign service officers and their families who live and work there are at risk.
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Howard Wolfe of Michigan.
Ron Wyden of Oregon.
Gus Yarrow of Texas.
Martin Olva Sabo of Minnesota.
Gus Savage of Illinois.
Claudine Schneider of Rhode Island.
Charles E. Schumer of New York.
Phil Sharp of Indiana.
Jim Slattery of Kansas.
Neal Smith of Iowa.
Stephen R. Solarz of New York.
Harley O. Staggers, Jr. of West Virginia.
Louis Stokes of Ohio.
Al Swift of Washington.
Rob Stringer of New York.
Robert G. Torricelli of New Jersey.
Morris K. Udall of Arizona.
Bruce F. Vento of Minnesota.
Doug Walgren of Pennsylvania.
James Weaver of Oregon.
Alan Wheat of Missouri.
Pat Williams of Montana.
Robert E. Wise, Jr. of West Virginia.
Jim Wright of Texas.
Sidney R. Yates of Illinois.

Things have calmed down a bit in recent days, but for minor embassy officials, living in insecure houses and getting their children safe to school and back again is a constant worry.

It's a special problem for the wives of foreign service officers living in these diplomatic war zones. They rebel long ago against being the unpaid servants of their Government and their husbands.

But this generation of United States diplomatic rules is better educated and less subservient than any before. They have professions of their own, and wonder why they have to be the unpaid servants, and follow their guys, even if they love them, into capitals where they can't practice their professions, or even be sure about the education and security of their kids.

No doubt George Shultz has thought about this, and if he hasn't you can be sure his wife will remind him.

In all embassies, including foreign embassies in the United States, many of the rules go back to the Congress of Vienna in 1815 and before. Then, as now, embassies were regarded as part of national soil a private preserve for communication between ambassadors and their governments at home, protected by "diplomatic immunity" for the conduct of the legitimate and necessary business of composing the inevitable differences between nations.

But that's not the way it has been working lately. The principle of "diplomatic immunity," for example, has been used by some outlaw nations to protect people who commit crimes of violence—as when the Libyan police were fired upon from the Libyan Embassy, and the culprits were given safe passage home.

Day by day, official messengers travel from one capital to another, with their diplomatic pouches at their feet, guaranteed freedom from inspection by customs officers when they arrive. But these days the pouches from some countries may contain, not proposals for peace but plans and even instruments of terror.

Under the old rules, still in existence, the Soviet Union, for example, or Libya, or Syria, could send as many as diplomats as they liked to foreign capitals or to the United Nations, calling them "journalists" or cultural attachés or professors. And often with many of them nothing more than cops, checking on one another, or spies.

In fairness, it has to be said that the United States and the other Western nations have been playing the same game, though not to the same extent, but still corrupting the diplomatic process through the C.I.A. with fake "diplomatic pouches" and wandering "professors".

Some things are being done about all this but not to great effect. The U.S. is trying to kick out some of the Soviet cops from the United Nations, and every day or so the British or French or Spaniards expel some Libyan or Syrian diplomatic thugs, but that doesn't really deal with the problem.

It was a British Ambassador, Sir Henry Wotton, who expressed as a scribbled joke that "an honest man who is sent abroad to lie for his country," his sovereign, James I fired him for his indiscretion.

But in some parts of the world, an ambassador is sent abroad to murder for his country, and when he is found out, is merely expelled and then honored as a hero when he gets home.

What can be done about all this is hard to tell. There has to be privacy and some kind
of immunity for civilized embassies and their servants, but not immunity for murder or parking their cars in the middle of the streets.

Maybe we need to reapply the diplomatic rules of the Congress of Vienna: 1815 was a long time ago, but the world is full of experienced and retired diplomats who might like to go back to Vienna and try to bring them up to date.

WASHINGTON TIMES DEBUNKS "KILLER BEE" THEORY

HON. JIM COURTEN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. COURTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is truly mind-boggling to witness the lengths to which the arms controllers will go in order to exonerate the Soviet Union of chemical weapons use charges. As the following editorial from the Washington Times illustrates so clearly, administration charges of yellow rain use, already painstakingly documented, continue to be subjected to withering attacks from the scientific community.

There appears to be no appreciation of the credibility of existing open source evidence, let alone the likelihood that that classified data just might be available to buttress the administration's charges. At the very least, it should be understood that the yellow rain charges passed through a veritable gauntlet of State Department, ACDA, and CIA lawyers and scientists before being released.

The Soviets have been caught yellow handed, which would not be the first time. We would be well advised to appreciate the implications of this Soviet activity, and take the appropriate action. My colleagues are urged to pay careful attention to the following editorial:

NONE OF YOUR BEESWAX!

Let's see. We've got testimony of the victims, who ought to know the difference between the effects of bee excrement and a modern version of mustard gas. We've got the testimony of the communist defectors who say that, sure enough, "yellow rain" has been employed against tribesmen in Southeast Asia and Afghanistan. And we've got the leading European expert on chemical warfare, who has examined the evidence for "yellow rain" and found it convincing.

What we also have, if the latest "scientific" discoveries of The Washington Post are any guide, is what William James called "the will to disbelieve"—the tendency of some to reject any charge, such as the one made repeatedly by the Reagan administration, that the Soviets would stoop to such heinous practices. What? Destroy the hope that civilized people can get along with the Evil Empire?

According to The Post, which coaxed the information out of the British and Canadian governments, the Canadians carried out the only large-scale sampling of blood of a variety of people near the war zone in Laos and Kampuchea, and found that about 2 percent of the people tested had the toxins—called tricothecenes—in their blood. But they were not believed to be victims of any chemical attacks. Rather, they were probably poisoned by fungus-infested food.

The British, in studies published in the prestigious journal Nature, "revealed that hundreds of samples taken from 35 separate alleged attack sites showed that there was none of the supposed "yellow rain" chemical agent present." The Post says the administration's case is thereby "rebutted."

In fact, rebuttal is scarcely the term. The Canadians may have concocted "the only large-scale sampling," but here is a case where the size of the sample is irrelevant. The Canadian study, done in 1984, simply neglected the work done since 1981 by Aubin Heyndrickx, head of the toxicology department at Belgium's University of Ghent.

Professor Heyndrickx examined more than 30 samples brought to him by Thai students and gathered on his own visits to attack sites in Southeast Asia. There is no question," he concluded, "that people have been attacked by a poison that is very toxic and can come only from human, and not natural, sources."

Nowhere does The Post, great scientific journal that it is, mention the Heyndrickx findings—an omission that opens the way for one of the most interesting pathological studies yet to be done of our confused era: why some journalists will disbelieve any evidence about "yellow rain," while swallowing the filmiest assertions about "acid rain."

SALUTE TO RALPH B. PENNYPACKER

HON. GUS YATRON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 6, 1986, Reading, PA, City Fire Marshal Ralph B. Pennypacker will be honored with a retirement dinner by the Reading City Fire Department. Fire Marshal Pennypacker, affectionately known to all as "Penny," will be honored for his 42 years of firefighting—20 of those years spent as Reading City fire marshal.

Penny has had a long and distinguished career in fire fighting and he is a widely respected figure in the field. Penny wanted to be a fireman since his boyhood, fulfilling his lifelong dream in 1944 when he joined the Reading Volunteer Fire Department as a member of Reading Hose No. 1. In recognition of his leadership potential, Penny was appointed foreman of Reading Hose in 1947 and held that position until transferring to the Junior Fire Company in 1953.

He remained at the Junior Fire Co. for a number of years. At that time, like now, firefighting was characterized by a spirit of camaraderie. Full of this spirit, Penny was well-known and popular among fire companies throughout the area. He was also respected for his bravery, nearly losing his life at one point during a fire in 1955. In 1962, Penny entered into service with the city of Reading where his leadership skills were soon noticed. His many years of dedicated service were recognized when he was appointed acting fire marshal in December 1966. On February 7, 1967, Penny was formally appointed fire marshal, a position he held until this year.

Fire Marshal Pennypacker's tenure was a productive one and he has seen a number of changes in the fire marshal's duties since he assumed the post. The biggest change has been the fire marshal's assumption of an important role in arson investigations. This practice was begun in 1981, and since assuming these duties, Fire Marshal Pennypacker's arson team has been phenomenally successful, investigating over 300 fires with a clearance rate of over 60 percent. The team's greatest triumph was the successful investigation and conviction of an arsonist in the Central YMCA fire case in 1985.

In addition to his service to the city of Reading, Penny has been prominent in a number of firemen's organizations. He is a past director of the Keystone Fire Chief's Association, has served as secretary of the Berks County Fire Chief's Association for 25 years, and has also served as vice president of the Berks County Fireman's Association and as president of the fireman's union. He is also a proud member of the "Over-the-Hill Club" of the Pennsylvania Firemen's Association. His other affiliations include membership in the International Association of Arson Investigators, the Pennsylvania Arson Investigators Association, the Fire Marshals Association of North America as well as numerous fire companies in our surrounding area. In short, Penny's life has been dedicated to fire prevention and protection of his fellow citizens from this threat.

Like many citizens in the Reading area, I am sorry that we are losing the services of a dedicated public servant such as Penny. In his many years of firefighting, Penny's work has been characterized by effectiveness and professionalism. He will be sorely missed. I know that my colleagues will want to join me in honoring Fire Marshal Ralph B. Pennypacker for his 42 years of service and commitment to firefighting. I commend him and I wish Penny and his family continued success and good fortune in the years to come.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO PRESERVE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to be present on the floor on May 21 to take part in the discussion on the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare headed by Mr. James Roosevelt. Unfortunately, a meeting prevented me from being present but I would like to insert these remarks concerning this debate.

First, I want to note it has been an honor and a pleasure for me to know Mr. Roosevelt for several years. By every measure of his life and his ideals, he qualifies as a great American. I have the utmost respect for him.

Second, like many of the individuals who spoke on May 21, many of my constituents also mention the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare. They tell me how appreciative they are of the work the committee is doing. They tell me how good they feel about being informed and being able to express informed opinions to their Representative. They tell me they are proud and honored to be part of this effort.
Third, in reviewing some of the mailings and publications of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, I have found their articles to be informative and understanding. Older citizens in my area are very worried about these programs, they depend on them, and it is vital to their health and life style that they continue. As much as I and other Members of Congress strive to keep our constituents informed, publications such as these are extremely helpful in letting people know the situation, and communicating with their Congress.

We face a significant continuing debate with Social Security and Medicare. While both systems are presently sound, the need for review and improvements is constant. I believe Mr. Roosevelt's organization has done an excellent job of highlighting these issues.

I insert these remarks in praise of Mr. Roosevelt and the job he has done. As the eldest son of President Franklin Roosevelt, I am sure he feels a special concern for programs that help the elderly and for Social Security, because of his father's role in opening these opportunities to a better life for millions of Americans. James Roosevelt is following in his father's tradition, and I believe this organization should be commended for its high degree of expertise and professionalism which it has brought to the senior citizens debate.

THE COSTA MESA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE MAN AND WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two very special people in my district, Pat and Lou Dinger of Costa Mesa, CA, who are being honored June 10, 1986, as the Costa Mesa Chamber of Commerce Man and Woman of the Year. These are truly outstanding citizens in every respect and it is my privilege to count them among my longtime friends in the community.

Between them, Pat and Lou have done as much or more to benefit their community and those around them than perhaps any other couple in the area. Elderly Costa Mesans confined to the area's convalescent homes and young people with emotional problems have one very good friend in common—Pat Dinger. She is perhaps the best-known and best-loved Costa Mesan to the residents of the convalescent homes because of her warm and caring visitations 40 or more times each year as head of a special program of the Woman's Fellowship of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church. These are not simple visits, but are full-scale birthday parties and holiday celebrations requiring many hours of preparation and planning.

Young people represent another segment of the community who benefit from Pat's love and attention. For nearly two decades, she has been active in support of the Child Guidance Center of Orange County, serving for the past 3 years as director of a thrift shop operation producing funds to support the center.
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Lou Dinger, coowner of Mesa Center Automotive, has been a businessman in the city for more than 36 years. I have known him since my sons were involved in Cub Scouts some years ago and Scouts in Orange County have known him for many years as a scoutmaster and district and council leader.

Lou is past president of the Rotary Club of Costa Mesa and has been a member for 22 years, involved in service projects to benefit youth, older adults, schools and hospitals. For the last 10 years, he has been active in projects to provide food, clothing and hospital supplies for the Casa de Todas Children's Clinic in Tijuana, Mexico. He has given his time to Share Our Selves (SOS), the YMCA, the United Fund, the Child Guidance Center of Orange County and the Mesa Verde Figure Skating Club. He also has been an adviser to our local college, active in his church and is past president and director of the Automotive Service Council of California.

This is the first time the Costa Mesa Chamber has chosen a husband and wife in the same year to receive this most prestigious honor for distinguished volunteer service. In selecting Pat and Lou Dinger, the chamber could not have chosen a better team of leading citizens and community benefactors.

TRIBUTE TO THE NATIONAL MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS SOCIETY ON ITS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to pause in its deliberations today to pay tribute to the National Multiple Sclerosis Society in recognition of its 40th anniversary.

In 1946, this Nation was in transition between a wartime and peacetime economy. Abroad, the Nuremberg War Crime Trials were well under way, and Emperor Hirohito signed Japan's new constitution. At home, Jackie Robinson began his first year with the Brooklyn Dodgers. "Oklahoma" was the hit of the season on Broadway.

It was also this year, 40 years ago, that the National Multiple Sclerosis Society became officially chartered. It had been nearly a year since Sylvia Lawry, the society's founder, had placed her May 1 ad in the New York Times classified section, asking: "Multiple Sclerosis: Will anyone recovered from it, please communicate with patient?" Her brother, Bernard, had just been diagnosed and was suffering more each day.

About 50 people responded. But not one knew of anyone who had recovered. Each wanted to be among the first to know when a cure was found. They met and agreed to raise funds for research to find a cure. To do this, they would need an organization. They decided to name it the Association for the Advancement of Research in Multiple Sclerosis.

In 1 year's time, however, they came to realize that the needs of people who have multiple sclerosis must also be served, and they broadened the purposes of the fledgling organization accordingly.

In 1947, this ambitious organization was renamed the National Multiple Sclerosis Society. By the end of 1947, it had awarded its first research grant, enrolled 750 members, reached its first $100,000 funding goal, and chartered two chapters.

In 1950, the American Medical Association gave its official sanction to the society and the first two multiple sclerosis clinics were opened in Albany, NY, and Boston, MA. Chapters were chartered in Michigan, New Jersey, and Ohio, and the national society was on its way.

At that time, Federal funding for multiple sclerosis research was almost nonexistent; the Government had spent only about $14,000. Through the efforts of its founder, Sylvia Lawry, and Senator Charles Tobey of New Hampshire, whose daughter had multiple sclerosis, the society was able to prevail upon Congress to adopt legislation establishing what is now the National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke. It was signed into law by President Truman on August 15, 1950. The first appropriation to NINCDS in fiscal year 1951 was $302,400. Today, because of the effects launched 40 years ago by dedicated men and women to bring attention to the growing needs for biomedical research, we annually appropriate millions of dollars for multiple sclerosis and other neurological research.

Meanwhile, the National Multiple Sclerosis Society's own expenditures on research have grown to more than $5.4 million in 1985, bringing its accumulative expenditures for multiple sclerosis research since 1946 to more than $95.7 million. The number of chapters and branches has grown to 140, and the number of multiple sclerosis clinics in the United States which they now help to support stands at 82. Membership in the society has grown to 485,000.

The National Multiple Sclerosis Society has come a long way since that day in 1945 when Sylvia Lawry placed her ad in the New York Times. And while a cure for this disease remains elusive, today's researchers now know more about the pathology of multiple sclerosis than ever before.

Biomedical research will give us the knowledge needed to prevent, treat, and cure this disabling disease which affects the brain, spinal cord, and optic nerves and compromises the quality of life of young adults who are diagnosed with multiple sclerosis.

Approximately 75.3 percent of the monies collected by the society are spent directly on biomedical research, patient services, and public education programs. This is one of the best accountability records of any major charity, according to a recent analysis undertaken by the Council of Better Business Bureaus and the National Charities Information Bureau. It is a record of which the society should be proud, and a record on which its members deserve our congratulations.

The National Multiple Sclerosis Society at 40 is "Incurably Optimistic" that it will succeed in its mission of finding the cause and cure for the disease known as the real cripple of young adults. Based on its record of accomplishment, and our annual research commitments, we in Congress, are, too.
HUNGER AMONG PLENTY

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, recently President Reagan stated that hunger in the United States is caused by lack of knowledge about where to obtain help. He added "I don't believe there is anyone going hungry in America since the loss of a job or lack of money to feed them." Apparently what prompted the President to respond in this manner was a new report issued by the Physicians Task Force on Hunger which reported that participation in the Food Stamp Program has declined while hunger and poverty have intensified.

I find myself in partial agreement with the President in his assertion. Yes, hunger exists in the United States, and we do not have hunger because we lack the ability to feed these people. Farmers in the United States are among the most efficient in the world—and we have the capability to produce enough food to feed hungry people. In fact, we have a tremendous backlog of surplus commodities today. As of April 1, 1986, the Federal Government had on hand in uncommitted inventories 134 million pounds of soybeans, over 200 million pounds of butter, almost 1 billion pounds of nonfat dry milk, and over 600 million pounds of cheese.

But this is a report that was done by individuals at the Department of Political Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology looking into the commodity distribution programs in the United States. The title of the article, "Food in the Warehouses, Hunger in the Streets," so aptly points out the tremendous irony. Farm support programs require that the Commodity Credit Corporation buy commodities from farmers if the market price falls below a certain level. We then spend substantial sums of money to store these commodities, while at the same time we have hungry people in the streets throughout America.

The good news in the President's recent comments is that he is finally agreeing that there indeed is hunger in America. In the past, he has flat out denied the existence of hunger and claimed that the incidences of hunger were merely anecdotal. The President has come full circle on this issue. At least now, he admits that there is a problem.

But the answer is not to stand up and proclaim that there is hunger and then blame the victim. The fact of the matter is that when the Federal Government reduces its commitment to deal with hunger as a national problem, people go hungry. According to the report released by the Physicians Task Force, the decline in food stamps coverage occurred because of eligibility restrictions imposed by the administration and Congress in 1981 and 1982, because many do not know that they are eligible, and because of a lack of coordinated Government efforts to inform the poor about benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the answer lies in increasing the Food Stamp Program. The answer is in releasing the surplus cheese that we have in overflowing Kansas caves, the surplus flour, and other non-perishable items. The Food Stamp Program is the answer. 
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June 3, 1986

LATIN AMERICANS AGAIN CALL FOR END TO CONTRA AID

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues the text of a communiqué that was issued in San José, Costa Rica, by the eight countries that comprise the Contadora Group. The communiqué was issued on May 8 on the occasion of the inauguration of Costa Rica's new President, Oscar Arias Sanchez.

I would call my colleagues' attention in particular to point 4, which refers very clearly—albeit in diplomatic language—to the United States and to the necessity of terminating Contra aid. This paragraph reads as follows:

At the same time, the countries with ties and interests in the region must provide adequate guarantees that the coming into effect and implementation of Contadora's Act will not be frustrated. In this regard, the Contadora Group and Group of Support urge the cessation of the aid being provided to the irregular forces operating in the region, and make an appeal to one of these countries with ties and interest in the region to go beyond the encouraging signs it has given in this regard on the present occasion, by converting them into actions.

Mr. Speaker, the administration constantly talks as if the only obstacle to implementation of a Contadora treaty were compliance by Nicaragua. But from this communiqué, it could not be more clear that the eight countries that are trying to make an agreement happen think that the most serious obstacle to "the coming into effect and implementation" of a treaty is continued support for the Contras.

I again urge my colleagues to listen to our friends in the region as we consider what U.S. actions would be most constructive. They tell us that the contras are an obstacle to peace, not an instrument of peace. I hope we will act accordingly when we next have the opportunity to vote on this issue.

The text of the communiqué follows:

EMBASSY OF MEXICO

Text of the Communique issued in San José, Costa Rica, on May 8, 1986, by the Heads of State and Heads of Diplomatic Missions of the member countries of the Contadora Group and the Group of Support.

[Unofficial Translation]

The Presidents and Heads of Special Missions of the Heads of State and Heads of Diplomatic Missions of the member countries of the Contadora Group and the Group of Support, meeting on May 8, 1986, in the city of San José, on the occasion of the transition of presidential power in Costa Rica, expressed their congratulations to Rican people for this new act of civic reaffirmation which strengthens the process of democratization in Latin America. They also expressed their best wishes for the success of the mandate of President Oscar Arias Sánchez.

The Presidents and the Heads of Special Missions referred to the current endeavors for the conclusion of Central American dialogues and made the following statements in this regard.

1. It is indispensable to show that Latin America is able to solve its own problems. Latin America's hope for unity resides on its proving this ability.

2. It is a must to conclude the signing of Contadora's Act for Peace and Cooperation as soon as possible, and for this Act to contain all the elements that would ensure the peaceful solution of the Central American conflict.

3. It is essential to count on the political will of the five Central American States to conclude the peace negotiations and to ratify the text of Contadora's Act, to have the Act signed and ratified, and to ensure strict compliance with the terms of this document. To this end, it is essential that the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of these countries in the region be fully observed.

4. At the same time, the countries with ties and interests in the region must provide adequate guarantees that the coming into effect and implementation of Contadora's Act will not be frustrated. In this regard, the Contadora Group and Group of Support urge the cessation of the aid being provided to the irregular forces operating in the region, and make an appeal to one of these countries with ties and interest in the region to go beyond the encouraging signs it has given in this regard on the present occasion, by converting them into actions.

5. The Contadora Group and the Group of Support reiterated their call of a meeting of plenipotentiaries previously summoned by the Contadora Group for May 16 to 18, in the city of Panama, in order to conclude by June 6, 1986, the negotiation of the last two pending issues in the Act, and to formalize the process.

6. They agree to adopt and promote specific measures of social and economic cooperation that will contribute to lessen and off-set the effects of the crisis, and to strengthen the democratic self-determination of the countries in the region.

7. They reiterate their hope that the meeting of the five Central American leaders, to be held this current month of May in Esquipulas, Nicaragua, will contribute to peace and to overcome the crisis in the region through the use of dialogue as the effective instrument for attaining understanding and consolidation in the region.

To conclude, the Presidents and Heads of Special Missions of Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela express their determination to continue their activity in order to contribute to the achievement of peace in the region, to create the necessary climate of trust, and to participate in all efforts which may facilitate the observance of the commitments to be made by the five Central American countries.
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EVO ANTON DeCONCINI
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, only a few people in each generation leave their mark and really make a difference. We lost such a man in Arizona recently—Eva Anton DeConcini. There have been few like him.

Evo DeConcini was never satisfied doing just one thing. As a young man, he became a skilled real estate developer. He earned a law degree at the University of Arizona and went on to serve as attorney general, as a superior court judge and a State supreme court justice.

Beyond that, he was a devoted father who loved his family, his church and the law. He was a man who was not only a model to his children, but an inspiration to countless others. He was a man for all seasons, proud of his heritage, caring for his community, compassionate to those less fortunate, a man who believed that doing good meant doing your best.

Evo DeConcini was among that handful of devoted men and women who helped guide Tucson and Arizona from the fringes of an old west to the new, thriving and more cosmopolitan—and more complex—era.

I was proud to call Evo DeConcini my friend. My sympathy goes to his wife, Ora, who is a remarkable person in her own right, and to all the DeConcini children and grandchildren, in this time of loss.

Carla McClain, a staff writer for the Tucson Citizen, summed up Evo DeConcini’s career in a front page obituary, published May 20, 1986. I am asking that it be reprinted here in tribute to this good man.

(By Carla McClain)

Evo Anton DeConcini, the partilarch of one of Arizona’s most influential families and a mover and shaker of Tucson throughout much of the century, died early this morning of heart failure at age 85.

Mr. DeConcini died in St. Joseph’s Hospital. He had been ill for about a month and was admitted to the hospital about two weeks ago after suffering a mild heart attack, family and hospital spokesmen said.

“My father will be missed by many,” one of his four children, U.S. Sen. Dennis DeConcini, D-Ariz., said just hours after his father’s death. “He had a close, loving relationship with his children and was a wonderful role model for all of us. We encouraged us to reach out, to stretch ourselves when pursuing our goals.

“His inspiration will remain with me always.”

It was 65 years ago that young Evo moved to tiny Tucson from the even smaller rural village of Iron Mountain, Mich. He was 20 when he came here with his parents to help them run what was then known as the American Hotel downtown in this dusty outpost of the Southwest.

Mr. DeConcini earned a law degree 10 years later at the small land grant school known as the University of Arizona. That launched him into the spotlight of power and into several years as Arizona’s next half-century—as attorney, real estate developer, leading politician, county judge, state Supreme Court justice, state attorney general, civic activist and family patriarch.

Mr. DeConcini always called “the judge” by his friends and family, and despite his age kept an active eye on his real estate holdings and an active hand in his charitable work through most of this past year.

He was fond of saying how surprised he was at Tucson’s growth from what he called “a one-street-car town” to “a big city” of more than a half-million people—even though Mr. DeConcini himself played one of the major roles in that boom.

“He said Tucson lawyers, including himself, always admired ‘the judge’ because ‘he had one of the finest legal minds in the community. He was an inspiration to all of us.’”

Eaved with his UA law degree, Mr. DeConcini started out in the 1920s as an attorney and real estate developer.

Watching the city grow, he commented two years ago, “The growth of Tucson has meant so much to Arizona and it means so much to the people who come here because it’s a nice place to live. They want to stay here.

“You make room for people and there is nothing wrong with that.”

Mr. DeConcini’s public service career began in the 1930s, when he served as a regent for the state’s universitites.

That began a string of high political and public positions in the state, including judge of the Pima County Superior Court during the 1940s and Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court in the early 1950s.

A leader in Democratic politics, Mr. DeConcini was elected state attorney general in 1946 after serving as assistant attorney general seven years earlier. He later chaired both the county and state Democratic committees.

Mr. DeConcini married the daughter of one of Arizona’s pioneer families, Ora L. Webster, who also became active in Democratic politics, in 1932. They had four children—Dennis of Tucson and Washington, Dino, who practices law in Phoenix, David, the only son who did not enter politics but became a prominent Tucson developer and Danielle of South Dakota. All survive Mr. DeConcini, as do 12 grandchildren.

In addition to his political and legal careers, Mr. DeConcini served as chairman of his civic and charitable work in Tucson. His longtime service included the presidencies of the Tucson Community Chest, United Appeal, the Tucson Fund, and funeral director and board member for St. Mary’s and St. Joseph’s hospitals.

Mr. DeConcini was honored by the Italian government with its Star of Solidarity. The U.S. honored him with its medalion of merit, as did the UA Alumni Association.

Funeral services are pending.

CONGRESSMAN ROSTENKOWSKI REPORTS ON QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the results of a survey I conducted recently among the residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Illinois. The questionnaire covered both domestic and foreign policy issues. I have summarized and commented on the results below.

CONGRESSIONAL PRIORITIES

Please assign a numerical ranking to the following issues in terms of the urgency with which Congress should act:

1. Unemployment
2. Poverty
3. High interest rates
4. Federal budget deficit
5. International terrorism
6. Arms control
7. U.S. involvement in Central America
8. Immigration
9. U.S. trade deficit

It is interesting to note that of the four top concerns, all are domestic and three, strictly speaking, are economic. I hope that my constituents will see that the recent actions in the House on the budget and trade reform are timely and effective responses to their concerns.

FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIT

The Federal Budget deficit, now totaling over $2 trillion, is the largest in history. On December 12, 1985, President Reagan signed into law the “Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Deficit Reduction Act”, which requires that the deficit be eliminated by 1991, and provides for automatic deep spending cuts in all programs except Social Security and certain benefits for the poor. How would you reduce the Federal deficit? (Please check a combination.)

(a) Cut spending across the board
(b) Cut spending for domestic programs
(c) Cut spending for Social Security
(d) Cut spending for national defense
(e) Cut spending for foreign aid
(f) Raise taxes

As noted above, the people of the Eighth Congressional District are very much concerned with the Federal deficit. The results of the poll show a clear preference for cutting spending before raising taxes. In particular, cuts in defense spending and foreign assistance are heavily favored. I support a balanced approach to budget cuts with both defense and domestic spending bearing equal shares of the burden along with provisions for modest revenue increases—as in the House-passed budget resolution.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

Congress will consider proposals to reduce the Social Security and Medicare trust funds from the “unified budget.” That is Congress will forbid the loan of excess trust funds to other Government programs. Supporters of
this proposal believe it will ensure that benefits to senior citizens are not reduced as Congress works to eliminate the Federal deficit. Opponents believe that Social Security and Medicare should not be treated differently than other social programs. Do you believe that Congress should remove from the "unified budget:" (b) Federal assistance to industries

There is a strong sentiment in the District that Social Security and Medicare should be protected from budget reductions by removing the trust funds from the unified budget. I agree that we must preserve the benefits which Social Security provides to the elderly and disabled of our Nation. Further, we cannot allow Medicare to fall victim to the heavy budget cuts proposed by the administration.

DEFENSE SPENDING

Since announcing the Strategic Defense Initiative, known as "Star Wars," in 1983, President Reagan has argued that the United States must move toward a space-based defensive system to prevent nuclear war. Critics contend that the program will intensify the arms race, is too expensive, and is unworkable. In fiscal year 1985, $14.4 billion was spent on the development of the SDI. Do you think the United States should: (Please check one.)

- (a) Increase funding to accelerate SDI development? 18
- (b) Decrease funding, but go ahead with SDI? 52
- (c) Eliminate funding for SDI? 30

The Strategic Defense Initiative is one of the single largest defense spending programs holding the least promise. Although there was substantial support for SDI research, there was a rejection of the unprecedented levels of funding for a system with unproven and dubious capabilities. I, too, believe that funding for SDI should be reduced to the lowest practicable level.

TRADE DEFICIT

The U.S. trade deficit for 1985 is estimated at $150 billion, that is, the United States imported 150 billion dollars worth of goods more than it exported. The trade deficit has been blamed for the loss of thousands of jobs within the past 5 years. Which of the following do you believe would most effectively resolve the trade deficit problem? (Please check any combination.)

- (a) Protective measures such as increased tariffs and quotas on the products of those countries which pursue unfair trade practices against the United States? 68
- (b) Federal assistance to industries which are particularly hurt by foreign competition, such as the auto and steel industries? 17

- (c) Expanding Federal programs to retain unemployed workers laid off due to foreign competition? 45
- (d) A national campaign to educate Americans about the extent of the trade imbalance and the need to support our industries? 50
- (e) No action by Congress? 8

The response to the questionnaire emphasizes the growing disenchantment of the American people with current U.S. trade policy. An overwhelming number of respondents favored the imposition of quotas against those countries which pursue unfair trade practices against the United States. Most of the concerns expressed have been addressed in H.R. 4800, the Trade and International Economic Policy Reform Act, just passed by the House.

AID TO EL SALVADOR

Congress will again consider U.S. policy with respect to military and economic aid to El Salvador. The elected government of President Duarte reports that it is attempting to curb the human rights abuses of the Salvadoran Army while also fighting the insidious forces of terrorism in the countryside. Incidents of terrorism are increasing, and both sides accuse the other of such acts. What type of assistance should the United States provide the Duarte government? (Please check any combination.)

- (a) Economic aid to rebuild the infrastructure (that is, roads, schools, hospitals, etc.) of El Salvador? 30
- (b) Unrestricted military aid 2
- (c) Military aid tied to the improvement of human rights conditions? 34
- (d) Aid to civilian police forces for counter-terrorism training and equipment? 25
- (e) None? 40

There was no clear consensus among my constituents on aid to El Salvador. Although 40 percent opposed all aid, the remaining 60 percent favored one form or another of assistance. I support nonmilitary assistance to El Salvador designed to help that country rebuild its economic infrastructure and stabilize the political situation. I have long opposed military assistance to El Salvador, as we have substantial reason to believe that it has been misused. For example, organizations to which a number of my constituents belong have provided me with evidence that U.S. funds have been used for the bombing of civilians which, if true, could not be more disturbing. However, recognizing the will of the House to provide President Duarte with some military aid, I have insisted that such aid be conditioned on demonstrable progress in the improvement of human rights. I have also insisted that the Congress maintain close scrutiny of how all our aid, military and economic, is being used in El Salvador. I will continue to work with those members who have authorization and appropriation authority over this important issue, to see to it that our restrictions are being honored.
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Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the "Computer Software Rental Act of 1986" to provide important protection against the commercial exploitation of one of our most important and growing industries—the personal computer software industry.
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The Strategic Defense Initiative is one of the single largest defense spending programs holding the least promise. Although there was substantial support for SDI research, there was a rejection of the unprecedented levels of funding for a system with unproven and dubious capabilities. I, too, believe that funding for SDI should be reduced to the lowest practicable level.
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- (a) Economic aid to rebuild the infrastructure (that is, roads, schools, hospitals, etc.) of El Salvador? 30
- (b) Unrestricted military aid 2
- (c) Military aid tied to the improvement of human rights conditions? 34
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There was no clear consensus among my constituents on aid to El Salvador. Although 40 percent opposed all aid, the remaining 60 percent favored one form or another of assistance. I support nonmilitary assistance to El Salvador designed to help that country rebuild its economic infrastructure and stabilize the political situation. I have long opposed military assistance to El Salvador, as we have substantial reason to believe that it has been misused. For example, organizations to which a number of my constituents belong have provided me with evidence that U.S. funds have been used for the bombing of civilians which, if true, could not be more disturbing. However, recognizing the will of the House to provide President Duarte with some military aid, I have insisted that such aid be conditioned on demonstrable progress in the improvement of human rights. I have also insisted that the Congress maintain close scrutiny of how all our aid, military and economic, is being used in El Salvador. I will continue to work with those members who have authorization and appropriation authority over this important issue, to see to it that our restrictions are being honored.
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Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the "Computer Software Rental Act of 1986" to provide important protection against the commercial exploitation of one of our most important and growing industries—the personal computer software industry.
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Just as the proliferation of personal computers in recent years has brought the advantages of computer technology to millions of users, that technology has also brought us a major copyright problem—the ability of each computer user to make perfect copies of the software necessary to make the computer function. The copyright laws provide in section 117 of the United States Code that the user is entitled to an archival copy of the computer software. However, the law does not authorize the making of copies that allow persons to obtain computer software products for free. The industry thus faces a dilemma: how to allow the customer to have the convenience of a back-up copy, without setting in motion a proliferation of illegal copying that threatens the industry's ability to recover and benefit from its enormous development efforts.

In the past, microcomputer software manufacturers have used encoding techniques, called "copy protection," to attempt to thwart copying. This, however, has created undesirable marketing problems and has spawned a sub-industry in code breakers, or products designed to strip the copy protection from the software. This arms race between those seeking to protect their software and those seeking to remove software protection now appears to be abating as more firms abandon copy protection. The removal of impediments to copying, or going naked, is becoming more common in the software industry. Thus the risk of illegal duplication of software is now greater than ever. Accordingly, the software industry must, to a much greater degree, rely upon the protection afforded by the copyright laws.

The bill I am introducing today does not attempt to deal with the broad question of computer software copying, which entails complicated copyright issues deserving further study. However, I think that we all accept the principle that commercial business interests should not be allowed to reap profits from loopholes in the copyright laws, or to conduct trade in copyrighted works at the expense of copyright owners. One such business is the rental of personal computer software. Proprietors of these businesses reap huge profits such as Lotus 1-2-3, D-base III, and a host of personal productivity and educational programs under the guise of allowing the renter to preview the software. The Software Publishers Association notes that the true purpose of such rental transactions is obvious—to permit the renter to make a permanent copy of the program for future use—with no compensation to the author.

The illegal nature of the business is illustrated by the pricing generally used by these rental operations. The rental price of the software, generally 25 percent of the suggested retail price, is to high to be a true rental. Instead, it is a thinly disguised method of permitting individuals to obtain a wide range of software for 25 percent of the retail price, with none of the revenue going to the copyright holder. One hardly wishes to learn a word processing or financial management program, only to return it to a rental store a few days later. By the same token, productivity, creativity, and educational software is used over a longer period of time than would be practical when one is renting the product.

The Software Publishers Association has noted that the number of software rental operations, both in storefront locations and mail order forms, has grown significantly over the past year. I believe that only congressional action can ensure that this growing practice of computer software rental does not deal a damaging blow to the copyright protection of computer software. For that reason, I am today introducing the "Software Rental Act of 1986" to require authorization from the copyright owner before one may engage in the rental, lease, or lending of computer programs for commercial purposes.

This provision modifies the first sale doctrine of our copyright laws that allows someone who has purchased a copyrighted work to dispose of it in any way he likes, by selling it, renting it, or giving it away. This rule has worked fairly well, and prevents individuals from worrying about copyright liability when they lend a book to a friend or sell an old record. In 1984, however, Congress unanimously passed similar legislation to modify this first sale doctrine with respect to audio records—the Record Rental Amendment of 1984—October 4, 1984, Public Law 98-450, 98 stat. 1727. That act, provides a commonsense reform that requires a person who wishes to rent out records on a commercial basis to get permission of the copyright owner before doing so.

The Software Rental Act of 1986 is patterned exactly after the record rental legislation, and addresses the same problems. In fact, software rental weakens the effectiveness of copyright protection even more seriously than the rental of records or tapes. A single program may reflect years of arduous work and may sell for several hundred dollars—as opposed to $6 to $12 for a record. Therefore, the revenue loss from each act of illegal duplication is quite substantial. Moreover, copying a software diskette is usually easier and quicker than duplicating a sound recording, and, unlike duplicated sound recordings, each software copy is precisely equal to that of the original. Illegal copying of rented software is thus more tempting and easier to accomplish than the copying of rented musical recordings.

The computer software industry is an important industry. In domestic and international arenas, we all recognize the importance of intellectual property, and the intellectual property industries to the American economy. I urge my colleagues to seriously consider these issues and join me in pushing for this small step to curb the commercial exploiters who threaten to stifle the kind of entrepreneurial development of computer software products that will contribute to our Nation's economic growth.
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THE 11TH DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOL ESSAY WINNERS: "HUMAN RIGHTS—THE MORAL FOUNDATION OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY"
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Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the five winners of the first Congressional Human Rights Foundation essay contest conducted in my district for high school seniors. The subject of the essay was: "Human Rights—The Moral Foundation of American Foreign Policy."

The genesis of the idea for the essay contest was simple, yet important: that human rights have become an important element of American foreign policy, and therefore our Nation's students should take the time to analyze and examine just what it is we mean by "human rights." I am pleased to report that the students of San Mateo County were equal to this task, and several fine essays were submitted to the districtwide competition.

First place was shared by two students: Kristine Ann Loftus from Notre Dame High School in Belmont, and Tina Huie from Jefferson High School in Daly City. I would like to share the thoughts of these outstanding prize-winning students with my colleagues.

Tina Huie wrote of the need for Americans to care for individuals who suffer human rights abuses in other countries:

Some people feel that we should not become involved in the internal affairs of other countries. "It's none of our business," they argue. It is our business though. "No man is an island entire of itself." We cannot be indifferent to the sufferings of other people. If we were walking down a street and happened to see someone being beaten, I am sure many of us wouldn't hesitate to do something about it. Why, then, should we hesitate to try and help those who are being beaten and tortured behind bars? "We don't see them," someone could point out. That is all the more reason that we should help. We cannot stand idly by while others suffer. We must do something about it. Why, then, should we hesitate to try and help thousands who are being beaten and tortured behind bars?""
Second prize went to Matt Berto of Carlmont High School in Belmont. Antonia Hannon of Notre Dame High School and Shombee Randall of the Highlands Christian Schools won honorable mention for their essays. These students should be commended for the time and effort they put into preparing their essays. They have contributed to our understanding—and to their own understanding—of the importance of human rights in U.S. foreign policy. A foreign policy without the moral underpinnings of human rights is devoid of morality and vision, and it lacks the greatest contribution our Nation can make to future generations. All five students deserve credit for their intelligent contributions on this critical subject.

CHURCH VIEWS ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS
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Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, not long ago, as reported in the following Omaha World Herald editorial of May 6, 1986, which I commend to your attention, the bishops of the United Methodist Church issued a statement of their position on nuclear weapons. Among other things, the bishops called for a nuclear test ban; a freeze on production and deployment of nuclear weapons; a no-first-strike agreement; and rapid reduction of nuclear arsenals. Going beyond what Catholic and Episcopal bishops earlier had advocated, the Methodist bishops criticized the maintenance of nuclear stockpiles meant to deter aggression. "The moral case for deterrence," they said, "has been undermined by unrelenting arms escalation."

No one, least of all this Member, would question the well-intentioned sincerity of these groups. Nor would anyone in his right mind argue with their goal, which is to keep the world from nuclear destruction. This Member does, however, think it is revealing and productive to contrast these statements by groups of American clergy with statements by European Catholic bishops—especially bishops from France and West Germany. For starters, the European bishops recognize that peace movements invariably put more pressure on Western governments than on Warsaw Pact nations. More fundamentally, the European bishops characterize the obligation of government to defend justice, freedom and independence as, and here I am quoting: At least as great and probably greater than the obligation to prevent war. Government's duty is to protect the innocent, by persuasion preferably, but by force if necessary.

Thus, it has been concluded, the Europeans rule out the massive or indiscriminate use of nuclear weapons, but have not ruled out the controlled or tactical use of nuclear weapons. Beyond this, the European Catholic bishops express concern that unilateral abandonment of nuclear arms might increase the likelihood of their use instead of preventing it. They also ask whether the unconditional refusal to defend oneself might not provide an opportunity for blackmail. They ask further, and I believe this is the central issue, if absolute condemnation of all war does not place peace-loving groups at the mercy of those motivated by an ideology of domination.

In essence, the European bishops see the stockpiling and threatened use of nuclear weapons as the lesser of two evils. In contrast to at least some of the U.S. groups, the European bishops do not view as immoral the willingness to threaten the use of nuclear weapons.

They say:

"Weapons only provide an effective deterrent if their use can be threatened in a credible manner. If an enemy knows that it is only bluff, it is no threat.

In defense of nuclear deterrence, which they note has staved off direct suicidal confrontation between the superpowers, French bishops write that its whole rationale is to make clear to an adversary that the costs of launching an attack or a related attempt at coercion are out of proportion to the benefit to be derived from such an action and are therefore not advisable.

Mr. Speaker, the position taken by the European bishops on this controversial, and certainly politically difficult to enumerate without great cost, but I submit that the concepts they advocate are worthy of careful examination by leaders of the American clergy and by public policy leaders of this Nation.

From the Omaha World Herald, May 6, 1986

KEEPING SOVIETS IN CHECK A MORALLY DEFENSIBLE ACT

Few rational humans can seriously oppose the goal of a world in which nuclear weapons are but a memory and nations live together in peace and harmony. Bishops of the United Methodist Church in their statement on nuclear weapons, indicated that they want much the same thing as leaders of the Roman Catholic and Episcopal Churches, the nuclear freeze movement, and the United States bishops in their statements of ordinary people around the world.

Unfortunately, no one, including the Methodist bishops, has come up with a clear way of achieving the goal.

The Methodist bishops called for a comprehensive nuclear test ban and a mutual, verifiable freeze on production and deployment of nuclear weapons; a no-first-strike agreement; and rapid reduction of nuclear arsenals. The statement calls on the United States and the Soviet Union to work together to eliminate nuclear weapons, but it also calls for unilateral action. While Catholic and Episcopal leaders earlier expressed conditional acceptance of nuclear deterrence, the U.S. practice of maintaining a stockpile of nuclear weapons to discourage aggression by the Soviet Union, the Methodists criticized the practice.

"The moral case of deterrence, even as an intermittent ethic, has been undermined by unrelenting arms escalation," the Methodist bishops said.

The moral case for deterrence? Unrelenting arms escalation? The Soviets have spent the last 40 years vigorously arming themselves. Even in the years immediately after the war in Vietnam, when the United States was cutting back on its military forces, the Soviets carried on—and even accelerated—their arms buildup. Finally, in the 1980s, the White House and Congress began following a policy in effect to let the Soviets develop a permanent military advantage.

The U.S. refusal to accept a permanent also-ran status in strategic military hardware has reduced the danger of Soviet aggression and helped persuade Moscow to negotiate on arms reductions. These are not immoral results.

Deterrence might not necessarily be the best way of managing the disagreements between the United States and the Soviet Union. Arms control is worth pursuing. So is the study of space-based defensive weapons. But the search for a better way must be realistic. The Soviet record is clear. Any attempt to declare deterrence immoral and replace it with something else could increase the danger to the West unless it took into account the fundamental hostility of the Soviet Union toward Western democracy.

No one knows what the Red Army would actually do if NATO gave up its ability to retaliate with nuclear weapons against a massive conventional attack against Western Europe. Nor does anyone know precisely how the Soviet Union would behave if the United States, through disarmament, put itself in a position of being vulnerable to aggression or nuclear blackmail. But what is certain, and it is a very, very bad thing, is that the United States would have to reduce its nuclear stockpiles in order to achieve further arms reductions with the Soviet Union.

The trial of the sanctuary activists has raised important moral and legal questions. Once again, a group of conscientious Americans have decided to follow their conscience and engage in acts of civil disobedience. Writing for the Washington Post, Colman McCarthy has taken a look at some of the moral and legal questions raised by the trial. At this point, I insert his column of Sunday, May 25, 1986, into the RECORD and urge my colleagues to read it.

The article follows:
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[From the Washington Post, May 25, 1986]

Refugees, Laws and Conscience
(By Colman McCarthy)

A 2,000-year-old question asks: If you were arrested for being a Christian, would they have evidence to convict you?

In Tucson, eight religious leaders are the latest believers to answer yes. A federal jury, responding to felony charges brought by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, convicted two priests, a nun, a minister and four lay workers of smuggling or harboring illegal immigrants from Central America.

Christian leaders have been accused by a Hebrew rebel executed in his mid-thirties by the government, is behind the crime wave uncovered in Tucson and spreading elsewhere.

More than 300 conversations in about 20 cities are caring for Central Americans in the ways the government says are criminal. People are choosing to be good Christians rather than good Americans. One of the convicted smugglers, Sister Darlene Nicolinski, put it well: "If I am guilty of anything, I am guilty of the Gospel."

The sister, uncomplainingly, will take her punishment if it comes. The appeal may take two years. She will be also be punished with the nine other defendants who see her and the entire Sanctuary Movement as a band of the self-righteous putting themselves above the law and then griping when the law catches them.

"That isn't the impression created by the statements made by the defendants after the trial and their pretrial statements," said the trial's priest, and "when one believes in God, you don't have reason to turn back or falter or to feel fear ... The only consequence this trial will bring is the multiplication of the number of us who will continue working for the same ideals." Jim Corbett, a Quaker and retired rancher, said, "Whenever the federal government makes a new trial of this kind, I think that we have to expect to go back to court as many times as is needed to inform the public enough so that no jury will convict."

A group of Salvadoran refugees—the illegals who led the eight into their lives of crime—also offered some thoughts at the end of the trial. "For us Central American refugees, it is significant that these brothers and sisters opted to remain faithful to their understanding of the law, and they have taken these risks so that we can find safe haven in this country ... They tried to find immediate solutions for refugees who are suffering the consequences of (a) 6-year-old war, and as long as the technique is used, it will continue to exist, so then the exodus will continue." These comments need to be recoated because, by order of an irascible judge, they weren't allowed in the court. Motives in other felony trials are allowed airings, but this one stayed roped to the technicalities of immigration and smuggling aliens or didn't it? Of course it did, and of course the law was broken. But are all laws sacred? Martin Luther King Jr. didn't think so, even in constitutional demands. He was jailed for lawbreaking. Henry Thoreau wrote that "unjust laws exist," and he was also jailed. The leaders of the abolitionist Underground Railroad broke the law, as did the organizers of the Boston Tea Party.

The argument against the Sanctuary Movement is the standard one always thrown at them. If you breathe like the law, change it through democratic channels. Otherwise, you invite anarchy.

The anarchy argument is overdrawn, especially in this case. Anarchy already prevails in El Salvador, from where refugees are fleeing death threats and violence that has seen 50,000 people killed in the past eight years. By one reliable count, more than 1,000 air and ground attacks were waged against civilians in 1985.

The civil disobedience of the Sanctuary Movement is based on the rational view that unless the law is challenged by direct defiance, the delay in changing it through legislatures will mean more death and suffering. Would America's segregation laws have been changed as quickly if King did not break them? Would the draft laws have been abandoned in the early 1970s if Vietnam war protesters had not defied the Selective Service?

The Sanctuary Movement, which is both religious and political, respects the law but not to the point of blindness. Nor is it its eye closed to the other moral issue—that the 50,000 killings occurred when Congress and the Reagan State Department were stating every six months, in a bludgeoning of truth, that human rights had been improving in El Salvador.

The Justice Department's job is to prosecute the Tucson group is impressive. With violent crime up 5 percent last year, here is the government in a massive case singling out the nonviolent, whose crimes to comfort their fight, for the hemisphere's tormented. Something else: If only part of the zeal for prosecution were transferred, as Henry Thoreau said, to the United States and Guatemala, where most state murders have gone unpunished, perhaps the refugees would not have been fleeing all these years.

Lessons Learned from Chernobyl: "What You Read Is Not What You Get!"

HON. MARILYN LLOYD
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the Chernobyl accident, a lot of confusing and misleading information has been propagated regarding the so-called graphite confinement, which is the heart of the accident (in the form of graphite). Indeed, it is easy to make hydrogen explode, but just try to burn graphite.

Some of us remember the German airship, the Hindenburg. It was the pride of the fleet before it exploded in Lakehurst, N.J. In January we again witnesses the explosive power of hydrogen with the Challenger accident. Then in April, the Chernobyl Unit No. 4 was damaged by an explosion. We suspect hydrogen was formed after the reactor lost its cooling water. This loss of cooling water resulted in a corresponding loss of pressure. As you know, water boils and turns to steam more rapidly the lower the pressure.

The Soviet reactor was built of many materials, but we know one of the materials used extensively was zirconium metal. When steam and zirconium react together they form hydro­gen. The Chernobyl unit has a great capacity to become a hydrogen generator since it not only contained zirconium-clad fuel but also included many large zirconium cooling tubes.

Unfortunately, the media, and even members of the international technical community, jumped to erroneous conclusions. The Challenger accident and the bombing of Libya had just gotten off the front pages, and Chernobyl came just in time to re-stir public emotions, and this time the bad actor was "graphite." One trade newspaper carried the headline, "Graphite Fire Fuels Russia's Nuclear Nightmare." The problem with that statement is that graphite is a very cheap material that doesn't burn. It is almost twice as dense as coal. In fact, it takes a fantastic quantity of air and a very high temperature to force graphite to burn. If one had taken just a minute to read page 545 of Webster's II University Dictionary, he would have read:

Graphite—a hexagonal crystalized allotrope of carbon used in lead pencils, lubricants, paint and coating and various fabricated forms including molds, bricks, electrodes, crucibles and rocket nozzles.

If you still think graphite burns easily, you try it by extending the lead from your pencil and holding a match under it. What happened? Nothing, right? So it appears that what happened at Chernobyl was that there was catastrophic loss of coolant, failure of limited emergency systems combined with an inherent flaw which finally resulted in the extreme conditions of heat and large oxygen supply required for graphite to ignite.

It happens that the Department of Energy has a civilian reactor development program directed toward vastly improved levels of nuclear reactor safety; using what? A graphite-mod­erated reactor, or course.

Sometimes we shoot before we understand what is the target. On May 14, 1986, I chaired a hearing of the Subcommittee on Energy Research and Production which brought some of the world's best nuclear engineers together for the purpose of collecting the preliminary technical "lessons learned" from the Chernobyl accident. One of the witnesses was Valentina Shkolnik, senior nuclear engineer employed by Combustion Engineering of Windsor, CT. Ms. Shkolnik was educated at the Kiev Polytechnic Institute, and is an expert on the Chernobyl type machine having participated in the design of those so-called RBMK reactors.

With the information furnished by these experts, permit me to set the record straight and present some of the differences between the Soviet reactor and United States commercial reactors.

The reactor at the Chernobyl nuclear generating station did not have a containment building like those built over the top of U.S. nuclear reactors. U.S. containment buildings include features which fulfill four separate safety functions:

First, isolation of the reactor and nuclear fuel from the surrounding environment.

Second, built-in capacity to reduce pressures and temperatures within the containment building—for example, by venting—to preserve the integrity of the building.

Third, elimination of hydrogen should it be emitted from the reactor by converting it to harmless water vapor.

Fourth, built-in equipment to capture radioactive materials and store them inside the building should they escape from the reactor.

The containment building at Three Mile Island Unit 2 performed these functions nearly perfectly.
The Soviet reactor was more difficult to operate than United States nuclear reactors for two very good reasons:

First, the Soviet reactor of the type used at the Chernobyl generating station was designed in a way that was, in the previously cited "design flaw"—that caused the nuclear chain reaction to speed up and "run wild" during an accident if the cooling water was lost—that's called positive coefficient of reactivity. The nuclear chain reaction would "snow down" in a U.S. reactor if the cooling water was lost.

Second, the Chernobyl-type Soviet reactor is refueled while running at full power. When the Soviet operators pull the old burnt fuel from the reactor it introduces an instability or fluctuation in the nuclear reactor. The operators then have the scary task of performing a nuclear balancing act with a 1.3 million horsepower engine (1,000 megawatts) ready to race out of control. The Chernobyl Unit No. 4 apparently did.

As a last resort, the people who live in the vicinity of U.S. nuclear reactors are protected by prepared evacuation plans to temporarily get them to safe distances should radioactive materials escape.

Mr. Speaker, the full story of lessons learned from Chernobyl must await the U.S.S.R.'s detailed accident scenario, but the record should be set straight as to why this accident turned into a disaster. Carbon and hydrogen are not the "villains." Present U.S. commercial design reactors with defense-in-depths provide this type of disaster as do the advanced passively safe reactor designs such as the modular high temperature gas-cooled reactor (HTGR) which employ graphite with confidence.

SALUTE TO STAN KOPPEL, A GREAT UNION MAN

HON. SALA BURTON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, next week one of San Francisco's outstanding union members will be honored on his 75th birthday. Stan Koppel has been a member of the Brotherhood of Painters nearly 50 years. I am pleased to present to my colleagues a statement about Mr. Koppel that reflects the high esteem his union holds for him.

The statement follows:

A SALUTE TO STAN KOPPEL ON JUNE 8, 1986

Stan Koppel first joined the Brotherhood of Painters back in 1937 just in time to be on strike. That's the kind of a guy he is. Stan was an active member of the Union in three areas of our country, Los Angeles, New York City and San Francisco. In the history of the Brotherhood of Painters there are three outstanding progressive-radical leaders during the period from the 30's through the 60's. It is no coincidence that our Union happened to be right at the place and time when each of these Rank & File leaders were active. It's Union members like Stan who made such leaders. They are the ones who build the support of the Rank & File that make possible big gains in what unions are all about—better working conditions and improvements in workers way of life.

Back in 1937, Koppel joined Local # 1348 a Jewish Local in the Los Angeles area. Laurel Heights, well-known for the movie stars cemetery. He went to work as a set-painter and in 1937 the Painters were on strike. He was on strike and it was there that Stan met and became a close friend of Herb Sorel, the Rank & File leader who later became the head of the Painters Union for the whole of southern California. In the 1937 strike they lost the battle but set the stage to win the war against the Labor racketeers then in power. Stan was one of the casualties. He was black-balled and forced to seek employment elsewhere.

Stan was never one to sit back and watch things happen. When our country was attacked in 1942, he got right in the middle of the action by joining the Submarine service. In April of 1947 Koppel found himself back in the Painters Union but this time on the East Coast. While a member of Local # 892 he joined with the Leader of the progressive forces, Louis Weinstock in the fight against the Labor racketeers then in power. Stan was one of the casualties. He was black-balled and forced to seek employment elsewhere.

In May of 1951 Koppel found himself back in the Painters Union but this time on the East Coast. While a member of Local # 892 he joined with the Leader of the progressive forces, Louis Weinstock in the fight against the Labor racketeers then in power. Stan was one of the casualties. He was black-balled and forced to seek employment elsewhere.

Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, next week one of San Francisco's outstanding union members will be honored on his 75th birthday. Stan Koppel has been a member of the Brotherhood of Painters nearly 50 years. I am pleased to present to my colleagues a statement about Mr. Koppel that reflects the high esteem his union holds for him.

The statement follows:

A SALUTE TO STAN KOPPEL ON JUNE 8, 1986

Stan Koppel first joined the Brotherhood of Painters back in 1937 just in time to be on strike. That's the kind of a guy he is. Stan was an active member of the Union in three areas of our country, Los Angeles, New York City and San Francisco. In the history of the Brotherhood of Painters there are three outstanding progressive-radical leaders during the period from the 30's through the 60's. It is no coincidence that our Union happened to be right at the place and time when each of these Rank & File leaders were active. It's Union members like Stan who made such leaders. They are the ones who build the support of the Rank & File that make possible big gains in what unions are all about—better working conditions and improvements in workers way of life.

Back in 1937, Koppel joined Local # 1348 a Jewish Local in the Los Angeles area called Laurel Heights, well-known for the movie stars cemetery. He went to work as a set-painter and in 1937 the Painters were on strike. He was on strike and it was there that Stan met and became a close friend of Herb Sorel, the Rank & File leader who later became the head of the Painters Union for the whole of southern California. In the 1937 strike they lost the battle but set the stage to win the war against the Labor racketeers then in power. Stan was one of the casualties. He was black-balled and forced to seek employment elsewhere.

In April of 1947 Koppel found himself back in the Painters Union but this time on the East Coast. While a member of Local # 892 he joined with the Leader of the progressive forces, Louis Weinstock in the fight against the Labor racketeers then in power. Stan was one of the casualties. He was black-balled and forced to seek employment elsewhere.

In May of 1951 Koppel found himself back in the Painters Union but this time on the East Coast. While a member of Local # 892 he joined with the Leader of the progressive forces, Louis Weinstock in the fight against the Labor racketeers then in power. Stan was one of the casualties. He was black-balled and forced to seek employment elsewhere.

Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, next week one of San Francisco's outstanding union members will be honored on his 75th birthday. Stan Koppel has been a member of the Brotherhood of Painters nearly 50 years. I am pleased to present to my colleagues a statement about Mr. Koppel that reflects the high esteem his union holds for him.

The statement follows:

A SALUTE TO STAN KOPPEL ON JUNE 8, 1986

Stan Koppel first joined the Brotherhood of Painters back in 1937 just in time to be on strike. That's the kind of a guy he is. Stan was an active member of the Union in three areas of our country, Los Angeles, New York City and San Francisco. In the history of the Brotherhood of Painters there are three outstanding progressive-radical leaders during the period from the 30's through the 60's. It is no coincidence that our Union happened to be right at the place and time when each of these Rank & File leaders were active. It's Union members like Stan who made such leaders. They are the ones who build the support of the Rank & File that make possible big gains in what unions are all about—better working conditions and improvements in workers way of life.

Back in 1937, Koppel joined Local # 1348 a Jewish Local in the Los Angeles area called Laurel Heights, well-known for the movie stars cemetery. He went to work as a set-painter and in 1937 the Painters were on strike. He was on strike and it was there that Stan met and became a close friend of Herb Sorel, the Rank & File leader who later became the head of the Painters Union for the whole of southern California. In the 1937 strike they lost the battle but set the stage to win the war against the Labor racketeers then in power. Stan was one of the casualties. He was black-balled and forced to seek employment elsewhere.

In April of 1947 Koppel found himself back in the Painters Union but this time on the East Coast. While a member of Local # 892 he joined with the Leader of the progressive forces, Louis Weinstock in the fight against the Labor racketeers then in power. Stan was one of the casualties. He was black-balled and forced to seek employment elsewhere.

In May of 1951 Koppel found himself back in the Painters Union but this time on the East Coast. While a member of Local # 892 he joined with the Leader of the progressive forces, Louis Weinstock in the fight against the Labor racketeers then in power. Stan was one of the casualties. He was black-balled and forced to seek employment elsewhere.
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that there were no local block-parent homes.  
There was no place for them (the elementary pupils) to go," Ebling said in the library of the elementary school on Mifflin Street.

"And there are little, little kids," said Shirley Cvetko, PTA first vice president.  "They don't have any older ones walking home with them to look out for them."

The "little, little kids" she referred to are the 215 kindergarten through second-grade pupils at the school. The pupils come from Orwigsburg, Auburn, North Manheim Township and Deer Lake—and the PTA would like to see block parents spread throughout each of those areas.

Ebling said the main purpose of the program was to discourage troublemakers from entering the area.

She said it has been proven in other places using a similar program that it significantly reduces and in many cases eliminates child molestation from an area.

PUPILS TO GET PRESENTATION

After applications are screened, Karb will give a presentation to the elementary pupils in early April on how they should use the block program.

The children will be told that they may use a block-parent home in any area, regardless of which school they attend or which school the block-parent home is affiliated with.

"These homes are not to be used if a child falls down and scratches his knee," O'Hara said.

Children will be instructed that the block-parent homes are to be used in emergencies only.

"We want the children to think of home first in an emergency," said Debbie Schenring, PTA treasurer.

But if he needs immediate help and there is no home available, then he can go to the block-parent home that has been approved by police.

"For a first up to bat, we're pleased with the turnout," she said. "But we're hoping for more."

Ebling said the vast majority of block-parents will never be called upon to give protection or aid.

"The success of the program will be determined by its inactivity," she said.

NEW JERSEY'S STAR-LEDGER ON FREEDOM'S RING

HON. JIM COURTER  
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to salute Newark's Star-Ledger for its consistent efforts at helping to keep the tragedy of Soviet Jewry in the forefront of American political interests. My own recent trip to the Soviet Union convinced me of the necessity to keep pressing hard and publicly for the right of Soviet citizens to emigrate, and so I have returned to America with an even greater appreciation than before of the kind of editorial the Star-Ledger ran in its May 19 issue. I am entering "Freedom's Ring" into the RECORD for your perusal.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FREEDOM'S RING

When he came to power, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev made much of the fact that his would be a regime of openness and candor, a new era of compassion and understanding. Disappointment and disbelief, therefore, were the immediate reactions of many to an impenetrable wall of silence in response to the Chernobyl nuclear accident.

Perceptive Soviet observers, however, knew long before the nuclear disaster that not much had changed with the ascendency of Mr. Gorbachev. The Communist state was still being ruled with an iron fist and human rights were still being denied.

Criticizing the trampling of individual freedom has been a matter of conscience and concern to Soviet Jews, who have been caught in the middle of an unenlightened policy. They have found it impossible to practice their religion and have been prevented from emigrating to Israel or other nations.

The Soviet policy of denying human rights to its Jewish population is the more despicable because it flouts the Helsinki Accords, which the Communists signed with great fanfare.

Anatoly Shcharansky, a Soviet Jew, has been an activist for individual rights for years—persistent, unrelenting and unapologetic in his struggle to maintain freedom of conscience and to bring home.

Shcharansky's tenacity finally brought him freedom from prison and from the Soviet Union. He was reluctantly released by the Soviet Union for an exchange of certain spies the Communists were anxious to bring home.

He has met with President Reagan and been honored by Congress, and his voice continues to ring out freedom's message. He urges Jews in the free world not to rely on quiet diplomacy to ease the plight of Jews who are trapped and persecuted inside the Soviet Union.

Mr. Shcharansky advises public demonstrations to keep pressure on the Soviets to relax their anti-Jewish policy and respect human rights for all. "They will never open the doors for 400,000 Soviet Jews until the losses for them, the dangers if they don't open the gates, are more than if they allow the Jews to emigrate," he said.

Keeping the pressure on the Soviets is sound advice that should be followed by all people who recognize the worth of the individual and abhor the denial of human rights anywhere in the world.

IRVING L. SPRATT, M.D., TO BE HONORED JUNE 18, 1986

HON. JERRY LEWIS  
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and feeling that I ask my colleagues to join me today along with family and friends in honoring Irving L. Spratt, M.D. On the 19th of June of this year, this outstanding individual will be recognized by the Inland Empire Chapter of the American Diabetes Association for his years of service to the association and his community.

Dr. Spratt's life is a history of his acts of giving. His contributions have included involvement in both civic and medical organization. He is a member of the San Bernardino County Medical Society, California Medical Society; American Medical Association, Fellow American College of Physicians, and American Diabetes Association.

He has been a dynamic and unselfish leader in his community for many years. Dr. Spratt served as a member of the board of directors for the San Bernardino-Riverside Goodwill Industries from 1959-66, and was duly recognized by Goodwill Industries with the "Man of the Year" award in 1964 for his service to the handicapped. From 1964-65, he acted as president of the San Bernardino County Heart Association. In 1967, he organized the San Bernardino Unit of the American Diabetes Association of Southern California and continued to serve that organization as chairman of the diabetes detection committee from 1970-75, president in 1976 and chairman of both the nominating committee and the goals committee from 1977-79.

Even with his busy medical practice, he has always found time to be directly involved in the American Diabetes Association. Dr. Spratt served as president of the association from 1982-83, and in 1983 was awarded the Banting Medal, which is the association's highest award for service to the medical profession and patients.

He maintains his fine Diabetes Medical Clinic in San Bernardino, and in the tradition of his years of public service, currently is a member of the advisory board of NIH Diabetes Data Group, project director of the San Bernardino Community Diabetes Control Program and active in the American Diabetes Association.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in paying tribute to this truly remarkable man, Dr. Irving L. Spratt. A devoted husband and father of five children, his service and dedication to the field of medicine and his community are certainly a source of pride and inspiration for us all.

ROUKEMA CALLS ATTENTION TO CHEMICAL WEAPONS DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA  
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, as Congress begins consideration of the defense authorization and appropriations bills for fiscal year 1987, the issue of the renewed production of chemical weapons by the United States is sure to be a controversial one.

One point upon which all sides agree is that, until negotiations with the Soviets to ban chemical weapons from Europe are complete, the Western alliance must maintain a chemical munitions stockpile in Europe to act as a deterrent. However, recent actions taken by the Pentagon and the NATO Defense Planning Committee throw into jeopardy NATO's deterrent capabilities by removing, without replacement, our current stockpile from West Germany. I urge you to consider the weakened position of the United States as a result of
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS
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HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced legislation (H.R. 4871) which would protect animals in shelters from becoming the subject of scientifically questionable research. I would like to request that this bill be reprinted at the conclusion of my remarks.

As you may be aware, shelter animals are not suitable for use in research because nothing is known about their genetic, environmental, or medical background. Despite this fact, some federally funded researchers continue to purchase dogs and cats from local shelters, breeders, and through intermediaries. These researchers unilaterally select those animals which appear to be the healthiest, most obedient, and most adoptable.

Because it is widely recognized that data obtained through research on shelter animals may not be scientifically valid, these animals now constitute less than 1 percent of the total number of animals used in biomedical research. The continued use of these animals is a tradition, not a necessity, and suitable, purpose-bred alternatives are readily available.

Researchers who use shelter animals argue that they are less expensive to acquire than purpose-bred animals. This is a false economy. Because of their diverse and unknown background, shelter animals must undergo expensive conditioning before they are suitable for laboratory use. They are more likely than purpose-bred animals to become sick or die prematurely, and more are required to complete identical research.

Eleven States and four foreign countries have already prohibited the research use of shelter animals. Although the National Institutes of Health [NIH] bans the in-house use of these dogs and cats, the Institute continues to fund outside experiments regardless of where the animals used. This bill is urgently needed to restore public confidence in the integrity of NIH research and to eliminate the use of animals in federally funded research.

This Act may be cited as the "Pet Protection Act of 1988."

SEC. 2. RESTRICTION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Federal funds received under any grant or research protocol of the National Institutes of Health may not be used to obtain or use any animal acquired directly or indirectly from any animal shelter for any research project or protocol.

(b) ANIMAL SHELTER DEFINED.—As used in subsection (a), the term "animal shelter" means any organization or government agency which—

(1) cares for lost, stray, unwanted, abandoned, or homeless animals; or

(2) is given custody of animals seized under State or local law.

SEC. 3. REGULATIONS.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

The violation of this Act or any regulation prescribed under this Act in connection with any research project or protocol shall result in the immediate termination of funds for the project or research protocol.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall apply with respect to funds appropriated in any Act or joint resolution enacted after 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

IMMEDIATE NEED FOR ACID RAIN CONTROL

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, an acid rain bill, H.R. 4567, has been reported out of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, and I am hoping that the full Committee on Energy and Commerce will give immediate attention to it so that we can enact it into law during this session of the Congress.

H.R. 4567, introduced by Mr. Skoroski, has been supported by more than 150 Members of the House, and, in my view, is the most sensible approach yet offered in protecting the environment from further damage from acid deposition. The bill encompasses two important and valid principles: First, let the polluter pay; and, second, don't impose specific technological solutions. The bill deserves the support of every Member of this House.

Much controversy has surrounded the issue of acid deposition, but the preponderance of evidence shows that sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides emitted from fossil fuel-fired utility and industrial facilities are in fact damaging our lakes, streams, forests, crops, buildings, and even our monuments including the Statue of Liberty. The evidence further shows that acid rain is an interstate problem, and that clean air legislation already enacted is inadequate to deal with it.

The Health and the Environment Subcommittee, on which I serve, has recently concluded extensive hearings on H.R. 4567. Chairman Waxman has very ably compiled a record showing beyond reasonable doubt that more stringent emission standards and controls are
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needed immediately. H.R. 4567 provides the needed standards and controls, and does so while leaving needed immediately. H.R. 4567 provides the date on this critical environmental issue, and the future. am optimistic that a

adjustment of status, circumstances have pre­

ty, his contribution to the Immigration and Nat­

members of the INS, to defeat the Pittsburgh Penguins in seven games, even though they had lost the first three. New York lost their next round series, but their victories over the Rangers and Pen­
guins were the first indication of great things to come. The Stanley Cup first made its appearance at the Nassau County Coliseum on May 24, 1980. Bob Nystrom's overtime goal against the Philadelphia Flyers sent the entire Island into a frenzy. This was a feeling that Islander fans refused to relinquish as New York went on to three more cup wins—in 1981 against Minnesota, 1982 against Vancouver, and 1983 against Edmonton. It was a feisty Oiler team that finally dethroned the Islanders in 1984. It could be argued that the greatest names in Islander annals belong to Bossy, Trottier, and Potvin. However, the name that belongs on the top of that list is Al Arbour. Al will stay on with the Islanders as a vice president, but the ever tall, wire-rimmed glasses bearing figure who stood behind the New York bench during their most memorable moments, will be sorely missed. Good luck in your new position, Al, we'll miss you. Thanks for the memories.

CHURCH AND PRIEST MARK
50TH ANNIVERSARIES

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 22, at the No. 1 Fire Hall in West Mifflin, PA, an unusual celebration will be held by 600 parishioners and friends of Resurrection Catholic Church. They will gather to mark the 50th anniversary of their church—and the 50th anniversary of the ordination of its pastor—Rev. Thomas Regis Patrick Mahy.

According to a history of the church, the formation of the parish is due to a great extent to the persistence of a group of women known as "The Catholic Ladies." For 2 years they petitioned for their cause and, finally, won consent. The first Mass in the "Homerville Mission" was celebrated on Easter Sunday, April 12, 1936.

Two months later, June 14, and not too far away, at St. Vincent's College, a young priest, Father Murphy, took his final vows for the priesthood.

Meanwhile, under the leadership of Father Lavelle, the parishioners of Homerville Mission worked toward getting their own church. They bought ground and on November 11, 1938, Resurrection Church formally was dedicated by Bishop Hugh C. Boyle.

A century later, in 1961, the parish was preparing to observe its 25th anni­versary while in the middle of building a school. The idea long had been the dream of
President Dr. Varner J. Johns, Jr.

HON. BILL RICHARDSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to salute an outstanding businesswoman from New Mexico, Sheila Garcia.

Sheila has been appointed to be a delegate to the national 1986 White House Conference on Small Business to be held in Washington this August. She was chosen to represent New Mexico because of her proven capabilities as a leader in the business community in Albuquerque and Santa Fe. Additionally, Sheila is always ready to lend a helping hand to other business owners by listening to their concerns and working together with them to strengthen the small business community.

Because of her dedication, Sheila was named the top Hispanic woman executive of the year by the national Hispanic Review of Business magazine. She is the president of Julian Garcia's Toyota City of Albuquerque, a business ranked 37th among the top 100 Hispanic-owned businesses for 1984 sales leadership. Sheila has been president of the firm since 1976, when her husband died last year. Under her leadership, the company ended the year with an estimated total of $35 million in sales, an increase of nearly $4 million from the previous year.

I am proud of my friend Sheila Garcia. Her selection to the White House Conference of Small Business verifies what so many New Mexicans have always known: Sheila Garcia is a woman who has learned that you don't lead by pointing to a place and telling people to go there, you lead by going to that place and making a case.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this outstanding citizen and businesswoman.

CONGRATULATIONS BONNIE BAKER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to Bonnie Baker, a teacher at the Thomas Downey High School in Modesto, CA, for having been awarded the Excellence in Teaching Award in recognition of dedication service to the students of Downey High School.

Bonnie Baker received her bachelor of arts degree from Western Washington State and furthered her education at California State University, Stanislaus. Bonnie began as an English instructor at La Loma Junior High School in 1972. Then in 1981 she moved to Downey High School where she taught English and journalism. For 3 years she also taught night school at the high school.

She has developed and presented a 10-hour SAP prep course and written four of Modesto City School's competency tests. She has served as a mentor teacher and been approved for a 1-year sabbatical to study American literature tradition in New England and California. In 1984, Bonnie Baker was recognized as the most significant contributor to a Presidential scholars.

Bonnie Baker's high degree of involvement in Downey High School's regular and extracurricular programs attest to her dedication to the field of education and to the youth of Modesto. I would like to congratulate Bonnie Baker upon receiving the Excellence in Teaching Award.
sone." He is a gifted teacher, a beloved and admired physician, skillful administrator and medical diplomat as well as a devoted husband, father, and grandfather. He is a remarkable man who has through his dedication and selfless years made an outstanding contribution to his profession, State, and country.

NO NEED FOR NEW CHEMICAL WEAPONS

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the administration wants to resume production of a new generation of chemical weapons. These deadly nerve gases are among the most bionous weapons that civilization has ever devised.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the May 15, 1986, editorial from Baraboo, WI, New Reporter which states the reasons why the United States should move forward with the development of these chemical weapons. Instead, the Baraboo News Reporter argues that we should work for a ban on chemical weapons.

MODERNIZATION OF WAR CHEMICALS IS NOT NECESSARY

The horrors of modern warfare are not restricted to nuclear weapons.

Chemical weapons are seldom mentioned in talk of defense, but they were not abandoned after their horrible use in World War I. Stocks of chemicals for use in war are maintained by the NATO alliance.

This month, representatives of the alliance—foreign ministers and defense ministers—will discuss modernization of chemical stocks.

We would rather see those talks center on destruction of current stocks and negotiations for a worldwide ban on chemical weapons.

The U.S. and NATO maintain their chemical weapons, presumably, in response to the Soviet Union's reliance on chemicals as an integral part of its military system. The Soviets have reportedly used chemicals in their war against rebel forces in Afghanistan.

Soviet troops are heavilytrained in the use of chemical weapons. That training in itself is an indicator and can be a significant number of casualties from such training, resulting from the Soviet's view of warfare and their military's lower value on human life.

The use of chemicals by the Soviets, however, no reason for NATO forces to maintain such weapons as an active part of the western defense.

The use of conventional forces, tactical nuclear weapons, and negotiations should be enough of a deterrent to the Eastern Bloc.

Yet this month NATO ministers will consider a proposal by the United States to fund, produce, and store new chemicals for weapons. If NATO countries ever decided to use chemicals in a conflict, the stocks could be flown to Western Europe. West Germany is now the only Western European nation to maintain the old chemical inventories.

The U.S. proposal is not politically acceptable to Europeans, but it should not be acceptable to Americans.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The United States should, instead, press for a ban on chemical weapons and destroy its current stocks. It shouldn't be a fine foreign policy-public relations move? It would also give up nothing, since the West's other deterrents are more than enough to convince the Russians that waging war is useless.

NATHAN L. "NATE" READE
HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to pay tribute today to an outstanding citizen of my district, Nathan L. "Nate" Reade, who is retiring this month after 10 years as executive manager of the Costa Mesa Chamber of Commerce. For more than 30 years, Nate Reade has given of himself to his community through participation in more than 20 different community organizations.

On June 29, Nate's family and many friends will honor him at a special function to recount many contributions.

The Costa Mesa Chamber is deeply involved in the varied facets of life in the city. As executive manager and as a chamber staff member since 1966, Nate Reade has personified this spirit of volunteerism and community involvement through his generous gift of personal time for the benefit of those around him.

He served for 16 years as a member of the Costa Mesa Planning Commission and also served as a director of the Costa Mesa Consolidated Water District. He is the former director of the local chapter of the City of Hope, past chairman of the United Fund drive, past president of the Youth Restitution Program and past president of the Costa Mesa-Newport Harbor Lions Club.

A founder of the Orange Coast YMCA, Nate also is a former director of that organization. He also was a member of the board of the Boys Club, has been active in the Boys Scouts of America, and is a former field worker and director of the Salvation Army.

Among the honors already paid to him is the Soroptomist Club's "Man of the Year," Orange Coast College's "Outstanding Citizen" and Child Guidance 1986 "Angel of the Year."

Nate and wife, Thelma, have four children, all of whom attended our local community college, Orange Coast.

Costa Mesa and the surrounding communities are better for Nate Reade's many contributions and I am pleased to pay him this tribute before the House of Representatives.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE CONRADS
HON. JIM COURTER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to George Conrads, chief of police, township of Chatham. Mr. Conrads will retire on June 30, 1986, after 27 years of devoted service.

George was appointed as a patrolman on March 30, 1959, he was promoted to sergeant in 1965, to lieutenant in 1971, and chief of police in 1978. While a member of the police force in Chatham Township he reorganized the police department in 1978 and introduced new records system including the introduction of computers.

He is a member of the Chatham Township Drug Abuse Council, Morris County Safety Officers Association, P.B.A. Local 139, and Local 170 and board of directors of the Chatham Township P.A.L.

Mr. Conrads graduated third in his class after completing 6 weeks basic police training at the State Police Academy in Sea Girt, NJ. He is married to Hilda Conrads and they have three children. The people of Chatham Township are indeed lucky to have such a capable and respected individual as chief of police. I take great pride in noting his accomplishments before my colleagues.

DONALD TRAUTLEIN ASSESSES STATE OF AMERICAN STEEL INDUSTRY

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 3, 1986

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure over the last few years to work closely with Don Trautlein, both in his capacity as head of Bethlehem Steel Corp. and as chairman of the American Iron and Steel Institute.

At the recent AISI annual meeting, Mr. Trautlein gave an excellent outline of the steps taken by the steel industry and how he sees the industry's future prospects.

It represents an especially significant outlook since Mr. Trautlein is retiring this year after a decade of dedicated, progressive, far-reaching service to the American steel industry.

Those 10 years have probably spanned the most difficult times faced by the American steel industry. As Mr. Trautlein noted in his comments, in 1978, about 101 million tons of steel were consumed in the United States with the domestic industry shipping 89 million of those tons. In 1976, the United States provided 26 percent of the free world's steel production. In 1986, the U.S. market will consume about 93 million tons—off 8 percent in a decade—but the domestic industry will ship only 72 million tons—a decline of 20 percent. Our portion of free world production will be only 17 percent.

But both personally and professionally, Mr. Trautlein saw good points. Personally, he commented that "I have enjoyed the challenges and the associations of my time in the steel industry. I admire and respect the men and women with whom I have worked in addressing the problems. And, while it appears that there are even more problems today than there were when I first arrived, I feel sure that you are heading in the right direction."

I also am inserting a portion of an article from the Pittsburgh Press which outlined Mr. Trautlein's assessment of the industry's position.
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STEEL INDUSTRY OVERCOMING BAD TIMES, AISI CHIEF SAYS
(By Cynthia Piechowiak)

NEW YORK—The nation’s steelmakers are not “out of the woods yet,” but they have laid the groundwork for better times, a top industry executive says.

“It hasn’t been a picnic for anyone producing international commodities in the United States in recent years,” Donald H. Trautlein, chairman of Bethlehem Steel Corp. and the American Iron and Steel Institute, said yesterday at the AISI’s annual meeting.

“The industry has been in a devastating spiral of self-liquidation and financial brinksmanship in recent years and we have not had time to regroup between crises,” he said in a keynote address to several hundred steel company officials.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

In the last 10 years, Trautlein said, industry employment has plunged by 60 percent and imported steel has leaped from 14 percent to 24 percent of the domestic market.

“Terrible things have happened to the steel family. Our traditionally generous and paternalistic industry—and I don’t say those are bad characteristics in and of themselves—has had to turn itself inside out to survive in recent years,” he said.

“That’s not a very happy portrait of an industry and the people who work in it, nor are we out of the woods yet,” said Trautlein, who is to retire from Bethlehem this year and will be followed as AISI chairman by newly elected Thomas Graham, vice chairman of U.S. Steel Corp.

“As far as foreign competition goes, I do not think we’ll see any relief,” Trautlein predicted. “I see more joint ventures and increased ownership by foreign interests.”

But Trautlein held out hope on a number of fronts, claiming the industry has improved quality and service, is making deliveries on time and has learned to view itself from a global perspective.

“Major customers are acknowledging that the quality of domestic steel is now unsurpassed,” Trautlein said. “In other words, we are on the right track.”

“Another plus is that the industry has become far more aggressive in managing its assets,” he said. “Those restructuring and modernized operations of ours are managing with smaller inventories than were ever dreamed possible.”

In addition, steel executives and steelworkers finally are beginning to alter decades of adversarial relations, he said.

“Gradually the hostilities and lack of communication that have characterized labor relations for many, many years are changing, and that is as it has to be,” Trautlein said. “We are headed in the right direction and there is progress.”